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P R E F A C E

As the title indicates, this study is concerned with the relationship between self-regard and regard for others; changes in these variables as a function of Interaction Group Experiences; and the broader implications of these variables for black-white interpersonal relations.

To prepare the reader for the study's purpose as it is developed in the Introduction and the first three chapters, it may be well to clarify the relationships of these three elements; i.e., Self-Other Regard; black-white interpersonal relations, and Interaction Group Experiences.

The basis of the problem underlying the need for the study lies clearly in the social and personal problems accompanying the so-called "Black Revolution" in the United States, as well as in other parts of the world. While the complexities of the Black Revolution involve many sociological, psychological, economic, and political issues, the issue of interpersonal relations is the focus of this study because such relations are regarded as the key factor in the ultimate alleviation of the problems underlying interracial relations and communication.

The Introduction presents a setting for the understanding of the general dynamics underlying the Black Revolution and its direction and devotes specific attention to interpersonal conflicts.
within this broader context.

While the setting of black-white relations is the frame of reference for this study, the relationship between self-regard and regard for others is the primary focus in the sense that it is considered basic to all interpersonal relations. The selection of this focus is based upon the proposition that black-white problems have roots and implications which transcend the more conventional focus upon persons as black and persons as white. This study will deal with regard for self and others as it concerns persons as persons. The Discussion Chapter (VI) will develop more fully how this issue of regard is basically and significantly related to black-white interpersonal problems.

Having established the focus upon self-regard and regard for others within the context of the Black Revolution, the facilitation of positive regard becomes an implied aim. The vehicle used in this study as the experimental variable designed to promote positive regard is Interaction Group Experiences. This explanation should help to place the study in some perspective for the reader.
INTRODUCTION

Amidst cries of "Black Power" and "Freedom Now," the study of black-white interpersonal relations becomes increasingly relevant.

The issue of black-white relations, particularly within the context of the changing image and role of the black man, is of crucial significance to everyone involved with interpersonal and human relations. The relevance of this issue is not limited to black-white relations only, but is crucial for international relations and world understanding.

The "Black Revolution" has redefined itself, its goals, and its battlegrounds. *Time Magazine* (February, 1969) observes that in the 1950's and in the early 1960's black students marched under the banner of civil rights. The struggle was fought on such battlegrounds as Oxford, Selma, and Montgomery. Recognizing the role of education in any revolution, black students today are making their thoughts and actions felt on college campuses throughout the country. These actions range from confrontation such as that experienced at San Francisco State, to the actual seige or "occupation" of crucial (functionally) and symbolic buildings such as happened at Brandeis.

It is no mere accident that these events have been taking place on campuses in the past three to four years.

It is self-evident that Myrdal (1944), the Swedish social scientist, should have been taken more seriously, when he warned, more than twenty years ago, that America can no longer "wait and see"—as
some people firmly believed that time alone would solve the problem of race relations—but "She must do something big and do it soon."

Each of the major issues involving black-white communication and relations is of, and by itself, highly complex, and perhaps even more difficult to solve. When an issue such as education is complicated by other factors such as race, the resulting complexities and controversies are most likely to lead to conflict.

It also seems inevitable that if, as de Tocqueville (1837) observes: "In the Northern States slavery recedes, but the prejudice to which it has given birth has remained immovable"; black and white may have to endure an ordeal of conflict and confrontation before they can learn to live with each other.

There are various ways in which the dynamics of black-white relations may be interpreted. The most realistic and fundamental one is by adopting a dim and pessimistic outlook. For, if in any society involved in this issue, better human relations connote the achievement of equal and fuller participation by all its members, then the picture portrayed through activities on the international scene (in general) and in the United States, Britain, South Africa, Rhodesia (in particular) is, indeed, a gloomy one.

It is possible, however, to turn this pessimism into a positive outlook, particularly when it calls for social change in general. For, it may be through this very pessimism that we may come closer to a realistic appraisal of the persistent problem and thus confront the issue more honestly in any attempts at facilitating and promoting interpersonal understanding and human recognition. Pessimism, coupled
with questioning and confrontation, is supremely useful for, like a toothache, it communicates the presence of decay and impending death to the body. Aptheker (1964) observes that without such communication societies (like the body) would go on suffering, unknowingly thinking: "All is well, when lo! the danger lurks."

The present world situation demands that black and white, and other ethnic groups in general, understand, accept, and recognize one another first and foremost, in fundamental terms of human worth. Northrop (1966) in his formulation of "epistemic correlations" as guiding principles in relating to international and human problems, poses the problem of recognizing conflicting human and cultural ideals; and he observes that two or more values or "civilizations" are shown to supplement and reinforce each other; they can meet, not because they are saying the same thing, but because they are expressing different yet complementary things, both of which are required for a positive and true conception of man's self and universe. Each can move into the new comprehensive world of the future, proud of its past (culture) and preserving its self-respect.

The preceding discussion provides an introductory background against which the experimental model presented in this study is reviewed. The specific dynamics of interpersonal relations derive from three positions: (1) the proposition formulated by Grambs (1965) on the re-education of black youth based on the self-concept development; (2) the concept of complete "determination" of behavior and personality development based on a phenomenological-perceptual frame of reference (Combs and Snygg, 1949; Rogers, 1957; and Mathewson and Rochlin, 1961); and (3) a
recognition of the relation between self-regard and regard for others as basic variables in interpersonal relations (Adler, 1921; Horney, 1937; Fromm, 1939; Rogers, 1954; Kennedy, 1958; and Erickson, 1959).

The model proposed in this study (Chapter IV) is based on an attempt to reexamine the role played by educational experiences in the promotion of positive interpersonal relations, personal worth and human understanding. Although specific emphasis is on those personal interchanges relating to interracial attitudes, implications for this study stretch far beyond such limited scope.

Differential interracial valuation. The questions of interpersonal conflicts—those resulting from interracial relations—have been explored in research studies and writings in sociology, social psychology, and human dynamics (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, 1950; Sarnoff and Katz, 1954; Morris, 1956; Rosenfeld and Jackson, 1959; Rokeach, 1960; Fanon, 1967). These conflicts have been demonstrated conclusively as deriving from differential valuations of members within any given society. These valuations, in turn, determine the manner in which people regard themselves and others, and the nature of the relationship formed.

This observation has been confirmed by contemporary research (Sheerer, 1949; Stock, 1949; Rogers, 1954), theoretical and research formulations in child growth and personality development, and demonstrates the significance and implications of the individual's perception of himself and those around him. The individual's self-perceptions or self-valuations are, of course, learned and not innate. Numerous studies in the area of social science and human development
demonstrate—through the process of learning, development, and socialization—how differential treatment produces differential and varying behavior responses and patterns. This assumption, however, does not preclude the intensity of such valuations in the development of other unique patterns of behavior within and between groups.

Commenting on intergroup behavior responses in the United States, Grambs (1965) observes that: "One of the clearest differences between Negro and white is that society in the contemporary United States continually tells the groups that they are different" (p. 89).

These differences, whether actual (e.g., color) or imagined, have been interpreted and perceived in a variety of ways by the society in general. Perceptions based on such valuations have, in turn, been related in terms of a continuum to connote superiority of the white race and inferiority of the black race. This message has been communicated in a variety of ways, some directly and others indirectly, and also via the different media available to the society.

For this research and study, the question, therefore, is not whether differences exist, but what they are perceived to mean, for to refuse to acknowledge the reality of racial differences, such as color, is to betray a fear that such differences somehow connote inferiority (Silberman, 1964).

Relating the effects of differential treatment and valuation to the too-frequently reported "neurosis" of the black person, Fanon (1967) observes that every neurosis, every abnormal manifestation is the product of a cultural situation. Fortunately, Freud, Adler, and Jung did not think of the black man in all their investigations; and perhaps
they were right not to have related their findings to the black man, because he is not a basic element of human reality. That is, there is a set of fixed attitudes, a series of propositions that slowly and subtly (through books, newspapers, schools and their curricula, advertisements, films, radio, etc.) work their way into one's mind and shape one's view of the world of the group to which one belongs. When the black interacts with the white world, a certain sensitizing action takes place. If the personality structure is weak, one observes a collapse of the ego. The black person, thus stops behaving as a spontaneous person. The goal of his behavior becomes the other, i.e., in the image of the white man, for, on the basis of differential valuation, he has learned that it is the other alone that can give him worth or self-esteem. It is, therefore, not surprising that a "normal" black child, having grown up within a normal family, will become "abnormal" on the slightest contact with the white world.

It seems unquestionable, therefore, that this kind of differential social and personal communication would, in the final analysis, result in differential effects on the perception, attitudes, personality development, and general behavior of the members of such groups. Naturally, these effects would be expected to relate to such perceptions and attitudes in terms of their positive or negative values.

Thus, the ways in which people perceive themselves and others, including their total environment, are significant in understanding the dynamics of both individual and group behavior; but of even greater concern, particularly for interpersonal relations and human interactions, are perceptions and attitudes based on such valuations and resulting in
negative self-perceptions. Of particular relevance to this observation is Baldwin's (1960) comment that: "The Negro child . . . looking at the society that produced him . . . understands that this structure is operated for someone else's benefit--not his" (p. 27). Hall (1965) in documentaries of her personal experience comments that:

Even today . . . I find that when I run into prejudice, my first response is to feel rejection, because I am unworthy. Later, I am able to be intelligent about it and realize that I am more sinned against than sinner, but the pain is still there (p. 12).

How it feels to be perceived as inferior particularly in the context of black-white relations, can be summarized in two words: "ego damage." The variety of pathological behaviors that have, as a result, followed ego damage are numerous (Sutherland, 1942; Kardiner and Ovesey, 1951; Deutsch, 1951; Frankl, 1959; Kvaraceus, et al., 1965; and Fanon, 1967). It is, therefore, the consequences of ego damage and its resultant effects on interpersonal relations, rather than the phenomenon itself that is of major concern for this research, for, it has been demonstrated that man's alienation, and, consequently, his pathology, is not an individual question. Since man is what brings society into being, society cannot escape any of the human influences encountered within that society particularly as affecting all the members of that society (Fanon, 1967).

Research studies and writings by social scientists have demonstrated that no ethnic or racial people or group is inherently inferior. On the contrary, biological studies continue to demonstrate and confirm the concept of equality of races and the universality of mankind.
From the variety of examples throughout the struggles for freedom by minority groups and oppressed people, and from examples of activities on contemporary educational scenes, i.e., college campuses, it is self-evident that the prospect of a continuing "inferior" status is essentially unacceptable to any group of people.

Thus, since man has been proved to be born a social being who only through interaction with his fellow beings can reach his fullest development, denial at any point and by any means, of this interpersonal and social bond is bound to result in confrontation and conflict. Consequently, neither colonial exploitation nor oppression of minorities in any nation, is likely, in the long run, to be compatible with stability, peace, and human understanding (Cantril, 1950; and Fanon, 1967).

A "perceptual-revolution." One general theme of this study is that the so-called "Black problem" is not just the white man's problem, as Myrdal (1944) believes; it is the black man's problem, as well.

This "problem" as perceived in the context of this study, involves a revolution in attitude change. It is not enough for the white to change his attitudes, the black must change as well. For the latter, this revolution in attitude implies changes with reference to self-perceptions.

When self-regard and regard for others is the focus of concern, as it is in this study, the attitudinal revolution, both black and white, is of central importance. Already, for the black, there is overwhelming evidence that the attitudinal revolution is spreading far and deep, not only within Black America, but in Africa as well.
This revolution has created political, social, economic, as well as personal awareness and a positive feeling among a people who otherwise would still be lingering in the depths of complete powerlessness and despair. The revolution is here interpreted as having brought about significant effects on the black man's concept of himself, for he is finally challenging and is refusing to accept the white world's estimate of his personal worth.

The United States, South Africa, as well as all other countries evolving around differential valuation of members of their societies, must go through a revolution, a "White Revolution." Paradoxically, however, if no change in white attitudes (racist) is effected—the black man shares the blame. For, to cast all blame on whites and do nothing about it, is to shun the reciprocal responsibility necessary to effect attitude change. Since there is something curative in taking blame "repentantly" on oneself, it is healthier and more effective when the white examines himself, and the black, rightly so, "aides" him to see his responsibility. But if the black self-righteously excludes all blacks from "guilt," simply because he is black, he commits a gross error. Indeed, Fanon (1967) observes:

The other has to perform the same operation. Action from one side only would be useless because what is to happen can only (most effectively) be brought about by means of both (p. 217).

The role of education in the "perceptual revolution." The central question for this study evolves around examining the role of education in the "attitude revolution." Because education is believed by most people to be the bridge of the future, it seems self-evident that
it must play a prominent role in the efforts to effect this revolution, and in the promotion of human and personal recognition, irrespective of differences. Thus, to be really effective, education will have to accept the task of dealing with the whole phenomenal field of the individual, of producing changes in the perception of himself as well as in his perception of his environment (Combs and Snygg, 1959), including his relationships with other people.

If, on the basis of the preceding discussion, it is true that only through the process of education can men of different races learn to live together in harmony and in full respect of each other's rights (Fullbright, 1963), then every effort to introduce active interpersonal programs seems to be more urgent, especially within educational institutions. It has been found that educational experiences, other than academic, are effective in attempts at confronting interpersonal conflicts, particularly those conflicts that have their basis in interracial beliefs and attitudes. Thus, any attempts at promoting positive interracial relations could utilize these experiences to develop new models, and to expand older attempts that have proved to be ineffective.

The events that take place on American college campuses today relate directly to this question. When a people realize and are convinced that education is irrelevant to their immediate needs and future goals, then their task becomes almost an impossible one. Recognizing this point, black students are seeking ways to confront and to change this situation. The resulting demonstrations, sit-ins, and other actions of a similar nature, are merely manifestations of attempts to dissociate
the educational process from any of the connotations it has gathered particularly for the black student.

Numerous studies on the incidence of school drop-outs (Conant, 1958; Sexton, 1961; Riessman, 1962; Passow, 1963; Harrington, 1964; Holt, 1964; Goodman, 1964; Clark, 1965; Kvaraceus, Gibson, and Curtin, 1967) confirm the observations made by black students that the present generation produces the next, and that for education to be effective, it must be made relevant to a person's total experience.

An analysis of the role of education in interpersonal relationships suggests that America and her colleges can no longer ignore the black man. His physical presence alone makes this impossible. One suspects, however, that some, more conservative, black leaders may have been willing to discount the present generation, placing hope on the next. Nevertheless, today's college student refuses to accept postponement of the question, and thus insists on other kinds of educational interventions, including confrontation, the inclusion of material relevant to the black student within the curriculum, and other examples of actions.

A number of writings have alluded to the question of low motivation and need for achievement among black students. This question, however, is seldom related to the issue of curriculum and educational relevance. Commenting on the significance of the latter, Deutsch (1960) observed in one school, that only during "Black History Week" did the majority of the students appear to be making a real effort to learn, and in some classrooms this was the only time at which some appearance of "order" was achieved and maintained for any length of time.
This observation is particularly relevant to the issue of understanding why and how black students, in general, have come to learn "certain ways" of coping with a system that, as Baldwin observed, is not operated for their benefit, but for someone else's. Arguing on theoretical grounds, therefore, the child who has insight into his group status, particularly if he has been made to believe that he is inferior, is better able to cope with his status in a positive manner in his attempts at adjusting to his environment. These attempts, however, may not necessarily be compatible with those of the total system, and thus may not make learning any easier for the student.

It is, indeed, wishful thinking to feel that children involved in irrelevant types of learning situations will catch up simply because they are taken to another school, particularly if at twelve years of age they read at the second grade level.

The role of the educational institution in American society, therefore, has to be redefined and broadened so as to be concerned with the responsibility of educating its students (socially, emotionally, physically, intellectually, and in its broad sense, personally). While educational institutions cannot be regarded as panaceas for all social ills, they are increasingly becoming aware of the possibility of utilizing available talent to ameliorate many of the social, human, and interpersonal problems which surround this society and the world in general.

"The Universities," says Cobbs (1968), "have become the dusty southern towns of today" (p. 18). To most whites, the analogy may seem somewhat exaggerated. A few United States colleges, after all, have responded to the black students' demands. However, yielding to
these demands seems in most cases to be totally unrelated to understanding the dynamics of the problem. This is perhaps one of the reasons why some whites, particularly the conservatives, find it easy to panic about black demonstrations and other related forms of action. This panic has led to misperceptions of the real issues basic to the problem, rather than to attempts at understanding the dynamics underlying these actions. Examples of such interpretations are reflected in an article on "College Struggles," by Thelwell and Pouissant in Newsweek (February 10, 1969).

This change in targets from southern towns to college campuses has had ambiguous, ambivalent, and often traumatic effects on many whites. These people have been alarmed by black demonstrations and other related actions, but they have not been so alarmed by the violence to personality of racial injustice (Fanon, 1963; and Cobbs and Price, 1968). There is violence everywhere, silent violence that is ghastly and white, as for example, in South Africa and Rhodesia; but rarely does white opinion openly lash out against it as it does against black "riots" or demonstrations, as demonstrated by reactions toward the events in the Congo in 1960.

The heart of the matter is that the black person may lash out, since experience demonstrates no one seems to listen to him. He may speak out violently and even act violently. There is evidence from contemporary black American literature (Ellison, 1952; Wright, 1961; Baldwin, 1961; Gregory, 1964; Malcolm X, 1964) that the black man has been persistently "appealing" to the white world to listen to him. To listen to him, as a practical attempt to show why he has developed a
certain image of himself, and consequently a certain image of whites.

From these observations, it is not surprising that one of the chief demands black students make on college campuses is that of sensitivity training and experiential groups for the total college population, i.e., administrative staff, faculty, and students. They recognize that since the majority of whites are often unclear or unaware of the present black attitudes, there are some crucial issues which need to be confronted more openly and frankly, particularly from the black's viewpoint.

Black students, have, thus, taken the responsibility of enlightening, though indirectly, the white people in this society. Moreover, most whites do not yet grasp what is happening on college campuses, and in this society in general, is "revolution" and not evolution. Black people have been marking time for over a century, during which period anger and frustrations resulted in "explosions," then everybody is to blame; the black for delaying and postponing the issue, and the white for evading the issue.

This statement is particularly true when one examines the social situation in South Africa and Rhodesia. South African and Rhodesian whites are, like American whites, evading the issue of interracial relationships, Apartheid in South Africa is such an issue evasion. Ultimately, however, such evasion become a supreme irrelevancy. There is ample evidence of this problem through events taking place in contemporary America and Africa, particularly as demonstrated during the Congo crisis of 1960. We can only conclude, therefore, that if attempts at change keep on, as for example in the Sharpeville crisis
of 1961 in South Africa (Roux, 1966), and the object does not move, explosions of all varieties will be inevitable.

Recognizing the truth of the issue referred to above, Brookes (1965) warns the whites in South Africa, that:

Bleak it is to us, however budding and singing with hope to our African fellow-citizens. What is spring to them, looks like an endless winter to us, cold and bleak and bringing death to all our hopes (p. 12).

A number of writers in this field have noted that "riots" and other related acts are "symptoms rather than causes" of the social disease. Thus, like any other disease—the social disease deriving from differential valuation and resulting in a variety of interracial conflicts—must be corrected before it reaches a cancerous stage.

Of particular relevance to this issue, especially in the context of this study, is the Kerner Report (1968). One of the basic questions that the report addresses itself to is what kind of program can be advanced to cope with the "sheer humanness of racism." The report recommends that only a nationwide commitment can perhaps, shape a future compatible with the historic ideals of American Society.

Because people can be restrained only so far as their tolerance will sustain them, we must be prepared for the accumulation of more and more frustration resulting in greater and even more severe confrontations, if the channels for more open and frank types of communication are not opened. It seems evident, therefore, that one way of approaching the problem is to increase and facilitate the quality and number of interracial contacts in the attempt to reduce the frequently used excuse in the form of "not knowingness." Ignorance of one race about another has been demonstrated to be the basis for the learned racial attitudes,
distorted perceptions, and stereotypes (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, 1950).

Black students on college campuses, within the revolution should be considered "God-sent." For they are continually demanding from whites self-confrontation and honest self-evaluation in perceptions and attitudes. In many cases, these experiences and encounters have resulted in a flow and exchange of insights, ideas, and attitudes, back and forth. Through this exchange it is hoped that imaginations can be sharpened, feelings conveyed, and distorted perceptions modified.

Any attempt at promoting positive black-white interpersonal relations must, at least, be based on increased understanding, the encouragement of a continuing open dialogue within and between the racial groups, and finally, a greater acceptance and recognition of individual (personal) as well as group worth.

This approach to the problem of interpersonal relations could provide a means whereby the two-dimensional world of communication between black and white (Fanon, 1967) may be destroyed and rendered unnecessary. Since the "racial drama" is played out in the open, the black student has not time to make it unconscious. The white student, on most college campuses, however, has been observed to succeed in doing so to a certain extent, perhaps, because of a new element guilt appears (Malcolm X, 1964). When guilt is the operative factor, very little in the form of open and honest communication can be effected. Directly related to the two-dimensional approach or attitude to communication, is Root's (1965) comment that, "there is a shocking lack of empathy on the part of the white person to the plight of the
Negro" (p. 20). The observation is not surprising, since evidence from a number of sources points to the conclusion that the majority of white people live for days, even longer, without thinking about the problem of race.

Black people cannot afford this luxury; for every black person has, at some point in his life, encountered experiences pointing to his "blackness." The black person's feelings of inferiority, superiority, or equality, are of necessity, highly conscious.

In their attempts to keep interaction closed, white parents often ask, "What if he (the Negro) learns in his own segregated school?" The difference is that frequently these schools are of inferior quality; and second, that if educational or school experiences and opportunities are based on differential valuations, black and white children do not get a first-hand experience of interaction and knowledge about the other person. Reactions toward each other are predominantly based on imaginations and learned stereotypes. For example, *Newsweek* found that, long before the riots of 1964, the irresistible force of black opinion was meeting the immovable object of white opinion. Two out of five blacks felt that white men wanted to keep them down. Three out of four whites felt that the black was moving too fast. How interracial understanding and recognition could be achieved when such feelings and opinions persist is beyond comprehensions.

The present study addresses itself to the problem of interpersonal communication through the use of interaction group experiences. In a broad sense it attempts to examine the extent to which theories and conclusions (Adler, 1917; Freud, 1933) can be applied in the effort
to understand the black man's view of his world. Specifically, the study is concerned with relating the perceptual-phenomenological approach to behavior (Combs and Snygg, 1949; and Rogers, 1954) to the problems of interaction, perceptual interpretation, and communication, particularly as it affects the learned two-dimensional way of communicating between black and white.

Since it is the "role playing" dimension of the black that is made available to the white, it is hardly surprising that the white hardly knows what it is like to be black in a predominantly white society. In order to understand the black man's real feelings and thoughts the white man depends mainly on his imagination and interpretations.

This approach to interpersonal relationships would provide the white man with the opportunity to weigh constantly his own values and attitudes. One of the main values of having the "revolution" begin with educational institutions and keeping the lines of communication open is that through interaction, imaginations can be sharpened or modified, and feelings conveyed.

How can we measure, for example, the stretching of awareness, sensitivity, empathy, and understanding that could be experienced by, for example, a white Anglo-Saxon, whose perceptions, attitudes, and reactions toward other peoples may be limited by the lack of contact, communication, and interaction with those peoples.

Having thus provided a context within which to examine the problem underlying this study, it is now necessary to define its specific nature, to identify the basic variables under investigation,
and to clarify the nature of their relationships with each other.

The next chapter is concerned with these issues, and in addition, provides a rationale for the significance of the present study, and the need for continued research efforts in the area of interpersonal relationships.
Despite the racial and social upheaval accompanying Black Civil Rights activities and events, there has been little contemporary research on prejudice and attitude change associated with increased black-white relations. The dearth of research makes it important to identify and describe prejudicial attitudes, and to deal with interpersonal conflicts emanating from them (Proenza and Strickland, 1965).

Within the context of this study, the problem of increasing black-white understanding suggests two areas of investigation: first, the nature and effectiveness of attitude change—that concerned with attitudes.

The first area of concern—attitude change—is one having many complex components. Problems of definition and measurement have made this a difficult area to study. One direction to follow is to work deductively toward determining the component parts of perceptions and attitudes. Another direction, and the one which will be followed in this study is to focus upon those factors which are considered most significant and crucial in the process of perceptual and, consequently, attitudinal change.
The focus of this study will be upon positive self-regard and regard for others as related variables. This focus will be without reference to the broader aspects of attitude change for two reasons:

1. As will be discussed in the section on Foundations of the Study (Chapter III), self-regard and regard-for-others are considered basic components of personality formation.

2. From a statistical viewpoint, these concepts are much less complex to deal with than the broader aspects of attitude itself.

The second area of concern is the possible effects of certain interaction group experiences upon self-regard and regard-for-others. It is hoped that information concerning these areas will contribute significantly to the accumulation of information about black-white relations so badly needed today. The primary issue, for this study, is to provide a model that can be applied in attempts to analyze, understand, and confront black-white interpersonal problems.

**Descriptive Statement of Basic Hypothesis**

Broadly speaking, the purpose of this study is to determine whether changes in self-regard lead to corresponding changes in regard for others as a function of Interaction Group Experiences. In addition, an attempt is made to explore implications of these findings as related to black-white interpersonal problems. The basis of the latter statement derives from the assumption that self-regard and regard-for-others are basic and related variables.
in all interpersonal relationships.

**Relevance of the Study.** It seems reasonable, at this point, to pose the question: What has this study to offer besides the factual appraisal of individual and group differences in perceptual and attitudinal development?

Two possible issues are considered: for one thing, it is hoped that the study will help in the analysis of the manner in which we perceive other people and other groups of people, given the perception of ourselves. This area of investigation has been identified by Combs and Snygg (1949), Buckheimer and Balogh (1961), as phenomenological.

A particularly important aspect of phenomenological investigation concerns the effects of what Allport (1954) referred to as equal-status contact. Several studies (Deutsch and Collins, 1950; Wilner, Walkley, and Cook, 1955) have demonstrated that this relationship facilitates mutual respect on all levels of interaction. On the basis of this hypothesis, it seems that the treatment model proposed in this study could be utilized by college and university personnel in efforts to develop models and programs for dealing with racial attitudes of college black and white students.

The fundamental purpose for undertaking this study arose out of a concern to develop a model, using interaction group experiences, to deal more effectively with a tense racial "climate" within the University of Massachusetts. For the first time (1968) the University of Massachusetts admitted a relatively large number of black students and these students were "housed" in one residential area (Chapter IV).
Consequently, this area became the target for racial tension and interpersonal conflicts.

The experimental program designed for this study was commissioned by the Office of Student Affairs, University of Massachusetts, as an attempt to avert confrontation by dealing with underlying tensions before they erupted and led to further solidifying racial stereotypes and attitudes within a community comprising students, faculty, and administration. The model proposed in this study is not, however, an ad hoc operation, but a social planning program for specific purposes of long-term perceptual attitudinal and social change. The program is designed to establish a process which would allow all members of the university community to confront and face up to their own perceptions and attitudes particularly as relating to other groups of peoples.

While the population sample used to test this model was made up solely of residence hall counselors and counselor apprentices, the proposed model itself is applicable to different segments of the total university community. For the model to be implemented effectively throughout the entire community, administrators must work and share the responsibility with the faculty and the entire student body.

The relevance of this study relates to the fundamental role of education, that is, the learning of new experiences and the facilitation of positive interpersonal and human relations. This proposal calls for a responsibility to develop "whole" human beings (i.e., intellectual, physical, moral, emotional, as well as social development).
The model proposed is particularly relevant when one examines the question: why colleges and universities have now become the battlegrounds for racial confrontations. About 150 years ago, deTocqueville observed that as illogical as it may seem, the worst symptoms and indications of deterioration in interpersonal relations seem to be occurring when conditions are "improving." To this writer, however, improvement in conditions, particularly as it relates to the oppressed and the oppressor, brings up an issue of definition and point of view. What may be called improvement by one group could be identified as deterioration by another.

Related to the preceding statement is an observation by Brandeis University President Abrams (1969):

Ferment in our land, including that in universities, may be the storm before the clearing . . . a measure of the currents of healthy change in society . . . Despite the threats to its welfare, a university cannot point to student demands or illegal acts as reasons for becoming defensive and hostile; in fact, just the opposite attitudes are now imperative. There must be from students, faculty, and administration in union, a positive thrust of unprecedented energy and imagination to re-examine the goals and structure of the university and to move with the speed that legitimate reforms deserve (p. 12).

Recent confrontations on college campuses are not unique to colleges and universities in the United States. Other countries operating under discriminatory (of one form or another) values, experience such confrontations. The University College of Fort Hare in South Africa is one example of a college that has been confronted by its students in their attempts at social change. The differences in these confrontations from country to country, reflect approaches rather than content and form. The basic theme in all of
these confrontations is a demand for "independence," "self-determination," "human recognition," and "worth."

Recognizing the role of education, particularly that concerned with higher education, Brookes (1965) comments on conditions in South Africa: "A nation depends very much on its universities, and it is not in the genius of academic institutions to thrive on inbreeding" (p. 28-29).

Relating these observations to the issue of self-other perceptions, certain basic assumptions could be made. The main assumption, one which is of major focus for this analysis, is that since the development of self-regard is a function of experience (i.e., growth and socialization) what happens to students during the time spent in an educational institution is of vital concern, and should, of necessity, be made relevant to their growth and development in all aspects (emotionally, physically, intellectually, as well as, socially). Thus, since our perceptual experiences are seldom free from societal expectations, we are always aware, consciously or unconsciously, of others. The way we perceive ourselves is, to a great extent, affected by these experiences. Further, since perceptual experiences require a certain degree of stability to have meaning and satisfaction for an individual, it is hardly surprising that the black, in his "two-dimensional" approach to communication (black world versus white world), has achieved little or no satisfaction. The stability of our perceptual experiences, i.e., consistency between feeling and acting, is an essential factor in achieving and
maintaining personal adequacy and fulfillment. Education, to be
effective, must be related to personal meaning and fulfillment.
Educational institutions, in a broad sense, therefore, should be
designed to function as agents of social change as well as ego-
building catalysts.

There are numerous studies showing how the relation between
self-regard and regard-for-others has been utilized as a strategy
in educational experiences. For example, Rogers (1954), on the
basis of Sheerer's (1949) conclusions, suggested that the relation-
ship between self-regard and regard-for-others would imply that self-
rejection or personal threat may be a factor in individual hostility
toward other individuals or groups. Indeed, Fromm (1939) saw the
"disproportionate" hostility expressed against Jews in Germany as
being related to a kind of cultural self-rejection on the part of the
Germans, which, he maintained, derives from an authoritarian tradition
of upbringing that tended to suppress spontaneity.

In a study on ethnic prejudice; Adorno, Frenkel-brunswik,
Levinson and Sanford (1950) observed from their findings
that:

Regardless of whether the specific topic was that of
ambivalence, or aggression, or passivity, or some other
related feature of personality dynamics, the outstanding
finding was that the extremely unprejudiced individual
tends to manifest a greater readiness to become aware of
unacceptable tendencies and impulses in himself. The
prejudiced individual, on the other hand, is more apt
not to face these tendencies openly and thus to fail in
integrating them satisfactorily with the conscious image
he has of himself (p. 218).

Findings by Rogers (1951), Wylie (1961), Rubin (1967) support the
proposition that one way to change a person's racial perceptions
and attitudes is to somehow change his perceptions of and attitudes toward himself.

Basic to this research is the general assumption that successful change in self-regard requires a particular kind of environment—one in which the individual feels psychologically secure. Consequently, Rogerian theory asserts that when people are placed in a non-judgmental and accepting environment, they will be able to confront their feelings more honestly, be open to new learning experiences, and eventually become more accepting of themselves. Rogers (1954) further predicts that with increased acceptance of self, the individual is better able to accept others.

Interaction group experiences have been found to be one of the most effective ways of providing such an avenue of psychological security and safety. Through interaction group experiences attempts are made to help people become aware of their major areas of pluralistic ignorance. Thus, it becomes possible for them to realize that, in fact, they no longer need to hide nearly so much of themselves from others as they formerly did.

The degree of mutual trust which develops during the interaction group experience enhances an individual's willingness to openly explore aspects of his self that before were either kept "hidden" or not accepted as existing. The individual becomes more accepting of these guarded aspects of his self. This experience is made possible because the participants and the trainer reinforced his openness by being supportive.
In proposing the experimental design used in this study, an assumption is made that interaction group experiences (as defined in Chapter IV) have a positive effect of certain (negative) personality characteristics. The specific characteristics under investigation in this study derive from the concept of regard, identified as self-regard and regard-for-others.

**Definition of Variables**

In the attempt to better understand the dynamics of personality development, self theorists have identified a variety of variables related to the concept of "self." Among these are variables, such as, "self-concept," "self-ideal," "self-adequacy," "self-acceptance," and "self-regard," and others. As these variables are adopted and used by an increasing number of people from a wide variety of theoretical frames of reference, the literature dealing with them has become more and more complex. This study, however, limits its conceptual bases to the variable of regard; specifically "self-regard" and its relation to "regard-for-others."

The word "self" is a comprehensive term referring to a specific human phenomenon. The assertion that a "self" exists may involve only the assumption that for a given human being, there exists identity (uniqueness) and consciousness of self and environment. If, however, we wish to go beyond this point and describe the characteristics and attributes of a given "self," the task becomes a more complex and difficult one, for the self can be observed from many different frames of reference. It may be described from the point of view of innumerable
observers, including the individual himself. It is this latter description which is of central concern for this study.

It is not the task of this study to examine the question of the "real" self, for, its very existence is a philosophical question. It is sufficient to recognize that the ways in which the self is perceived can be studied. The latter issue is of significance for this study since these perceptions are regarded as basic determinants of personality development and behavior.

**Self-regard.** The concept of self-regard is frequently used synonymously with the term "self-acceptance." This term as used by Sheerer (1949), Combs and Snyder (1949), Rogers (1951), Berger (1951), and Maslow (1954) refers to the ability of the individual to accept into awareness any facts about himself with minimum defense or distortion. This term is related to "accuracy" of observation and self-awareness, and does not imply approval or disapproval of self. Thus, a person who regards himself positively is one who is able to "laugh" at himself, in the face of unflattering judgment, without finding it necessary to be defensive about the existence of such perceptions. It would, therefore, be erroneous, within this frame of reference, to equate self-regard with self-approval.

Self-regard develops in the course of associating self-experiences (positive or negative) to the need for regard in general. That is, experiences have some effect on one's total experiential field (Rogers, 1951). These experiences (external) are then evaluated and subsequently internalized in the process of self-development. The nature of these experiences depends on our interaction with our
environment, including our interpersonal relationships. Consequently, self-regard becomes selective as significant others distinguish the self-experiences of the individual as more or less worthy of positive regard.

**Positive self-regard**, refers to a positive conception of self which is no longer directly dependent on others' appraisals and evaluations. This interpretation has important implications for black-white relations, particularly with respect to the historical development of the black man's perception of himself and the recent changes in self-perception. It implies, that although the white man's perception of the black man may not have changed, the latter's self perception and self-definition provides a basis for the understanding of slogans such as "black pride" and "black is beautiful" and many others, the basic themes which underly the Black Revolution.

**Regard-for-others.** Numerous studies provide evidence that behavior toward the other person is influenced by how he is perceived. If we perceive only favorable characteristics we tend to regard someone highly. If, however, we perceive only unfavorable characteristics we tend to reject someone or regard him negatively. Thus, Rogers (1951) observes: "an organism reacts to the field as it is experienced and perceived (p. 484). Although this statement implies imposing our own values in reacting to others, the concept of regard does not connote value-judgment. Rather, the use of the phrase "regard-for-others" implies a recognition of, and respect of others in spite of differences. In relating this analysis to black-white relations, it is evident that such responses as absolutism (Rokeach, 1960) are directly opposed to
the definition and interpretation of regard-for-others. Rather, more relevant is the concept of syntony (Chenault, 1966) which refers to the ability to value broadly, to transcend polarities, to avoid the extreme "either-or" orientation, to develop wider, more tentative, non-arbitrary values, to be less sure what is right and wrong, to be less eager to judge good and bad, and to recognize that so-called dichotomies can exist compatibly in one's self and in others (Chapter IV). Syntony implies a recognition and acceptance of the totality of human existence.

Absolutism. Studies on the concept of defensiveness and its effects on interpersonal relationships point to the observation that when self-regard is low and the feeling of potential threat is experienced, a person becomes uncomfortable and anxious. Avoidance of such threat provides strong motivation for the development of defenses as attempts to cope with anxiety. Anxiety in this sense is defined as anything the individual perceives as threatening—physically or psychologically. One such defense against anxiety is the development of absolute judgments. At a more personal level, fear or loss of regard tends to be most defended against. One way of doing this is by resorting to absolute judgments. Once this is done, the individual loses some degree of objectivity. Indeed, from evidence in studies on race relations, the tendency to make absolute judgments has been found to be the basis for interracial conflicts and confrontations, Adorno, et al. (1950); Allport (1960).

Absolutism refers to the tendency to be certain in one's
evaluation of people or things; an attitude frequently assumed without reference to anything else. It is characterized by an "either-or" orientation, closed-mindedness (Rokeach, 1960), concern with polarization, and a general tendency to make extreme and hasty judgments. It has been found to be closely related to dogmatism by Rokeach (1969), Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950) and often associated with maladjustment by Rogers (1954). For the purposes of this study, absolutism is operationally defined as the total score on the Absolutism Scale (Chapter IV).

If syntony, as implied in the previous discussion, is perceived as related to positive regard-for-others, it follows that it does not imply a complete absence of absolutism. For a syntonic person might occasionally value something as absolute as prejudice, greed, or resentment. He is a person capable of all the characteristics of a human being--strengths and weaknesses--yet one who recognizes his humanity and is not made to feel uncomfortable by the existence of opposite personality traits at any one given time. Such a person might occasionally utilize defense mechanisms but since he exercises a high degree of self-awareness, he tends not to maintain these defenses.

From the preceding discussion, it is evident that the basic assumptions made with regard to the research design refers to related changes in the perception of self and of others. These changes are examined within the specific limits (and frame of reference) of the concept of regard. From these findings (Chapter V) implications are explored and generalizations arrived at within the limits of the experimental design.
Hypotheses

Under this section is presented a rationale for and statement of the research hypotheses on which the study is based. These hypotheses have evolved from the more fundamental and broader questions raised in the preceding formulations. These formulations in turn involve the role of the self-concept in personality development and human behavior.

The most fundamental question, on which the main hypothesis is based, involves an attempt to explore the effects of interaction group experiences on self-regard, with implications for related changes on regard-for-others.

The supporting hypotheses (III and IV) have evolved from the broader applications of the variables of self-regard and regard-for-others to the dynamics of interpersonal behavior. Implications of these dynamics are explored within the limited scope of black-white interpersonal relations.

The foundations for the issues raised in this study have evolved from Rogers' (1935) theory of personality development as stated by Proposition XVIII:

When the individual perceives and accepts into one consistent and integrated system all his sensory and visceral experiences, then he is necessarily more understanding of others and is more accepting of others as separate individuals (p. 520).

To determine the effects of the experimental treatment on self-regard, regard-for-others, and related variables, two basic measures are used. These are the Berger Acceptance of Self and
Acceptance of Others Scales and the Absolutism Scale. A third supporting scale (The Rating Scale) is used to explore some variables assumed to have a negative effect (i.e., the tendency to make extreme judgments) on the development of positive regard as well as positive interpersonal communication.

In order to test the above assumptions, three steps will be followed:

A. Validation of the measures used, i.e., whether within the limits of this study the scales measure what they are assumed to measure (rationale for use of scales).

B. The effect of the experimental treatment on regard and related variables.

C. The implications of these variables on interpersonal factors (specifically relating to the Race [black-white] and Sex [male-female] variables).

Validation of, and rationale for, the measures:

The Berger Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Scale:

The Berger Scales (1952) were designed to test the assumption that in a normal population, there is a positive relation between the acceptance of self and the acceptance of others.

The Absolutism Scale:

The Absolutism Scale (Davies, 1966) was designed on the theoretical assumption that those people who check only one of paired opposite characteristics as descriptive of themselves and of others, and as acceptable in themselves and in others are more absolute than those persons who select both of paired opposite characteristics.

The Rating Scale:

(Davies, 1966) was used to determine the correlation between the scores on the Absolutism Scale and the selection of polar "1's" and "7's" on a seven point rating scale.
A more detailed review of these measures, as well as their use as indices of intergroup (black-white) relations will be presented in Chapter IV.

Below is a statement of the research hypothesis. In every case the hypotheses will be tested by the appropriate null hypothesis.

**Hypothesis I (Pre-Treatment Comparisons)**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between the experimental and control groups on any of the measures used before the introduction of the experimental treatment.

**Hypothesis II (Treatment Effects)**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between the experimental and control groups on any of the measures used after introducing the experimental treatment.

**Hypothesis III (Race Variable)**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between blacks and whites on any of the measures used. Likewise, it was hypothesized that there would be no interaction effects involving the race variable with the variables of Group or Sex.

**Hypothesis IV (Sex Variable)**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between males and females on any of the measures used. Likewise, it was hypothesized that there would be no interaction effects involving the sex variable with the variables of Group or Race.
Although there was much writing on self-theories during the 1940's and 1950's there was very little research done prior to 1949. Since that time, however, there has been an increasingly large number of investigations, each relating to, and exploring a variety of aspects or dimensions of the self.

The role of perception in relation to the self, and personality development has been explored by numerous investigators (Allport, 1935; Bruner and Postman, 1947; and others). These explorations have formed the basis for the assumption that perceptual experiences (stimuli) are basic to personality development and behavior (Sherif, 1948; Carter and Schooler, 1949; Solly and Murphy, 1960).

Basic to positions deriving from this assumption is the observation that the individual's perception of his own feelings, attitudes, and ideas is more valid than any outside diagnosis can be, and consequently, behavior can best be understood from the individual's own point of view (Snygg and Combs, 1949; Rogers, 1954). Following this observation is the assumption that a person responds in such ways as to be consistent with his experiences.

A theoretical frame of reference deriving from the assumption that perception is a basic determinant in behavior and personality development, along with an analysis of its philosophical implications, is explored in detail in Chapter III.
The attempt of this chapter is to provide empirical background for the study, together with a review of research related to changes in self-other regard as a function of group experiences, with implications of research findings for the promotion of interpersonal, as well as social (black-white) relations.

Review of literature on related changes between self-regard and regard-for-others. About two decades ago, closer attention was directed at the individual's perceptions of other persons (Sheerer, 1949), and significant relationships were demonstrated between the perceptions of others and the needs and attitudes of the perceiver toward himself (Berger, 1952; Fey, 1954; Omwake, 1954; Bossom and Maslow, 1957; Wylie, 1957 and others).

Through the influence of observations made by Sheerer as early as 1949, there has been, in recent years, an increasing amount of attention focused on the study of perception, especially social perception and its relevance to personality adjustment, interpersonal relations, the individual's conceptualization of self and others, and his attitudes toward these self-other perceptions.

A variety of dimensions of self-other perceptions, such as accuracy, similarity, stereotypy, have been explored (Dymond, 1950; Postman, 1953; Gage, 1953; Cronbach, 1955; Cline and Richards, 1961; Richards, Cline, and Rardin, 1962; and Crow, 1964). The one dimension which has provided a framework for much of personality theory, and, therefore, has attracted more research attention, is that of acceptance which includes attitudes toward the self and others.

Significant contributions to the understanding of personality
dynamics and development have been made by a number of theories in relation to aspects of self-regard. Examples of these are indicated in Adler's (1921) "compensation for inferiority feelings"; Horney's (1937) "real versus the idealized self"; Allport's (1937) "trait organization within the individual"; Sullivan's (1953) "security"; Snygg and Combs' (1949) "differentiation of the phenomenal self"; Angyal's (1941) "conscious self"; Lecky's (1945) "self-consistency"; and Sarbin's (1954) "self-role interaction scheme." All these theoretical formulations form the basis for the study of self-development.

There has been very little theorizing relative to the relationship between acceptance of others, taken singly, and personality development and functioning (Kennedy, 1958). However, in many of the theories in which the concept of self-regard or acceptance of self is central, the significance of regard for others is implied. Newcomb (1950) particularly emphasizes the relevance and interdependence of the two concepts in understanding personality: "... a great deal of personality can be understood in terms of self-other perceptions," and "... self perceptions and self attitudes are at the same time other perceptions and other attitudes." He notes further that: "It is not as ye judge so shall you be judged, but as you judge yourself so shall you judge others."

Interpersonal relations have received renewed emphasis in the contemporary personality theories of Goldstein (1940), Angyal (1941), Lecky (1945), Masserman (1946), Maslow (1954), Murray (1956), Allport (1962), and others. Perhaps the greatest single influence on
the resurgence of theoretical emphasis on self and self-in-relationship
as central notions in understanding personality comes from Rogers and
his associates.

The most commonly studied set of variables of self-other
perceptions include such attitudes as self-other regard, self-other
acceptance, self-esteem, congruence and/or discrepancies between these
attitudes. Although the first three attitudes are frequently used
interchangeably they should not necessarily be regarded as synonymous
(Wylie, 1961).

For some authors (Rogers, 1954) positive self-regard implies a
respect for one's faults and weaknesses, while self-esteem means being
proud of one's self or evaluating one's attitudes highly. In fact,
to some authors (Jervis, 1959) optimum self-esteem or self-satisfaction
is manifested by moderately small discrepancies between subjects' descriptions of self and ideal self on, for example, Q sorts, rating scales, or adjective check lists. Thus, self-acceptance is, in this context, regarded to be the conscious recognition of some falling short of the ideal.

Although the concept of self-regard, as conceived in this study
should not be confused with self-satisfaction, complacency, or resignation, for purposes of convenience in discussing and ordering research literature, the words "self-regard" as used in this study, will be considered as encompassing self-acceptance.

Phenomenological research on self-regard dates from the study by Raimy (1948). Raimy established an extensive self-concept theory of personality and studied the ways in which the self-concept constitutes
an index of change in personality. His study of therapy records supported
his hypothesis. Cases judged successful showed positive shifts in self-
concept while cases judged unsuccessful did not.

Various other similar concepts, however, have occupied dominant
roles in other theories (Combs and Snygg, 1949; Horney, 1950; and
Sullivan, 1953). More important, self-regard seems to have been used
exclusively for less systematic, eclectic purposes by many practicing
clinicians and researchers (Cowan, 1956; Coven, Heilzer, Axelrod, and
Alexander, 1957; Zuckerman, Baer, and Monashkin, 1957). The major
part of the research on self-regard derives from Rogers' self-theory,
but research based on other theories (Block and Thomas, 1955; Sarbin
and Rosenber, 1955) and the generally empirical investigations
referred to above confirm the extent of current interest in the
behaviors classified under this broadly interpreted construct.

While no single definition of self-regard would be accepted by
all who use the term, the phenomenological view of Rogers seems to
represent at least a common point of departure. From the definition
of self-concept construct, the concept of self-regard is derived,
referring at least, operationally and all-inclusively, to the extent
to which this self-concept is congruent with the individual's
description of his "ideal self."

The majority of self-regard studies have followed this model
(Bills, Vance, and McClean, 1951; Phillips, 1951, using the Berger
Self-Acceptance Scale; Brownfain, 1952, using Self-Rating Inventory;
Rogers and Dymond, 1954, using Q sorts; LaForge and Suczel, 1955,
using the Interpersonal Check List; Buss and Gerjouy, 1957, using
Adjective Check List; Zuckerman and Monashkin, 1957 and Bills, 1958, using the Index of Adjustment and Values).

A somewhat different psychometric model has been proposed by Gough (1955), using the Adjective Check List, in which "self-acceptance" was inferred from the ratio of "favorable" self-descriptive statements to the total number of self-descriptive statements made by the subject.

A common denominator in the definition of self-regard, judging from the operations employed in its measurement, seems to be the degree of self-satisfaction in self-evaluation. As was mentioned earlier in this section, this definitional consensus, however, is achieved at the level of operations; other meanings may be, and are, in fact, implied by self-regard constructs.

The studies of Raimy (1943, 1948), McQuitty (1950), Hartley (1951) and others tend to support Rogers' (1950) view that positive and accepting attitudes toward the self are associated with good psychological adjustment. Yet, a superficial examination of clinical literature reveals many examples of individuals for whom the reported positive and accepting attitudes toward self are based upon distortions or misperceptions in self-appraisal. This is particularly true of manic patients, paranoid schizophrenics and of some neurotics who use mechanisms of self-enhancement.

Some authors report that in a true sense these individuals cannot be spoken of as having accepting attitudes toward the self, for, as Rogers points out, acceptance of self means that among other things, the client is able "to perceive his own feelings, motives, social and
personal experiences, without distortion of the basic sensory data."

An increase in positive self-regard and positive acceptance of others in clients who experienced successful therapy is reported by Sheerer (1949), Stock (1949), and Rudikoff (1954). Gordon and Cartwright (1954) found no change in clients' attitudes toward others from the beginning to the close of therapy while Zuckerman (1956) points out that in a group of patients regard for others is a better index to adjustment than self-regard. In out-of-therapy groups, using the questionnaire method for the measuring of self-regard and regard for others, Phillips (1951), Berger (1952), and Omwake (1954) found a positive relationship between these variables.

Research studies designed to test the theoretical positions relative to the variables of self-regard and regard for others have produced conflicting and sometimes ambiguous results.

Studies by Snyder (1945), Seeman (1949), Sheerer (1949), Stock (1949), and Rogers (1954) and others have established that during successful therapy there is an increase in patients' positive attitudes toward himself. Since self-regard has been considered a critical personality variable (Rogers, 1954), it follows that people who are high in acceptance of self should differ, generally in personality characteristics and, specifically, in their perception of others from those who are low in acceptance of self (Cowen, 1954; Fey, 1957; Silver, 1957; Rogers, 1958; and Jervis, 1959).

Self-regard (or self-acceptance) has become a popular concept in psychological literature. Along with "absolutism" "authoritarianism," and "conformity" (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levison and
Sanford, 1950; Rokeach, 1960), it has come to popular prominence since the past two decades, perhaps reflecting an evolution in value systems in American culture. Concepts relating to the self have been given particular attention in the formulation of personality theory, and social scientists have inevitably related these concepts to research in social phenomena.

Self regard has been specifically identified with Rogers' personality theory and was ascribed a central role in that system regarding its therapeutic goals.

From clinical interviews, Sheerer (1959) observed a positive relationship between acceptance of and respect for self, and acceptance of and respect for others in ten counseling cases. Sheerer's main interest was in determining whether self-other attitudes had a similar relationship to each other when studied in a non-clinical setting using a questionnaire technique. For more general interests, too, the study was thought to be of importance. The resulting emphasis that had been given to the study of the "self" (Hilgard, 1949) and the "self-system" (Sullivan, 1945), together with new trends and developments in psychology (Allen, 1942; Rogers, 1942; Sullivan, 1945), seemed to point toward the study of the individual's perceptions of himself, particularly as these perceptions and evaluations relate to attitudes toward others.

From these findings and observations, it became implicit, at least for many researchers and writers in the studies of racial attitudes and "prejudice," that one's own shortcomings and dislikes are projected in one way or another onto others—individuals, ethnic
groups, nations, etc. (Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, 1947). Sears' study of projection (1935) further provides examples of the tendency to project self-attitudes onto others.

Stock (1949) studies the relationship between self-other attitudes. Specifically, she was more interested in determining whether a sequential relationship existed between these two general kinds of feelings; that is, can change in one or the other of the two variables be shown to take place characteristically and consistently before change in the other; and can the general area of "feelings about others" be further differentiated into more specific areas which are relatively independent of each other; and finally, what is the relationship of these areas of the self. Using a rating scale Stock found a definite relationship between the way an individual feels about himself and the way he feels about other persons. An individual who tends to hold negative feelings toward himself, she stated, tends to hold negative feelings toward other people in general. As his feelings about himself become positive, feelings about others change in a similar direction. Stock could not, however, from the results identify a sequential relationship between feelings about the self and feelings about others. Separate and specific factors could be identified within the general area of feelings about others. Feelings toward the self were shown to be correlated in varying degrees with the different aspects of feelings toward others.

Using a questionnaire report, Phillips (1951) showed substantial relationships far above that expected by chance. Results also showed that the observations of clinicians in regard to self-other
attitudes hold for normal or non-clinical populations. These attitudes are not, therefore, a function of clinical states, maladjustment, and similar states.

McIntyre (1952), using the Phillips' questionnaire in conjunction with a sociometric device, explored the Rogerian hypothesis that the self-accepting individual will tend to have better interpersonal relationships. Although he was unable to confirm this hypothesis, McIntyre did find a +.46 correlation between scores of self-acceptance and of acceptance of others on the Phillips' instrument for his population of 112 college students.

Berger (1952), building largely from the Sheerer criteria, constructed new scales of self-acceptance and acceptance of others. These scales were then administered to groups of college students, prisoners, people with speech problems, and an adult YMCA class. The correlations between expressed attitudes of self-acceptance and acceptance of others ranged from +.36 to +.69.

Fey (1954, 1955) undertook studies to examine the relationship between expressed attitudes of self-acceptance and of acceptance-of-others, on the one hand, and expressed readiness for or interest in psychotherapy on the other. Fey observed that previous studies in combination hint that the diversity of correlations between these two attitude-systems is perhaps not due to random influences alone, but may actually reveal important variations in the individuals sampled. If acceptance of others rests upon genuine self-acceptance, for example, it might be hypothesized that a disparity between these two sets of attitudes betrays the operation of defensive mechanisms. Fey further
maintained that it was possible that such a typical interpersonal arrangement might be confirmed and perhaps clarified by a study of an individual's expressed interest in psychotherapy as some measure of his acceptance of the psychological status quo. Using three scales including Acceptance of Self (AS-44 items), Acceptance of Others (AS-36 items), and one for expressed attitudes of readiness for therapy (Rx-6 items), data from sixty freshman medical students were obtained. A significant positive relationship was found between scores for self-acceptance and acceptance-of-others. Neither self-acceptance nor acceptance-of-others scores was related significantly to the expressed readiness for therapy. This readiness was, however, firmly correlated to the discrepancy between self-acceptance and acceptance-of-others scores. That is, unsatisfying adjustments are to be found even where AS or AO are roughly equal. Thus, it appeared that the relationship between AS and AO scores is more sensitive to the character of one's adjustment than to its adequacy. Specifically, Fey found that while expressed attitudes of self-acceptance and acceptance-of-others tend to vary together, the persons who are exceptions to this rule appear to reveal something of the way they defend themselves interpersonally. Individuals showing low self-acceptance and high acceptance-of-others appeared to be intropunitive self-disparagers, those with high self-acceptance and low acceptance of others were especially resistant to the idea of personal psychotherapy and appeared to be extrapunitive projectors. If these descriptions have any validity, they suggest kinds of reactions of adjustment modes which would encounter differential acceptance of others. This study, in
addition to hypothesizing that acceptance of self is related to acceptance of others, hypothesizes that acceptance of others and by others is in fact a function of the pattern of interrelationships between one's attitudes toward himself and those toward others.

Omwake (1954) gave Berger's, Phillips', and Bills's instruments to the same subjects and correlated self-acceptance scores from each instrument against acceptance-of-others scores from each of the other instruments. In general, such cross-instrumental correlations were lower than correlations between the self-acceptance scores and acceptance-of-others scores based on the same instrument. The results, however, support the hypothesis that there is a marked relation between the way an individual sees himself and the way he sees others; those who accept themselves tend to be acceptant of others to perceive others as accepting themselves; those who reject themselves hold a correspondingly low opinion of others and perceive others as being self-rejected.

In another study involving sixth grade children in their classrooms, Zelen (1954a, 1954b) applied the Bonney Sociometric Technique and two measures of "self-acceptance" (California Test of Personality Feelings of Personal Worth and the Who-Are-You Test, scored for self-acceptance). He obtained small but significant correlations between each measure of self-acceptance and sociometric acceptance by peers. Neither of these measures, however, correlated with acceptance of others. From these results, Zelen concluded that a child who has positive feelings about himself is better able to devote his energies to the group activities and to
cooperate more fully with others. The child with negative self-percepts may be constantly on guard against new threats from others.

Halpern (1945) undertook a study to test the ability of thirty-eight student nurses in four groups, to predict each others' responses to a personality inventory (Gamin). This ability, which served as an operational definition of empathy, was found to be positively correlated with: (1) the similarity of predictor and predictee and (2) the predictor's satisfaction with her own behavior in the area of prediction. Subjects predicted with significantly greater accuracy on items where they had indicated self-satisfaction rather than dissatisfaction. From these findings Halpern suggested that "in areas where a person is discontent about his own behavior, disorganizing anxiety may be aroused and distortive defenses may be mobilized, causing aberrations in accurate interpersonal perceptions."

Fey (1957) formed four groups, high and low on Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others, based on scores from his own scales. He compared the four groups on F scale, Edwards' PPS and Bills's IAV items. He reports items on subscores which significantly distinguish any of the four basic groups from the remaining three.

Henry (1956) found a positive correlation between reported tendencies toward blaming one's self and blaming others in a hypothetical situation in which one participant in a conversation gets "hurt."

Wylie (1957) found significant correlations between self-ratings and mean ratings attributed to others on five evaluative trait scales.
Belenky (1960) undertook a study to examine the hypothesis that accuracy in self-perception is positively correlated with accuracy in the perception of others. Using the Allpart-Vernon study of values and level of aspiration test, the hypothesis was considered confirmed only under the condition of control of factors such as intelligence, tendency to perceive others in terms of a stereotyped notion of the group norms, and tendency to assume similarity between the self and others. Melnick (1967), using the TAT and Edwards' PPS on fourteen psychology classes, based his study on the effect of physiognomy on the perception of personality, to determine need based selective perception. He had subjects rate themselves and ninety-five facial photographs on nineteen trait dimensions, each appearing six times. The dimensions were highly polarized on an underlying continuum of favorability-unfavorability. It was thus possible to evaluate the ratings in terms of implied favorability assigned to the objects. Separate analyses were made of subjects type on the basis of TAT only; Edwards' PPS; and both tests. It was found, contrary to expectation, that both types tended to disparage others. However, in instances of favorable self-evaluation, Type I males disparaged others to a significantly greater degree than did Type II Males. Type I was designated as High Affiliation. These findings support general position of the study that differences in disparagement relate to underlying need configurations.

Finally, Loprieno, Emili, and Esposito (1968) analyzed responses given by twenty-five vocational training students during individual interviews to questionnaire items concerning nineteen
desirable or undesirable personality traits in a sociometric study to clarify relationships between evaluations of self and others; likes and dislikes and perception of others' attitudes towards oneself. The results revealed a tendency to overestimate oneself and the friends one prefers; subjects generally felt closer to those they had chosen, and all choices were related to the perception of the greatest resemblance between personality traits. The perception of such similarity between oneself and another person was interpreted as involving a certain reciprocal disposition for friendship, and expectations of sympathetic attitudes on the part of the other person.

A summary review of the preceding studies indicates that several different techniques have been devised within the past few years to measure some form of an individual's self-concept (e.g., Q technique, Rotter and Willerman, 1947; Free response method, Bugental and Zelen, 1949; Sheerer, 1949; Phillips, 1951; Parks, 1951; Rating method, Bills, Vance, and McLean, 1951; Brownfain, 1952; Butler and Haigh, 1954; Ewing, 1945; Merrill and Heathers, 1954; Matteson, 1956, 1958; Jourard, 1957; Worchel, 1957).

Most of these techniques give some index of perceived self-concept scores (e.g., Berger, 1952); the others utilize an adjustment index of some sort (e.g., Bills, 1951-1954).

Wrenn (1958) has emphasized the place of importance that self-concept theory and methods of measurement have in counseling, although most of the measurement techniques have been used primarily for research purposes thus far.

Some of the instruments leave much to be desired in many
respects, particularly in relation to validity, but what is most promising is the tendency to approach personality development in terms of a totality of response. Some of the efforts to correlate findings involving two or more of the instruments (Omwake, 1954) indicate that perhaps the same elements of personality may be measured by several of these tests. The special terminology and scoring approaches used in different ones may account for their apparent distinctiveness. On the other hand, since personality is admittedly a complex organization of many factors, it is reasonable to expect that may of the approaches attack the problem of measurement from unique points of view and, hence, may obtain scores which are truly uncorrelated.

Two considerations induce caution in interpreting results of the various studies:

(a) Possibilities of artificial contamination inherent in self-concept studies are present in many of the studies, most often through common response sets of various kinds

and

(b) A few exceptions and contradictions occur in the reported results.

On the whole, however, the evidence cited from the studies reviewed supports the hypothesized relation between positive self-regard and positive regard for others.

Different measures of the self-concept have different theoretical and operational bases. Where measures apply a similar rationale, significant correlations between measures have been found. But in similar measures such extraneous variables, mentioned above, as response set and social desirability, seem to produce similar
biases (Lowe, (1961)).

Most of the measures of self-concept have reliability and, to a certain degree, are interchangeable. Whether or not the reasons for similarity are intrinsic to the scales, the notion of the internal frame of reference seems well validated.

Studies on the co-variation of self-regard and regard-for-others as a function of group experiences. While groups form for a variety of reasons and purposes, it is an accepted assumption that members tend to relate to one another for the satisfaction of some recognized need (Stock and Thelen, 1958).

It has also been confirmed in studies on effects of group experiences that individuals may be affected or influenced by their experiences in a group in a variety of ways (Gordon, 1955). One person may enter the group with certain more or less fixed ideas about his own feelings and behavior, however, through his experience in the group he may reorganize this self-perceptual pattern. Such changes or reorganizations in self-percepts have a variety of meanings for each individual group member. They might reflect anything from greater awareness of his actual behavior or feelings, to just temporary conformity to the group "culture" or mood.

In order to understand the function and nature of change in the perception of self for each individual, it would be necessary to know how this change is related to other aspects of the person's personality and relationships. There are a variety of possible ways of relating self-percepts to personality structure and interpersonal relations. One way, directly concerning this study, relates changes in self-regard as a single variable to changes in the way a person
regards others, as a consequence of participating in a group experience.

From the pre and post test measures used in this study, the extent and nature (to a limited degree) of such changes are examined in order to determine variation in degree of such changes.

A great deal of evidence has been accumulated confirming the effectiveness of group experience in effecting changes in attitudes, personality, and behavior in various settings, with many different types of group participants. A variety of these group experiences have been found to have positive effects on interpersonal functioning (Semon and Goldstein, 1957). Group experiences have frequently been used to effect changes in behavior, attitudes and personality of college students. Johnsgard and Muench (1965) concluded that a number of personality variables of college students, as measured by objective tests, do change as a result of group experiences conducted over several weeks. Others found intensive short-term groups to be both appealing and effective for producing attitude change (Bach, 1966, 1967; Muntz, 1967). The following statement by Bach (1967, p. 995) indicates the positive experiences:

The ... group encounter has been found ... to be most efficient, and the most economical antidote to the alienation, meaninglessness, fragmentation and other hazards to mental health of our times.

While many studies (Asch, 1940; Festinger, 1950; and Sherif, 1954) have clearly shown how group experiences can result in changes in various types of attitudes, little attention has been given to the effects of group experiences on changes in attitudes toward the self or toward others.

One of the studies of the latter type was conducted by Zander
He compared the behavior of a group of high school teachers with the expectations of the teaching group with whom they were closely associated. The results indicated that those teachers who were failing to live up to the behavior expectations of the peer group were experiencing feelings of failure in self and self-dissatisfaction. The results suggest that living up to the peer group standards is related to the individual feeling of confidence and well being. The great majority of studies dealing with changes in attitudes towards self and others have been done to evaluate the effects of individual as well as group psychotherapy. The research reported by Gorlow (1950) and by Rogers and Dymond (1954) are outstanding examples of such research evaluating the results of psychotherapy. However, the focus of psychotherapy is far different than what would be found in most group situations.

Many writers (Trent, 1957; Franklin, 1958; Shein and Bennis, 1965) have stated either clearly or by implication that experiences in a group situation can affect attitudes toward self and others even though the group is not oriented toward psychotherapy.

Perhaps Gordon (1952) was clearest when he observed that members of a group, led by a group-centered leader, feel "more accepted by others, more secure, more spontaneous, less defensive of self, less withdrawn, and more confident." He adds further that a group-oriented atmosphere helps group members gain understanding of themselves and of others. Gordon feels, therefore, that the experience in a certain type of group situation can have many of the effects often attributed to individual psychotherapy.
Grater (1959) in a study on the effects of participation in a leadership training group on self-other attitudes, found significant changes as indicated on pre and post test Q-sort measures. Using a group of thirty students enrolled in a leadership training course at Michigan State University, Grater set about to explore two hypothesis: (1) that the experiences in a group situation can make significant changes in the individual's attitudes toward himself. These changes, he asserted, would occur even though the group itself did not focus on a discussion of factors commonly discussed in individual or group psychotherapy, i.e., factors associated with emotional conflict; (2) this hypothesis was concerned with the assumption that experiences in a group can result in significant changes toward a generalized other person.

This latter hypothesis was based on the assumption that attitudes towards the self and others are intimately interdependent (Sheerer, 1949). The main objective, in Grater's leadership training group was to establish a permissive, non-threatening group atmosphere, with the leader attempting to convey warmth, understanding, and acceptance toward each individual group member.

In a study using two kinds of group experiences, Leuthold (1956) demonstrated changes in the self-concept in relation to changes in the perception of others' attitudes. The author compared a student-centered group treatment method derived from principles based on Rogerian client-centered therapy, to a teacher-centered treatment method representing an authoritarian and instructional approach.

Before and after group experiences, each subject described the
self, ideal-self, and self-attitudes of three others in a group by means of the Q-sort method. The subject was asked to predict how the others would describe themselves, i.e., the three others with whom he felt, respectively, high, medium, and low empathy. In the context of this study, empathy was defined for the subject as the ability to assume another's frame of reference so as to see him as he sees himself. In addition to empathy scores, predictions of the instructor, and a randomly selected subject were added to the final test battery.

Expectations derived from Rogerian theory were entertained for the subjects treated in a student-centered group. It was predicted that they would be differentiated from subjects in the teacher-centered group by:

(a) Greater gains in empathic ability

(b) Greater revision of initial perceptions of others and greater differentiation among others in predicting their self concepts

(c) More accurate prediction of the instructor's self description

(d) Greater movement in ideal concepts toward the group mean ideal

An additional hypothesis was advanced that predictability and accuracy of prediction would be positively correlated irrespective of group treatment method.

Two of the five hypotheses were supported by the results. Subjects receiving student-centered treatment were significantly more accurate in their predictions of the instructor's self description and good predictors were significantly better predicted.
Instead of confirming expected increasing differentiation in assessment of others, final test measures demonstrated an overall movement, irrespective of group treatment, toward increasing similarity among all personality descriptions whether of self or of others. In another study concerned with changes in interpersonal perceptions following social interaction (group-discussion type), Bieri (1953) investigated the effects of such interaction on the similarity with which members of pairs perceived each other. Twenty-six pairs of subjects completed before and after descriptions of the Rosenzweig Picture-Frustration Study. Subjects were required to relate themselves to the test as they themselves would answer and as they thought their partners would probably answer. Pairs were assigned to experimental or control conditions. Responses for both occasions were compared for congruency. In addition, any behavior observed during the experimental discussions was recorded and compared.

Results demonstrated that interaction led to a higher perceived similarity between partners. In addition, experimental subjects' predictions of their partners' responses following interaction were significantly more like their own responses than were the same predictions made prior to interaction. Finally, experimental subjects had a greater increase in perceived similarity than did the controls.

In a similar study on interpersonal relations in a group using children, Davitz (1955) found that children with a high degree of liking for each other perceived each other as highly similar whether this similarity was actually the case or not.
Finally, in a study concerned with mutual perception and self-awareness in a T-Group, Clark and Culbert (1965) demonstrated that those members who are involved in interpersonal relationships, such as group experiences, perceived each other as high in level of regard, empathy, congruence, and unconditional regard. This investigation was based on the theoretical assumption that members of groups (depending on the nature of the group) become more self-aware in interpersonal relationships as experiences increase in interaction and communication.

A summary of research on the relation between self-other regard; and related changes in these variables following participation in group processes. Research studies designed to test the theoretical positions relative to the variables Self-Other Regard have, in general, produced conflicting and sometimes ambiguous results. However, the majority of the studies provide supportive evidence for the hypothesized relation between self-regard and regard-for-others.

Further, although the studies reviewed in the preceding sections are concerned with a variety of dimensions and aspects of the self-concept (in relation to self-other perceptions), there is enough evidence to justify the following conclusions:

(a) There is a relationship between self-regard (whether inferred from a person's verbal statements or expressions, or as judged by the person himself) and regard-for-others (inferred or self-rated).

(b) This relationship seems to hold true when perceptions (or attitudes) toward others refer to people in close personal relationships, as well as to varied groups of people involved in interaction, of one form or another.
(c) An experience in some types or forms of interaction (whether it be therapy or not—individual as well as group) produces significant changes in a person's perceptions and valuations of himself and others, in the direction of increased awareness, positive-regard and valuation.

(d) Despite the indicated generality in self-other regard changes, research evidence seems to point to a definite pattern that these changes follow. That is, changes toward particular or given kinds of others (e.g., "best-liked," etc.). These changes are frequently indicated by means of quantitative measures of responses.

A question of major concern for this study is whether people who demonstrate positive self-regard and positive regard-for-others have better (or more effective) interpersonal relations than those who do not. If so, what are the implications of such observations for black-white or racial interpersonal communication and relations. That is, what efforts and attempts can be designed or developed in the attempt to promote more effective interpersonal relations relating regard for self and others as basic variables in such interpersonal relations.

The next section, therefore, is a direct consequence and logical development from the observations made in the review of research studies. It is directly related to a review of attempts at resolving interpersonal problems deriving from racial prejudice and discrimination, and intergroup "miscommunications," through the use of group process involving interaction and learning through exploration of feelings. Its emphasis on the role of education—for the development of such attempts—brings about a "marriage" of "educational processes" and race relations, as one of a possible number of ways and means of making it possible for human beings to
live together more effectively and harmoniously.

**Definitions of related variables.** "Race" differences based on "black-white" distinctions. The use of the terms "black" and "white" in this study is based on their biological meaning. They are perceived as scientific constructs whereby people may be categorized into more or less exclusive groups on the basis of similarities and dissimilarities of physical characteristics. "Races," according to Comas (1956), "constitute the existence of groups presenting certain similarities in somatic (biological or physical) characteristics which set them off from any other group and whose characteristics are transmitted and perpetuated according to the laws of biological inheritance (or through the genes)."

From this conception of man, it is obvious that the characteristics whereby men are classified into races are physical and only physical. The most common physical characteristics used by scientists in categorizing people into races are: color of eyes; color of skin; quality of hair; nasal index etc. The one characteristic recognized for the purposes of this study is color, i.e., "black" and "white." Because these other characteristics have such numerous and complex variations within and between racial groups, practically most modern scientists have virtually given up the process of categorizing mankind into races. Ruth Benedict (1938) put it so well, when she referred to the human race.

It is evident, from research findings about the nature of man, that nobody can be categorized into a 'race' on the basis of such variables as behavior patterns, personality type, intelligence, etc.
It may be true that these variables could be passed on from one generation to another; they are, however, passed predominantly through perceptual experiences (learning) in the process of socialization. That is, although people inherit certain physical properties that tend to predispose them to different personality types, it is doubtful that anyone's personality structure is pretty well formed in a definitive way at birth.

On the basis of this assumption, it is apparent that "learning" through perceptual experiences occurs in the process of interacting with other people. In support of this statement, Klineberg (1956), through his investigations, observes that "there is no known physical characteristic that automatically translates itself into behavioral or psychological characteristics such as intelligence, pride (etc.)." He further comments that "there are no known characteristics that automatically produce inferior or superior status."

If the assumptions made in this section are unfounded, and if Klineberg's observations are not true it is apparent that it would not be necessary for "status" to be impressed upon people or enforced by law, as well as forced on people by public or private means of pressure (e.g., South Africa and other colonial countries). If the black man's reputed inferiority were so "natural" it would not be necessary to pass laws or even worry about keeping him in "his place"; he would remain on the bottom of the "totem pole" of society out of his "natural" condition.

The fact of the matter is that what constitutes racial or black-white problems (U.S.A., South Africa, Rhodesia, etc.) is what
society makes out of racial differences. For example, numerous writings (Kardiner and Ovesey, 1962; Fanon, 1967; Grier and Cobbs, 1969; and others) confirm the observation that the manner in which "society" reacts toward anyone manifesting differences such as "blackness" forces the black man to perceive and behave toward himself, perceive and behave toward others, in certain specific ways.

It is thus the political, economic, social, and interpersonal (sexual and relational) attitudes toward anyone black that constitute a racial or black-white (interpersonal) problem. In many writings and reports (Warren Commission on Civil Disorders, 1968), this attitude has been identified as "racism." One factor that is clear about the dynamics of racism is that it is a man-made and man-enforced phenomenon. Such an enforcement is demonstrated in many everyday experiences and is well documented in writings dealing with a variety of factors. Examples of these are evidenced in sexual relationships (Henton, 1965) and educational experiences (Sexton, 1961; Schragg, 1968).

Although this attitude (racism) has been defined and interpreted in a variety of ways, one common thread running through these conceptions is that it is "learned"—i.e., acquired on the basis of perceptual experiences. The emotional reactions (intensity) following such behavior, i.e., either of individuals or groups toward each other, are determined by the clarity, meanings, differentiation ability, level of awareness, and the total personality of the perceiver (Combs and Snygg, 1949).

Interpersonally, these individual or group perceptions affect other individuals or groups involved in the interaction process.
Social interaction and black-white interpersonal relations. What is meant by interpersonal relations has been suggested by Sullivan (1937) in a series of papers which have also attempted to explore the implications of this formulation for psychiatry and sociology. His assumption is that man is both a "human animal and a human animal." As an organism he takes his place in that realm of nature. This conception of man is related to Huxley's view of "man's place in nature and Nature's place in man." This means that man, the animal, is subjected to a certain "conditioning" process that is cultural and socializing (Mullahy, 1949). There is no need here to discuss in detail this process of socialization except to note that it deals with interaction among persons, and that it takes place between persons. Two or more persons come to define an interactional situation which is manifested according to other personal and cultural factors. In relating with other persons, or in absorbing "behavior" within his culture, the individual does not merely "take-in" things like a sponge. He also gives to his cultural material a set of personal and private meanings which are commonly more noticeable in feeling relationships than in other types. These private meanings are, in turn, the outcome of perceptual experiences from interpersonal relations. Thus, the group-processes referred to in this study are a direct outcome from dynamic explanations of group behavior in terms of the psychological motivations (perceptions, attitudes, ideas, etc.) of individuals integrated into interpersonal situations. These motivations are expressed in a series of "me-and-you" conceptions. This study is concerned, therefore, with analyzing these "me-and-you" conceptions.
(using the variables self-other regard) underlying a given set or structure of interpersonal situations. The almost infinite variety of interpersonal situations or experiences constitute what is known as social interaction or life (Linton, 1936).

All through life in every phase or stage the individual requires love, respect, and approval, if he is to find the freedom to be himself. It is through love, respect, and approval he perceives from others that he develops mutuality (Erikson, 1959). Not only does he have love and approval of himself (self-regard) but also positive regard for others (Rogers, 1951). He recognizes both his individuality (uniqueness) and universality. Self-regard and positive regard for others having grown simultaneously from the experience of mutuality tend to become one. Only an illusion made possible by defense mechanisms will allow man to separate himself from mankind (Fromm, 1962).

For the purposes of this study, it was essential to establish a restricted conceptual frame relating to the interpersonal variables explored. This frame of reference derives from a perceptual-phenomenological theoretical orientation to the study of personality growth and development, and deals directly with exploring self-regard and other-regard as basic and related variables in interpersonal relations broadly conceived of. In turn, the findings from indices of measurement (Chapter IV) used in this study are related to implications for racial or black-white relations.

The basic assumptions relating to self-other regard and interpersonal relations recognize certain factors (individual as well as group) or interpersonal situations in the context of the individual's
historic-social past.

Although not directly concerned with interaction specifics within the group (emphasis on group "climate"), these interpersonal relations become the focus in terms of their effects—specifically as regards the manner in which a group member perceives and regards himself, and perceives and regards others in the context of a given group situation.

Black-white interpersonal communication and interaction and implications for personality development of the black people. Studying individual psychological reactions to differential valuation (discrimination, prejudice, etc.) without examining the dynamics of the society in which that individual lives is an incomplete and meaningless effort. Differential valuations within a society are stimulated by a climate that encourages them (whether directly or indirectly).

Perhaps one of the problems in understanding the present discontent of people, as Grier and Cobbs (1968) observed, is highlighted in the conflicting experiences they encounter regarding the ideals of the society and the actual behavior of people within that society. In fact, the relationship between personality functioning and the larger social environment is an extremely complex one. To refer to only one of a variety of factors: when the black person wishes to change himself inside (self-perceptions), he finds it difficult to do so, unless conditions outside of himself (other-perceptions toward self) are changed as well. Consequently, in a society that puts achievement above humanity, people are often evaluated, valued, and respected for what they represent and not for "who" they are. In
fact, reactions to differential valuation based on achievement, color, etc., confirm the findings that suggest that black people do not function differently, psychologically, from anyone else. Black men's mental and emotional functioning is governed by the same rules or principles as that of any other group of men (Grier and Cobbs, 1968). The emotional problems encountered by blacks are by no means confined to black people.

Because of such interactional experiences between black and white there have been, and there continue to be, distortions in perceptions from one group to another.

Interactional experiences are a direct outcome of differential valuations that have distorted, and continue to distort, the perception or conception of the "real" nature of human beings, and have interfered or impaired attempts of facilitating human understanding (Moustakas, 1956; Northrop, 1966).

Recognizing the effects of differential valuation, it goes without saying that every human being wants to feel that his "whoness" is respected, and his individuality treasured, regardless of what his achievements or lack of achievements may be. Rogers (1954) recognized this attitude when he referred to "unconditional positive regard" in therapy.

It is indeed, as Merton (1938) observes from such frustrating experiences that are characteristic of a system of cultural values which extols "virtually above all else certain symbols of success for the population at large, while its social structure (systematically) restricts . . . access to approved modes of acquiring these symbols
for a considerable part of the same population, that antisocial behavior (interpersonal conflicts and violence) ensues on a considerable scale."

Prejudices following distorted interracial (or intergroup perceptions, and differential social valuations, are among the variety of behavioral consequences of anarchic social conditions that are characteristic of such societies. These behavioral consequences range from covert interracial hostilities to overt acts of violence (Hersey, 1968). It should be apparent to everyone concerned about human relations, that unless conditions responsible for these acts are removed, racial hostilities are not likely to be eliminated; and unless the entire society (including world-wide international efforts) "confronts more honestly: the critical social and educational problem (that of learning how shared relationships may be fostered), these conditions responsible for interracial hostilities, as well as world-wide international conflicts, will not be removed."

"Confrontation," as conceived in this study, does not mean physical violence nor mere physical or intimate contact of races. Rather it means an attempt to explore one's self, perceptually, emotionally, and intellectually. It is recognized as confrontation because such self-exploration is frequently not too comfortable a process, particularly as it relates to the reality of our own perceptions. Contact alone does not insure a change in perceptions, attitudes, ideas, etc., and consequently a reduction in prejudice. In fact, increases or decreases in prejudices, following any type of "contact" or "interaction" experiences (individual as well as group) have been found to be related to a person's total personality structure, evolving from how we perceive
ourselves and others-in-relation to us. Such changes are also related to the ability or willingness to expose ourselves to, and incorporate, new learning experiences.

In summary, the main concern of this study is that any attempt at promoting effective black-white (human) interpersonal relations is derived from the hypothesized assumption based on self-regard and other-regard as related and basic variables in all interpersonal relations, whether intra or intergroup.

Effects of group-experiences on black-white or "racial" interpersonal relations. Having thus far established, theoretically and empirically, the basis for self-regard and other-regard as related and basic variables in all interpersonal relationships, the promotion of positive regard, particularly in black-white interpersonal relations, becomes a factor of major concern for this study.

The following section is a review of research studies or general empirical attempts at promoting positive black-white or interracial relations using group methods or processes.

Since the publication of the Authoritarian Personality (1950), there has been growing research interest in the personality determinants of ingroup-outgroup perceptions, attitudes and behavior. Recently, a series of studies (Brodbeck and Perlmutter, 1954; and others) have made attempts to isolate a different and opposite kind of ingroup-outgroup reaction, that of preference.

Perlmutter (1954) labelled this variable "xenophilic." In both kinds of patterns, preference and non-preference, and with the measuring devices he used, Perlmutter found marked ingroup-outgroup
distinctions, with valuations and preferences in opposite directions. Additional evidence suggests that the same personality dynamics lead an individual to either extreme preference, at least for groups whose information about outgroups is limited. The observation is that (Perlmutter, 1954) those individuals who possess xenophilic attitudes have been demonstrated to share with the racial group some of the personality dimensions emphasized by the California group of investigators.

In a related study, Sarnoff (1951) found that Jewish students with strong self-hate were likely to perceive their parents as inadequate and weak models. These two empirical positions confirm Sheerer's (1949) hypothesized and confirmed correlation between positive self-regard and a tendency to perceive others more favorably, and vice versa.

This relationship has certain inter-racial implications: that self-rejection or personal inadequacy may be an underlying factor in individual as well as group hostilities toward other individuals or groups. Indeed, Fromm (1939) saw the "disproportionate" hostility expressed against Jews in Germany as related to a kind of cultural self-rejection on the part of the Germans. Fromm's explanation for this attitude was that it derives from an authoritarian tradition of upbringing that tended to suppress German spontaneity.

In a study on racial prejudice (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanfor, 1950), Frenkel-Brunswik summarized the major findings and observed that "regardless of whether the specific topic was that of ambivalence, or aggression, or passivity, or some other related feature of personality dynamics, the outstanding finding was
that the extremely unprejudiced individual tends to manifest a greater readiness to become aware of unacceptable tendencies and impulses in himself. The prejudiced individual, on the other hand, is more apt not to face these tendencies openly and thus to fail in integrating them satisfactorily with the conscious image he has of himself." These observations and findings seem to provide the basis for the assumption that one way to change a person's racial perceptions, attitudes and prejudices is to somehow change his attitude toward himself.

In yet another study, Himelhock (1950) found, in a study with college students, that generalized racial prejudice varies directly with self-rejection, the latter related to the individual's total personality structure as defined by his perceptions and valuations of himself and those he interacts with, as well as his values, ideas, attitudes, and beliefs.

In general, it seems justified to assume that "contacts" (interaction) between members of various groups will tend to bring about perceptual and attitudinal changes in the positive direction when (a) the interaction is based on equal-status (Allport, 1960); (b) the interaction is cooperative and mutual or when a group meets for a clearly defined purpose; (c) the interaction is of relatively significant duration.

Allport and Kramer (1946) found that "contacts" based on equal-status between members of various racial, religious, and other groups were most likely to result in positive perceptual and attitude change. MacKenzie (1948) similarly found that equal status between Negro and White students resulted in positive attitude change.
As it was noted, in the previous section of this chapter, contact alone is not considered sufficient to bring about desired and positive perceptual and attitude changes. In fact, Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, and Sherif (1954) confirm this observation. Only when interaction (super-ordinate goals) relating to feelings and self-exploration experiences took place, was there positive change, and a modification in distorted perceptions and out-group stereotypes. Brophy's (1946) study of the effects of white and Negro merchant seamen working together demonstrated that among white seamen who had never been in the company of Negroes, the percentage of non-prejudiced attitudes increased to 46. For those who interacted twice (shipping trips) there was a 62% increment, and finally an 82% increment was found among those who had interaction through five or more contacts or interaction experiences with Negro seamen. Similarly, Harding and Hogrefe (1952) found, after stores had begun to employ Negro co-workers that white department store employees changed their attitudes and behavior toward Negroes, at least, as demonstrated in the occupational situation.

Whenever "contact" was not based on equal-status either no change or negative changes were demonstrated.

There are a variety of different group-models used to bring about changes in behavior in interracial situations. These range from role-playing (Webb and Church, 1965) to small sensitivity-type or interactional experiences (Mauree, 1958; Burnstein and McRae, 1962; Katz and Cohen, 1962). These groups meet for a variety of purposes and emphasize different dimensions of group-dynamics (Kemp, 1965),
ranging from an analysis of the process to concern with outcome variables. Because this study is mainly concerned with group effects that relate to personal growth and its relation to interpersonal relations, it might well be essential to clarify that one of the basic needs for the proposed interaction model relates directly to the individual member's clarification of his perceptions (self) and values, and a greater understanding of his perceptions of the values and attitudes of other members. The outcome, rather, is the resolving of personal and group conflicts, improved positive self-regard and other-regard, mutual interest and respect among group members, a reduction of resistance to new learning of ideas, feelings, and perceptions, and a reduction in those factors that result in distortions of perceptions and communication from one member to another.

In this respect, the basic change is considered in terms of how it affects the individual in altering or modifying his perceptions of himself and his world (the actual dynamics of this process are reviewed in Chapter IV).

An analysis of the outcomes noted above indicates that for a successful change to take place a particular kind of group "climate" is required, one in which the individual feels psychologically safe and secure. Rogerian theory asserts that when people are exposed to a non-threatening, non-judgmental, accepting and supportive atmosphere, they will be more inclined to explore their feelings and perceptions and, consequently, learn more and eventually become more accepting of themselves. Rogers (1954) further predicts that with increased positive self-regard, the individual is better able to accept others. Numerous
other investigators (Sheerer, 1949; Gordon, 1950) have demonstrated the validity of this hypothesis.

It would seem to follow logically, that any attempt to promote black-white relations, must at least be based on group outcomes mentioned above, i.e., increased understanding, more positive regard, and the encouragement of a continuing dialogue between racial groups.

Group-experiences of an interactional (personal involvement) or sensitivity nature (self-exploration) have been found to be one of the effective ways of providing a "climate" loaded with psychological safety and security and consequently, one of the positive and effective ways of promoting black-white interpersonal relations.

More pertinent to the present study is empirical evidence concerned with studying the effects of group-experiences--of an interactional and sensitivity nature--on self-regard and regard-for-others based on changes in self-other perceptions.

While the majority of previous research in racial perceptions and attitudes placed more emphasis on differences between blacks and whites, Dreger and Miller (1968) note that "with the advent of at least limited desegregation in most sections of the country (U.S.A.) by 1960, there has been a shift in interest from merely measuring (perceptions) attitudes and behavior to a focus on the circumstances leading to modification of these factors."

Preoccupation with the measurement of differences between blacks and whites has led to little, if any, attention focused on methods or vehicles available for the promotion of racial perceptual and attitude change and facilitation of positive interracial relations. Much of the
research pertinent to this study—i.e., self-other perceptions and regard—has been done with college students. Gaier and Wombeck (1960) found a number of similarities between black and white college students in their self-reported personality assets and liabilities.

Not all studies exploring the relationship between self-regard and regard-for-others have been positive. Kassarjian (1965), studying the effects of a one semester sensitivity group on acceptance of self and others, found that this technique did not produce changes in self-other perceptions. This lack of effect has also been confirmed in other studies as well (Franklin, 1938; Bassin, 1958; and Bedmar, 1965).

Although the results of studies investigating the relationship between self-other regard are inconclusive, particularly with relevance for black-white interpersonal implications, the studies by Rubin (1966, 1967a, 1967b) reflect a great deal of potential. Rubin (1966, 1967a, 1967b) used a sensitivity model to effect changes in self-perceptions as well as racial attitudes (other-perception and regard). In an analysis of pretest-post-test change scores, he demonstrated that:

1. Sensitivity training models or procedures significantly increase self-acceptance and decrease negative racial attitudes

2. A significant positive relationship exists between changes in self-acceptance and changes in racial attitudes.

This study, however, was unable to obtain data on the ability of sensitivity training to produce changes in self-other perceptions with homogenous white and black groups.

Rubin, further explored a second area of interest—that concerning
the factors which might condition the kinds of learning an individual experiences as a result of sensitivity training. He concludes that "physiological anomaly:—defined as a feeling of restlessness and moral emptiness—results in impaired interaction, communication, and learning.

Reviewing the theoretical implications of his findings, Rubin observes that both the T-group (interaction process) and the therapy group provide the elements of psychological safety, support and opportunities for reality testing assumed necessary to effect an increase in an individual's level of self-acceptance, and consequently by such interaction models, to decrease one's level of racial prejudice.

These studies indicate a great step forward to the extent that they provide a base for future research and practical experience substantiating the findings of Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, 1950.

It can be concluded, in summary, that although studies dealing with the relation between self-other regard and effects of interaction group-experiences in facilitating black-white interpersonal relations are few and far between, these experiences are effective in producing changes in perceptions, valuations, attitudes and in behavior.
The foundations for this study are divided into philosophical, theoretical, and empirical categories. These derive from a review of pertinent literature in each of the categories.

The first section presents a philosophical frame of reference which originates primarily from the existential approach to the study of human nature. Specific emphasis is placed on Kierkegaard's (1962) work mainly because of its relevance to the basis of this investigation; that is, the expansion and interpretation of the *being*—conceived as basic to the concept of regard.

Kierkegaard's analysis of this concept is traced as deriving from the Socratic dictum: "Know Thyself," which forms the basis for the orientation considered fundamental to man's development, existence, dignity, and overall interaction (and involvement) with fellow beings. To this philosophical orientation and of significance for this study are two assumptions. Namely, first is the concept of experience and identity considered basic to the understanding of man, his behavior and interaction with his fellow beings. The second assumption assumes the phenomenological (experiential) approach to the study of man as uniquely perceived by each person.

Within the context of this background, it (is evident) it follows that any attempts at gaining knowledge about and understanding another
person should relate the unique perceptions and experiences as interpreted by the observed person. This statement is based on the assumption that a person interprets his perceptions (whether "real" or "imagined") according to the way he perceives or "sees" himself. This means that he is understood and appreciated in relation to "his world" rather than in a vacuum.

The philosophical basis to the study of human nature, and the resultant theoretical frame of reference, constitute the basic foundations for this study.

The second review of the foundations deals with a general analysis of the self and its various dimensions, and constitutes the theoretical basis for the study. Some of the dimensions examined relate to the concept of "defensiveness" and its effect on perceptual experiences, with an analysis of the broader implications of interpersonal relations.

The theoretical basis presents a review of a theory of behavior and personality development deriving from the perceptual-phenomenological approach to behavior. Assumptions made on this are based on the theoretical positions established by Combs and Snygg (1949) and Rogers (1954).

To relate the theoretical and philosophical bases directly to the assumptions made in this study a review of the significance of both internal and external (perceptual) experiences is made in the direction of integrating both these factors or experiences. This review is based on such theoretical positions as presented by Lecky (1945), Mathewson and Rochlin (1956), and Watts (1963).
Philosophical Basis

Perhaps one of the most basic and significant influences for this study, particularly that based on self-theory, originates from existential philosophy. The main concern for the existentialists has been with the essence of man's existence, the meaning of his life, his purpose, and the goals of living. The questions raised by the existentialists have been a subject of philosophic study since long before the time of Aristotle.

Existential psychology is concerned with two main issues: first, it places a radical stress on the concept of identity and the experience of identity as the basis of human nature and of any philosophy. This concept is regarded as one of the basic issues for this study (Fromm, 1947; Horney, 1950; Murphy, 1951; Rogers, 1954; Murray, 1956; Erikson, 1959; Goldstein, 1959; Allport, 1962). Second, it places great emphasis on starting from experiential knowledge other than from systems of concepts or abstract categories (Maslow, 1962). Existentialism rests on phenomenology—the use of personal, subjective experience as the foundation upon which abstract knowledge is built. Phenomenologists demonstrate that the best way to appreciate another human being is to understand his "Weltanschauung" and to be able to see his world through his eyes.

The blind alley of rational materialism at which man arrived by the middle of the nineteenth century impelled Kierkegaard (1941) to re-examine the reason for his own existence. The resulting question as to why we should even exist brought a new view to the entire field of counseling and psychotherapy. In his examination of
this question, Victor Frankl (1963) is noted as being fond of referring to, and quoting Nietzsche: "... he who has a why to live can bear any how" (p. 24).

Although a number of existential philosophies as presented by Husserl (1929), Heidegger (1949), Marcel (1951), Sartre (1953), and Jaspers (1955) are considered relevant to this study, the most pertinent and representative to the philosophical framework presented in this research is that of Kierkegaard (1941, 1962).

Kierkegaard (1941) pictured, with keen psychological insight, the dilemma of the individual. He points out that the most common despair is to be in despair at not choosing or willing to be oneself; but that the deepest form of despair is to choose "to be another than himself." On the other hand, "to will to be that self which one truly is, is indeed the opposite of despair" (p. 37), and this choice is the deepest responsibility of man. He writes:

As an heir, even though he were heir to the treasure of all the world, nevertheless does not possess his property before he has come of age, so even the richest personality is nothing before he has chosen himself, and on the other hand even what one might call the poorest personality is everything when he has chosen himself; for the great thing is not to be this or that but to be oneself (p. 99).

Kierkegaard, recognizing the relation between self-regard and despair, discusses the outcome of one who holds the Socratic view, "know thyself." He observes:

In the Socratic view, each individual is his own center, and the entire world centers in him, because his self knowledge is a knowledge of God. It was thus Socrates understood himself and thus thought that everyone must understand himself; in the light of this understanding interpreting his relationship to each individual, with equal humility and with equal pride. He had the courage and self possession to be sufficient unto himself but also in his relations to his fellowmen ... to be merely an occasion even when dealing with the meanest capacity (p. 201).
Socrates' dictum "know thyself," became for Kierkegaard "choose thyself," not by means of abstract knowledge but through the self's own inward action.

Socrates, as Kierkegaard saw him, was the embodiment of the perfect human-in-relation to others. He had self-confidence and surety enough to give his opinion without dominating the other or forcing his opinion. In his being-so-self-confident attitude, he stood in a right relationship with himself. He did not dominate or force his opinion on others, instead he was the occasion for others' coming to self knowledge.

Kierkegaard's existentialism arose, not as an extension of the particular tradition of any one branch of philosophy, but as a revolt against the whole of philosophy, and, for that matter, against existing theology. Whereas philosophy and theology dealt with humans in general, Kierkegaard concentrated on one individual person, not in order merely to theorize or speculate about him, but rather to reveal him as he really is. This task, said Kierkegaard, was far more difficult than one involving universals; it was harder to portray an individual actor than a whole philosophy of acting; a single performance was more difficult to describe than a single actor. In other words, Kierkegaard concentrated on portraying the single phenomenon rather than speculating on the universal. This phenomenological approach was not simply Kierkegaard's unique contribution to the history of philosophic thought; it has formed the basis of all existentialist thinking since his time.

Existentialism as a philosophic and educational tradition may be
characterized as a reawakening of man's interest in himself. As Kierkegaard would say, one goes "from the person over the things to the person, and not from the things over the person to the things." Man is a synthesis of the finite and the infinite; hence, he is "undialectical"; his dialectic exists outside of himself.

In his Either/Or, Kierkegaard likens this choice to the way in which Adam could "know" Eve, in the Old Testament sense of the word. "By the individual's intercourse with himself he impregnates himself and brings himself to birth . . . . Only within him has the individual the goal after which he has to strive." The goal for the existentialist, particularly for Kierkegaard, is always a positive affirmation of the self or in other words, positive self-regard.

Self-regard, which is first nurtured by positive regard and then experienced as mutuality is believed to be essential for the development of maintenance of satisfactory interpersonal relations. Self-regard, in this case, can be conceptualized in terms of a continuum from negative self-regard to a high degree of positive self-regard. Rid of any anxiety or despair, and consequently any defensiveness, and hence accepting of self and of others, the individual is a person of such rare magnitude that positive regard from others is showered upon him. Through the Socratic approach to life, there is no room for pretension or absolutism of beliefs.

Positive self-regard, however, should not be confused with self-satisfaction, complacency, or resignation. Positive self-regard is rather a forthright acknowledgement of one's strengths and weaknesses, one's successes and failures, and an open awareness of one's limitations.
and potential. True positive self-regard or self-acceptance must include a realization of the dynamic aspects of human nature and the capacity to change. Frequently people have a tendency to present to others only certain aspects of their personality, while carefully hiding from view the details that they are ashamed of. This attitude of masking some aspects of personality arises out of fear that if others knew what one really is, they would think less of one and even reject one completely. At such times, a person is unable to accept himself and, in turn, he cannot accept others. His focus may be upon fostering and maintaining this illusory self so that he may perceive those about him only as objects to be manipulated. He may not be interested in sharing the perceptions of others. Assurance of self is commonly regarded among existential psychologists as critical for interpersonal relations.

Interpersonal relations affect the growth and development of every human being. In the attempt to discover and know his own self, the individual typically "uses" relationships to explore, to examine various aspects of his own experiences; to recognize and face up to the deep incongruencies which he often discovers. He discovers how much of his life is guided by what he thinks he should be, not by what he is.

Theoretical Background: A Comprehensive View of Behavior and Personality Development Based on "Perceptual Phenomenology"

Two major trends have emerged in personality theory in relation to the development of the self-concept. One group of theorists (Closed-System), among whom are Freud and the behaviorist psychologists,
postulates that a person is motivated by forces at play within a closed system. These theorists maintain that an individual gains satisfaction by striving for inner balance, for homeostasis. Its use in a psychological sense originated with Freud (1955) on the one hand, with Cannon (1945) on the other hand, and at some point between these two positions, with Pavlov (1941).

According to this view, homeostasis is maintained when various psychological and physiological forces are kept in equilibrium. When forces acting on the person from the outer world upset the equilibrium, the resultant imbalance creates stress. Stress leads to accommodation and accommodation leads to homeostasis (Selye, 1956). When stress becomes anxiety, inadequate accommodation occurs. Consequently, the organism has to deal with surplus energy which somehow has to be repressed. This repression produces more anxiety and internal irritation. In this view, the outer world becomes at once a servant and a threat to the inner world. The self (or the ego) is in a constant state of activity as mediator and negotiator. This way of theorizing gives a somewhat harassed picture of the self.

Another group of personality theorists (Open-System) believes that the organism is an open system—that it finds its goal essentially outside development if one postulates a dialectic relation of the two viewpoints.

There are, as the concept of syntony (Chenault, 1966) suggests, other alternatives to the choice between internal and external events as presented in the preceding section. For example, an open system might be defined differently by some humanistic psychologists (Maslow,
1954; Watts, 1963). An open system need not refer to self-evaluations exclusively in terms of others. That is, a nondualistic view of the self which does not separate subject and object or self and environment would regard the self as being inseparable from external stimuli. The self, itself, is regarded as part of any so-called external or environmental field, rather than as a separate self operating within an environmental field.

Watts (1963) refers to the limitations of the traditional view of a "skin-encapsulated ego":

To begin with, there is no generally accepted theory or even terminology of the science, but rather a multiplicity of conflicting theories and divergent techniques . . . . We must ask, then, to what other milieu in our society we can look for anything to be done about the distress of the individual in his conflict with social institutions which are self-contradictory, obsolete or needlessly restricting—including . . . the current notion of the individual himself, of the skin encapsulated ego (p. 37).

While the theories of Goldstein (1940), Angyal (1941), Lecky (1945), Sullivan (1945), and Masserman (1946) present basic components compatible with the theoretical foundations of this study, it seems appropriate to limit theoretical references to those theories which are most relevant to the specific purposes of this study. The perceptual view of behavior based on Combs and Snygg (1949) and Rogers (1951) is, therefore, given particular attention as the most appropriate theoretical foundation for the study.

As Combs and Snygg (1949) observed, human behavior may be looked at from at least two very broad frames of references: from the point of view of an outsider, or from the point of view of the behaviorist himself. In the perceptual frame of reference, behavior
is observed from the point of view of the individual himself. People behave according to facts as they see them and the meanings things have for them.

What seems to be true for any one person depends on the frame of reference from which he makes his observations. The same data looked at in different ways lends itself to quite different kinds of interpretations. Behavior in this frame of reference is seen as an outcome of human perception. What governs behavior from the point of view of the individual himself are unique perceptions, of himself and the world in which he lives.

James's (1890) description of the child at birth as existing in a "booming, buzzing confusion" is a highly realistic appraisal of the field of the newborn infant. As the infant is born into a world of sight, sound, taste, smell, and feeling, perception is, at first, a hazy matter. For the newborn only the most intense stimuli elicit responses. As the infant develops, however, more precise differentiations are made. With sharper differentiations within the perceptual field, behavior also becomes increasingly well defined. Once the organs of sensing, taste, smell, sight, and hearing begin to function at birth, a number of new potentialities for differentiation become available and exploration begins, and continues throughout an individual's entire life.

This process of exploration and differentiation of himself and the world about him is the most outstanding characteristic of child behavior. Among the earliest of differentiations made by the infant are those concerned with the discovery of self. As experience increases,
the self becomes more and more clearly differentiated from the remainder of the phenomenal field.

The child's family provides the earliest experience of the individual's perception of himself (Erikson, 1946). The feeling of adequacy or inadequacy provided the child as a result of his early experience in his family contributes to his capacities for acceptance or rejection of himself and of others. Facts about "self" which the individual is unable to accept into awareness cannot be assimilated in his perceptual field. It is only the self which the individual can accept which provides the basis for his behavior. The capacity for acceptance is directly related to the individual's experience of adequacy. Generally speaking, the greater the feeling of adequacy, the greater the capacity for acceptance of self and of others.

In this context, the "phenomenal self" is the individual's basic frame of reference. It is the only self he knows. Whether other people agree with his self definitions or not, the phenomenal self has the feeling of complete reality for that individual. This theory of personality has been called self-theory because of the central importance attributed to the self, or self-concept. Consequently, put together both the theory of therapy (Rogers, 1951) and this theory of personality (Combs and Snygg, 1949) constitute a perceptual approach, or more specifically, a "phenomenological" theory.

Phenomenology assumes that although a real world may exist, its existence cannot be known or experienced directly. Its existence is inferred on the basis of perceptions of the world. These perceptions constitute the experiential field of the individual. In this context,
man can only know his phenomenal world, never any real world, and, therefore, can only behave in terms of how he perceives things, or how they appear to him. Rogers in his therapeutic approach, thus, accepts or adopts a phenomenological point of view when he utilizes the internal frame of reference of the subjective world of the individual as a basis for empathizing with and understanding him. Since the phenomenal self provides the very core of the individual's perceptual field, any understanding of the nature of the individual's field must, of necessity, be concerned with the peculiar organization of concepts which go to make up his self-concept.

Because our perceptions always have the "feeling" of reality at the instant of behaving, our feeling of reality with respect to our perceptual field is so strong that we seldom question it. People invest the things about them with all sorts of meanings. These meanings are for each person the reality to which he responds. In the same physical situation or in objectively identical situations, the perceptual fields of different individuals are both much more and much less than the field which is potentially available in the immediate physical environment. At any given time, the field of given individual is organized with reference to his needs and the activity by which he is attempting to satisfy his need at the time.

The meaning of any perceived event is always a product of the relationship of that event or experience to the total situation in which it is a part. The intensity with which events are perceived in the phenomenal or personal field is a function of differentiation and levels of awareness. Although the perceptual field includes all of one's
environment we are not aware of all parts with the same degree of clarity at any given moment. It follows, therefore, that at whatever level of awareness perceptions exist in the field, they have differential effects upon the individual's behavior. It is the differentiation an individual is able to make in his perceptual field that determines the nature of his perceptions. The most important complex of differentiations in the individual's perceptual field is his phenomenal self (Combs and Snygg, 1949). What a person thinks and how he behaves is largely determined by the concepts he holds about himself. What the particular description of a "real self" is can never be known, for the self can only be understood through somebody's perceptions. These perceptions may be more or less close approximations to the real self, but they are never entirely accurate. Concepts of the self may be held in common by the individual and by outsiders, or they may be the peculiar perceptions of the individual's own private world of experience.

The perceptions people have of themselves do not stop with description alone. Much more important, people perceive themselves in terms of values. These values are acquired from interactions with people about us. Whatever his way of describing himself, each person has structured or developed a large set of perceptions. These more or less separate perceptions are known as concepts of self, which are more or less discreet perceptions of self which the individual regards as part or characteristic of his being.

There are unresolved differences of opinion among self-theorists as to the specific sources of behavior. However, there is general agreement that whatever it is that motivates a person to respond in some ways and not in others is largely determined by what
what he thinks of himself (Wylie, 1961). In this regard, Park and Burgess (1961) comment that whatever components there may be to personality and behavior, "it is an organization of traits and attitudes of which the individual's conception of himself is central" (p. 183).

Contemporary research in child growth and development has emphasized the central significance of the individual's conception of himself (Rogers, 1954; Wylie, 1961). From the various sources of research it is apparent that individuals develop different concepts of themselves and that these concepts of self are always determined in terms of degrees of adequacy (Rogers, 1954). The role of the concept of self in achieving a sense of adequacy appears, according to most writings (Adler, 1921; Fromm, 1939; Horney, 1945) to be significant.

As a construct, the self is drawn from the work of James (1890), Mead (1934), Horney (1945), Sullivan (1947), and others. Jersild (1960) has put the meanings of the idea of self together in the following statement:

A composite of thoughts and feelings which constitute a person's awareness of his individual existence, his conception of who and what he is (p. 9).

Erikson (1960), however, equates behavior and personality development to the process of "Identity-Formation." He observes:

Identity formation neither begins nor ends with adolescence: it is a lifelong development largely unconscious to the individual and to his society. Its roots go back all the way to the first self-recognition . . . (p. 47).

The term self in these papers, seems to refer to the process of identity development and maintenance which occupies a significant role in human life. It can therefore be assumed, along with Sullivan, Horney, Mead and others, that the self can never be isolated from the
complex of interpersonal relations in which the person lives and
develops. It also is apparent that the self is greatly affected by
the "reflected appraisals" (Kvaraceus, 1965) of the society in which
the person lives. Jersild (1960) observes that if the reflected
appraisals,

. . . of which the self is made up are mainly derogatory
. . . then the growing child's attitudes toward himself
will be mainly derogatory. The child toward whom the
predominant attitude of significant persons has been one
of hostility, disapproval and dissatisfaction, will tend
to view the world in similar terms. He will have difficulty
in seeing or learning any better and although he may not
openly express self-depreciatory attitudes, he has a depre-
ciatory attitude toward others and toward himself (p. 13).

These orientations and viewpoints relate the self primarily
to significant others, in the family and in other interpersonal
interactions.

For the purposes of the present investigation, it is the
consequences of self-concept attitudes rather than the phenomenon
itself which is of most concern. The varieties of pathological
behavior that are reported (Kardiner and Ouesey, 1951) to follow
self-concepts based on negative attitudes are numerous.

It is because of their effects (negative self-concepts) on
interpersonal behavior and general human interaction that they are
of greater concern to people involved in this field.

Because a negative self-concept may be just as crippling
and just as hard to overcome as any physical condition, the child
with a negative view of himself will not be able to profit
adequately in his interactions with his environment. In fact,
a negative self-concept may be even more crippling because it is
often hidden from the view of the untrained observer. Most children
who hate themselves act out this self-hatred by "kicking" the world around them. Such an attitude often continues to cripple in adult life.

The word "self" has been used in several different ways. Two chief meanings have emerged, however, the self as subject or agent, and the self as the individual who is known to himself (English and English, 1958). Specifically, the words "self-regard" have come into common use with regard to the second meaning, and it is with this meaning that this study is concerned.

Inasmuch as self-regard may be defined in a general way as the organized collection of attitudes, opinions, and beliefs an individual holds about himself (Combs and Snygg, 1949; Rogers, 1951; Mathewson and Rochlin, 1956), it would be expected to be influenced by those factors that have previously been found to influence other kinds of beliefs and opinions (Allport and Vernon, 1931; Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, 1950; Rokeach, 1960).

Rogers (1961) in his theory of personality, states that a need for self-regard develops from the association of the satisfaction or frustration of the need for positive regard with self-experiences. Self-regard becomes selective as significant others distinguish the self-experiences of the individual as more or less worthy of regard. The experience only of unconditional positive regard would eliminate the development of conditions of worth and thus contribute to the development of unconditional self-regard, thus achieving such positive self-regard as would no longer directly be dependent on the attitudes of others.

A person's accumulated set of perceptions, both internal and
external, may also be referred to as self-situational constructs (Kelly, 1955). Distortions of reality are often incorporated within self-situational constructs. Perceptions of reality, distorted or true, probably have a developmental pattern of their own, a pattern that is related to general maturational processes as well as to specific social, cultural, and educational experiences.

Mathewson (1961) emphasizes the significance of a self-situational viewpoint by observing that it permits no feature of internal and external events to remain neglected, particularly with respect to relational aspects of personality and culture. A person's perceptions of himself are always related to the social context in which he functions. His "adjustment" depends on a state of harmony between personal and social perceptions. These personal perceptions have been identified in numerous writings as self-concept (Combs and Snygg, 1949; Rogers, 1954; Mathewson and Rochlin, 1961; Wylie, 1961). The way a person resolves or achieves a synthesis between these two constructs is identified as the process of self-actualization.

It seems reasonable at this point to concentrate upon what broad basic factors constitute a positive self-concept. One variable which may be basic to positive self-regard has been described by Chenault (1966) as syntony, and defined as the ability to value broadly, to transcend traditional polarities, to avoid the extreme either-or orientation, to develop wider, more tentative non-arbitrary values, to be less sure what is right and wrong, to be less eager to judge good and bad and to recognize that so-called dichotomies can exist compatibly in one's self and in others.
When a person is truly "syntonic" he is in harmony with himself and the world about him. He would be in Maslow's view (1965) "self-actualized," and in Rogers' view, "a fully functioning person."

Mathewson and Rochlin (1961), after examining some five hundred interviews in counseling, formulated the following hypothesis on self-regard:

(1) A high degree of self-regard leads to positive character development, which leads to

(2) Responsibility-taking in society, which leads to

(3) Feelings of personal and social effectiveness, which leads to

(4) Understanding of strengths and acceptance of limitations, which leads to

(5) Appropriate vocational and educational decisions or other social acts.

All these postulates are expressed in terms of high self-regard, noting further that:

(6) High self-regard seems to be positively related to school achievement.

(7) High self-regard seems to be positively related to interest in others, to the desire to help others, and to a sense of affiliation with the community and the total environment.

(8) High self-regard seems to be positively related to acceptance of others and regard for others.

(9) High self-regard seems to be positively related to leadership and assertiveness, but it seems to be negatively related to aggressiveness and to autocratic strivings and tendencies.

(10) High self-regard seems to be positively related to productivity and creativity.

(11) High self-regard seems to be positively related to personal optimism.

These hypotheses are similar to the many hypotheses that have been examined by Wylie (1961) in her comprehensive review of the
entire research literature on the self-concept. She warns of attributing cause-and-effect relationships to such hypotheses. Even after exhaustive scrutiny, however, she does not say that these hypotheses are unfounded.

On the basis of these hypotheses, it is observed that as the person moves from adolescence into adulthood, the postulates stated about degree of self-regard seem to hold true:

(12) A high degree of self-regard seems to be related to a tendency to view others favorably.

(13) A high degree of self-regard seems to produce the feeling that one is being viewed favorably by others.

(14) A high degree of self-regard seems to be related to a conviction that one is able to negotiate one's tasks, and that one's goals are attainable.

(15) A high degree of self-regard seems to be related to the capacity to adjust to events as they are, without calling into play defensive behavior that tends to distort present events (Rogers and Dymond, 1954; Mathewson and Rochlin, 1961).

It is this last postulate that is of particular interest in the present analysis of self-regard. When self-regard is low for a particular individual, and threat is experienced, the person becomes anxious. The avoidance of this threat provides motivation to develop defenses as a means of reducing or coping with anxiety. One such defense against anxiety is development of absolute judgments. This defense mechanism is directly related to the concept of syntony discussed earlier in this section. Absolutism is believed to develop as a result of anxiety, and anxiety, in this sense, is defined as anything the individual perceives to be a threat, either physical or
psychological. At a more personal level, fear or loss of self-regard must be defended against. As a result, absolute judgments may be resorted to in behaving. Once absolute judgments are used, the individual loses some degree of objectivity. Indeed, it is the absolute judgments which have become the basis for the development of existing prejudices and stereotypes, and has been recognized as the major contributing factor in interracial confrontations.

In the light of the preceding analysis, it should be noted that syntony does not imply a complete absence of absolutism. A syntonic person might on occasion value something as absolute or display preference, envy, resentment, or greed. He is a person capable of all the human possibilities and yet one who recognizes his humanity and is not uncomfortable by the awareness of opposite traits or behaviors. Although he may on occasion employ various defense mechanisms, he involves such a high degree of self-awareness that he will not maintain these defenses.

Defense Mechanisms and Perceptual Variability: Implications for Interpersonal Behavior

It was established, from the preceding discussion and reviews that perceptual behavior is selective. One never notices, for instance, all aspects of any situation; and even what one does notice may be interpreted or "integrated" in different ways for different people.

Selectivity in perception is determined by the existing state of motivation as experienced by each person (Bruner and Goodman, 1947; Bruner and Postman, 1947; Sherif and Cantril, 1947; Allport, 1955;
Solly and Murphy, 1960). Behavior based on this involves eliminating or omitting some elements of stimulus situations and substituting other details to complete our own picture of things. This well-known phenomenon led Lippman (1922) to conclude that we see things not as they are but as we are.

Self-other perceptions or attitudes are obviously outgrowths of experiences encountered in our daily existence. However, it is worthwhile to ask questions about the general effects of certain kinds of influences.

It is a well-documented observation among Self-Theorists that the influences which are significant in self-other perceptions or attitudes depend upon the way in which they are selected and experienced by individuals. These influences are mediated by certain intervening factors which create, confirm, or modify such perceptions.

If perception is a form of behavior, as suggested by Rogers (1954) and Snygg and Combs (1949) in which situations or people are evaluated in preparation for other forms of behavior; then, any situation or person is necessarily evaluated in relation to something or somebody. Whatever this something is seems to constitute the basis for the nature of the perception in the encountered situation.

Since perceptions influence the direction and intensity of other forms of behavior either for the self, or the self in-relation-to-others; and since such behavior is influenced by anticipations of being responded to by others in ways which affect one's own self-perception, the interpersonal implications of this phenomenon becomes obvious.
What such anticipated responses have in common is that they are perceived as either desirable or undesirable since they make a person's picture of himself either more or less acceptable and satisfying. Consequently, one's own self-perception depends very largely upon one's confidence or lack of confidence with respect to others' responses toward him. The process regarded as self-evaluation has been referred to by Cantril (1946) and Sherif (1947) as ego involvement.

When a person perceives a situation as threatening he is likely to react to that threat with other forces or attitudes of a supporting nature to his ego of self (i.e., defensively). He becomes motivated not only in supporting and maintaining his perception, but also toward the defense of his own self. Under such conditions his behavior is maintained in spite of influences which threaten to change his attitudes. Thus, if a person's attitudes do not change, this does not mean that there are not influences operating to make him change; rather, it means that he has maintained a constant state of "equilibrium" by opposing potential influences toward change of other (self) influences.

In the theories of Rogers (1951) and Combs and Snygg (1949), defensiveness is described as primarily a perceptual phenomenon which follows as a consequence of threat to the individual's self. Defensiveness, in essence, seems to be the prevention of "threatening" perceptions from reaching awareness. As a result, aspects of the environment, and of the person himself may be denied awareness or may be perceived in a distorted manner, with the purpose of maintaining "stability" as perceived by the person.
We are aware of the person's self only by observing what he does to maintain or increase its "value." Consequently, if a person's resistance to influences which might change his attitudes involves stability of the self, we might expect that he would become defensive. This is exactly what happens in everyday life. People commonly become defensive when attitudes or values which are important to them are challenged. The position assumed by the concept of distortion of perceptions is simply that the more defensive the motivation of the perceiver the less likely he is to re-examine his own position under the circumstances of confrontation.

This assumption is confirmed in various ways by self-theorists such as Angyal (1941), Lecky (1945), Rogers (1954), Allport (1962). In his analysis of the self with respect to adjustment Rogers (1951) comments:

Although the individual whose self-concept is incongruent with reality may be vulnerable, the extent to which he dimly perceives these incongruences and discrepancies is a measure of his internal tension and determines the amount of defensive behavior (pp. 191-192).

Behavior, therefore, becomes consistent with the organized hypotheses and concepts of the self-structure and these are unique for each individual person.

Defensiveness as with reference to self-regard is conceived in terms of a continuum related to either adjustment or maladjustment. Despite the difficulties encountered by theorists in this area in defining "adjustment," either conceptually or operationally, it is generally admitted that low degree of self-regard should be indicative of maladjustment.
The relationship between self-regard and defensiveness has been extensively studied (Rogers and Dymond, 1954) especially with respect to the process and degrees of adjustment (psychological). A natural outcome of these efforts has been attempts at developing criteria for adjustments. Other studies have been concerned with this relationship as it affects interpersonal relationships. It is with the latter that this investigation is concerned. The concept of defensiveness in relation to self-other regard is examined with the specific purpose of determining its relationship to the concept of absolutism and its effect on interpersonal relationships. It is with respect to this issue that the following analysis is concerned.

Rogers and Walsh (1959) hypothesized that "defensiveness" would influence "unwitting self-evaluation." Defensiveness of female college students was measured by the K scale of the MMPI. These authors found that defensive subjects unknowingly evaluated their own photographed facial expressions as significantly less attractive than did non-defensive subjects, when they also unknowingly evaluated their own photographed expressions. The externally judged attractiveness of the photographs of defensive and nondefensive subjects was equal. The authors suggest that "the defensive group's self-devaluation may have been based upon a feeling of self-dissatisfaction which was denied conscious expression in the interest of maintaining self-esteem."

Sullivan (1947), Rogers (1954), and Combs and Snygg (1949) contends that anxiety is the underlying factor in the development of defensive behavior. When the organism is striving to satisfy needs not consciously admitted and attempts to respond to experiences denied
by the conscious, anxiety follows. This seems to be true, particularly when the individuals are aware of this tension. Defensive behavior is developed in order to maintain the structure of the self; and as Rogers suggests, the more perceptions or experiences inconsistent with the concept of self there are, the more rigid the self-structure becomes. This experience of rigidity, closely related to the concept of absolutism as examined in this study, and to Rokeach's (1960) concept of closed-mindedness, is particularly relevant in attempts to analyze and understand interpersonal relations.

When the self cannot defend itself any longer against threats, a psychological breakdown or personality disintegration occurs.

Halpern (1955) suggested that in areas where a person is discontent with his own behavior, disorganizing anxiety may be aroused and distortive defenses may be mobilized leading to aberrations in accurate interpersonal perceptions. In a study using the Gamin Inventory Halpern found that subjects predicted responses of others more accurately for items on which they indicated that they were "pleased" with their own self-ratings than for items with which they were "dissatisfied." In another study, Whaler (1958) used as subjects university students, medical outpatient veterans, nonpsychotic veterans undergoing psychotherapy, and applicants for admission to the same outpatient psychiatric clinic. He found higher correlations for intakes than for psychotherapy patients, and significantly lower correlations for the latter than for the other three groups. He concluded that the higher correlation for intakes than for psychotherapy patients represents the defensiveness of intakes rather than their better judgment.
Hogan (1948) describes eight steps as a pattern of threat and defensiveness. He suggests that anxiety is reduced, for a particular person, by denial or distortion of perceived experiences. If, as suggested by Hogan, defensive behavior reduces the awareness of threat, then the insecure person who has developed defense patterns should no longer admit incongruity between perceived experience and his self-concept. It may be assumed, therefore, that the insecure person tends to be derogatory toward himself in sociometric ratings, when differences between the individual and others are emphasized (Rogers and Walsh, 1959), thus reflecting greater self-ideal discrepancy. This assumption is confirmed by Hilson and Worchel (1957) who concluded from their findings that self-ideal discrepancy and self-other depreciation go hand in hand in the insecure person.

The findings from these and other studies have led self-theorists and researchers in this area to formulate certain fundamental assumptions concerning the self-concept in general, that is: behavior is a function of the self-concept rather than being predictable from an observer's knowledge of so-called objective reality, and that discrepancies or contradictions within the self-concept tend to induce anxiety and consequently, defensiveness. Defensiveness, thus, is conceived as a function of discrepancies within the self-concept rather than being predictable simply from an individual's knowledge of objective reality or from his insight into objective reality (Lecky, 1945; Wylie, 1957).

Fenichel (1945), approaching this assumption from a psychodynamic point of view, distinguishes a number of "ego" defenses, among which projection, denial, repression, and intellectualization are examples.
People differ, Fenichel goes on, in their interpersonal reactions related to various adjustment styles and in the intensity of relationships made. They also differ, independently, in their characteristic styles of defense against disturbing or threatening experiences. Thus, each of the adjustment mechanisms may be associated in a wide variety of individuals with each of the various defense patterns.

To a significantly greater degree, these defenses have been found to affect interpersonal behavior and interaction (Horney, 1937; Freud, 1939; Fenichel, 1945; Erikson, 1956). Washbain (1962), for example, using a forced-choice item test to sample fifteen defense mechanisms on groups of high school and college students, found support for three hypotheses posted: that people who perceive themselves as inadequate tend to develop more hostile defenses than those who perceive themselves as adequate in relation to others; that individuals who evaluated themselves as inadequate tend to adopt more retreating defenses than those regarding themselves as adequate; and, finally, that individuals characteristically displaying more overt anxiety tend to have fewer defensive attitudes to justify "unacceptable" behavior and to avoid blame than individuals experiencing less anxiety.

Veldman and Worchel (1961) exposed college students to a frustrating situation (i.e., failure in a test situation accompanied by insults) to test the hypothesis that self-acceptance is inversely related to displacement of hostility. They predicted that the degree of self-acceptance and defensiveness interact to influence the expression of hostility. It was hypothesized that subjects with low defensiveness and high self-acceptance (i.e., the adjustive) would express strongest feelings of anger, while the high defensiveness and high self-accepting
person (i.e., the repressive) would express least anger, and the low
defensiveness and low self-accepting person (the anxious) would display
high aggression anxiety. Their findings generally supported these
hypotheses. In interpreting these findings, perhaps one should bear in
mind Block and Thomas's (1955) cautions, that reported high self-regard
may in fact indicate good adjustment, or on the other hand, indicate
a denial of problems and self-rejection, which are actually just as
serious as, or more serious than, admitted low self-regard. Rogers and
Dymond (1954) have suggested that in some cases positive self-concept
or high self-regard may also reflect a highly defensive and paranoid
individual. Frenkel-Brunswik (1939) and Hart (1947) present additional
support for this caution, that is for some individuals reported high
regard may be compensatory in nature. Hart, indeed, recognized the
difficulty in differentiating between true self-esteem and inflated
self-esteem. The possibility that high self-regard can compensate for
underlying negative attitudes toward the self has important theoretical
implications (Jervis, 1959).

Chodorkoss (1956), in a study to test the relation between threat,
defensiveness, and self-perceptions, found that the degree of threat
which an individual experiences does correlate significantly with
defensiveness. Using the score from a perceptual defense procedure,
he concluded that the extent of sensitization (i.e., responding to
threat more quickly) or avoidance (i.e., slow response) of threat is
related to the degree of threat experienced. Important differences
exist between persons and apparently can be demonstrated if personally
relevant; however, group interaction does influence perceptual defenses
and is known to have effected different changes in the perception of people and/or of total environments.

The mechanism of "adjustment, or more appropriately, of adaptation, first proposed in psychoanalytic theory and particularly relevant to this study is projection. Freud (1925) defines projection as the attribution to the external world of impulses unacceptable to the ego.

According to this view the term projection seems, without question, to carry negative connotations. The present research, however, as a point of departure, conceives of projection along a continuum, with negative and positive implications, depending on the people involved in the relationship. The negative interpretation of projection is well known and well supported by research beginning with the work of Sears (1936). Norman and Ainsworth (1954), basing their assumptions on statements in literature (Allport, 1938; Alexander, 1948), define projection as including the following aspects: it is defensive, it is unconscious, it involves undesirable characteristics and it is a self-deception and therefore a reality distortion.

As it has already been pointed out, from theoretical assumption and from studies reviewed in this research, there is a positive correlation between the ratings subjects assign to themselves and to others. Therefore, in including insightfulness-noninsightfulness in the attempt to define and measure projection, one should be careful to hold the self-rating part of the insight measure, if it is assumed to play a major role, constant across subjects or groups of subjects. Otherwise, the relationship between the independent and dependent variables may parsimoniously
be attributed to an association between "insight" and projection, rather than being due to a correlation between self-ratings and ratings assigned by the self to others. Sears did not hold self-ratings constant when making his comparisons between insightful and noninsightful groups.

It was not felt necessary in his study to hold the insightful-noninsightful concept constant for the groups tested because this variable was not of primary concern. Analyzing projection from its broader perspective, along a continuum, indicates the presence of insight-non-insight, and of conscious-unconscious motivations.

The conception of projection in its "positive" dimension is analogous to the concept of empathy referred to by many writers in this field. Empathy, as Dymond (1954) defines it, is an imaginative transposing of oneself into the thinking, feeling, and acting of another, and according to Grossman (1951) as perceiving the world from the other's frame of reference.

An example of "positive" projection, according to this study's interpretation, is seen when a high degree of regard or acceptance is related to a generous appraisal of others because of a tendency toward generous appraisal of self. On the other hand, an example of "negative" projection is seen where, if two or more people are interacting and both tend to project similar unacceptable or threatening attitudes or feelings, a potentially explosive and destructive relationship or interacting can undoubtedly be anticipated.

Projection, in this context, implies accepting traits, feelings, or attitudes perceived as existing within oneself (whether these are
admitted or denied, and whether perceived consciously or not) to the other person, group, or environment. This interpretation does not imply perceiving the world from the other person's frame of reference. Rather, it implies a perception of the existence of certain feelings, attitudes, or traits which, through either identification or rejection, may be related to the other person or group or total environment. The positive or negative nature of the attitude will determine the defensiveness or nondefensiveness of the mechanism.

Interpretation of projection as encountered in this study may seem novel but evidence in its support is abundant—from psychotherapy, writings in sociology and social psychology, from everyday observations, particularly with reference to intergroup relations based on religious affiliations, racial groups, philosophical beliefs, political ideology, and numerous other factors (Myrdal, 1944; Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson and Sanford, 1950; Rokeach, 1960; Silberman, 1964; Cobbs and Price, 1968; and Fanon, 1968).

There are many schools of thought among psychotherapists with regard to the nature of the relationship between defensiveness and adjustment. But one conviction supported by nearly all schools of thought is that attitudes cannot be changed without first dealing with defensiveness. Some therapists prefer "direct" methods of confronting the subject with his methods of defensiveness and helping him to examine them (Ellis, 1962). Others insist that the subject's need for defensiveness is at a minimum (Rogers, 1951).

There is a second point, related, however, to the first, about which most psychotherapists are also in general agreement. Progress
during treatment is associated with changed attitudes toward other people; that is, attitudes toward other people are changed as defensiveness is decreased. It is thus difficult to disregard the conclusion that defensiveness is utilized to maintain such feelings as guilt hostility, and inferiority.

Defensiveness, in its variety of forms, has been found to a significant extent, to affect interpersonal relations. Consistent with this observation, Combs and Snygg (1949) concluded:

So much of our lives is concerned with human relationships, that any change in our beliefs (perceptions) about the nature of man and his behavior must, of necessity, have tremendous implications for all aspects of our social existence . . . Whatever we believe about people must inevitably affect the ways we behave toward them (p. 32).

It has already been established that defensiveness plays a significant role in the persistence of negative attitudes. Whether or not certain attitudes or perceptions change will be determined by their significance for any given person. Thus, Cohen (1953) found that the negative interactions which are expected to follow when defenses are resorted to are of a variety of ways all originating from a conception of threat in interpersonal relationships. He found, further, that in interactions, when two persons threaten each other, they may: be relatively unattracted to the relationship, or to the other person and to the task around which they interact; or perceive the other as hostile, unfriendly, or in other negative terms; and, finally, they may develop a negative self-image and attribute this to the other person. As a result, both persons may become unmotivated to relate with each other in similar situations.

In addition, Cohen found that generally projectors experienced
more negative and hostile interpersonal relationships, perceived a more hostile and negative environment than non-projectors, were less attracted to interpersonal situations in general, perceived less support from others, and demonstrated more insecurity in their relationships. Concerning this last finding, Fenichel (1945) notes that the insecure person who uses the defensive mechanism of projection is sensitized, as it were, to perceive the unconscious of others, consequently his perception could be utilized to rationalize his own tendency toward projection.

Defenses associated with the most negative interpersonal relationships were found to be projection and regression in that order. These defenses have been observed, in many other writings, to lead to most interpersonal and intergroup confrontations.

In a related study involving personality and sociometric choice, Cohen (1954) also found that people who used projection against given situations "underchose" others. Those people who used avoidance defenses were seen by their social group to be less deviant from the norms and values of that group. In addition, the use of avoidance defenses was found to be related to high self-regard, while projection tended to be associated with low self-regard. Thus, in an open friendship choice situation and on a self-rating questionnaire in Cohen’s research, the different defenses appeared to have differential consequences for interpersonal relations and social adjustment.

The interpretation of interpersonal relations from a perceptual framework may appear to present some difficulties for this study, since,
according to this viewpoint, our perceptions always have a very strong feeling of reality, in spite of the fact that our reality may not correspond to other peoples' conception of reality. To avert this difficulty, the notion of syntony (Chenault, 1966) or openmindedness (Rokeach, 1960) is built-in to this conceptual framework. Syntony as perceived by Chenault is defined as:

... the ability to value broadly ... to develop wider, more tenative, non-arbitrary values, to be less sure what is right and wrong ... (p. 32).

This philosophy is essential for effective communication in inter-personal relationships.

Since many of the complex events we attempt to understand and predict can only be dealt with through understanding interrelationships, it is necessary to understand the nature of these interrelationships, even though their precise quality may not be known. Consequently, an analysis of defensiveness, for example, demonstrates that it is just as necessary to understand why people's perceptions sometimes fail to change as to understand the reasons for their changing.

A second difficulty concerns the way in which we conceive of man and his relationships to the environment in which he lives. This problem was recognized by Combs and Snygg (1949) and alluded to by Patterson (1966) in his review of Rogers's (1954) assumptions of phenomenology and his system as regards individual freedom and choice.

One of the earliest conceptions of the nature of man held that man was completely independent and responsible agent, that whatever he did arose entirely from within himself. If a person encountered some misfortune he was unquestionably and inescapably to blame for his behavior. Little sympathy was exchanged since events were seen only in terms of their "rightness" or "wrongness."
Another concept, commonly held even today, sees man as the victim of his environment. He is what he is because of what has happened to him. Unfortunately this viewpoint made it difficult to understand some of the most important, cogent, and pressing problems socially. This viewpoint has given rise to a mechanistic conception of human beings, to a total belief in the irreversibility of development, often resulting in a sense of complacency and dehumanization leading man to attribute responsibility for his actions outside of himself. The implications of this view are widespread throughout all aspects of human interaction, particularly those relating to attitudes toward "colonized" and "oppressed" people.

The point of view basic to this study conceives of man's responsibility and the influence of environment in non-absolute terms. It derives from existential philosophy which conceives of man as continuous with his environment. It provides an understanding of man as deeply and intimately affected by his environment but capable, through his relationships, of molding and shaping his destiny in significant ways. Recognizing this relationship, Fanon (1967) notes: "society cannot escape human influences. Man is what brings society into being" (p. 218). This viewpoint is closely tied in and directly pertinent to attempts at understanding the quality, nature, and direction of the "Black Revolution" which is presently taking place throughout the world. It provides a conceptual framework for the understanding of the black man's attempt at re-examining his life, finding solutions to his political, economic, social, and interpersonal problems including his position in his society,
his relationships within the society, a demand by him for recognition as a human being, and a restoration of his own worth and dignity. This conception calls for an approach that places emphasis on critical self-exploration as an attempt to help ourselves as well as others to perceive more freely and accurately. Involved, as a necessary adjunct of the process, is the mutuality and reciprocity of relationships.

Commenting on the absolute reciprocity of interrelations as the foundation of Hegelian dialectic, Fanon (1967) observes that:

"It is in the degree to which I go beyond my own immediate being that I apprehend the existence of the other as a natural and more than natural reality. If I close the circuit (through defensiveness), if I prevent the accomplishment of movement in two directions, I keep the other within himself. Ultimately I deprive him even of this being-for-itself. The only means of breaking this vicious circle . . . is to restore to the other, through mediation and recognition, human reality . . . (p. 217)."

On the reciprocity of this action, he states:

"The other has to perform the same operation. Action from one side only would be useless because what is to happen can only be brought about by means of both . . . They recognize themselves as mutually recognizing each other (p. 219)."

Consistent with this proposition is the emphasis, within the perceptual framework, on interacting with people through the creation of the kinds of situations which facilitate the process of perceptual and attitude change, through utilizing the techniques of communication, open dialogue, and discovery. Because this approach recognizes the role of defensiveness or interpersonal relationships and communication, its major emphasis is on creating settings or environments that would reduce such defensiveness to its minimum and thus facilitate open communication, dialogue, and honest confrontations of issues."
Lifton (1966) observes that this type of approach has been found to be particularly effective when applied in group settings whose major focus is supportiveness of the group and the individuals within the group during the course of their interaction. He notes:

When an individual quickly discovers, as he tests out his needs in a group, that he can get from others the things he wants only when he has developed a relationship with them, which will cause them to want to give him what he seeks . . . when you help an individual face (and evaluate) the world in which he finds himself, you also help him discover how his (perceptions) must be modified . . . (p. 8).

Although this approach recognizes environmental effects on people's development and behavior, it does not place environment above the person. This is an attempt to elevate human beings and provide them with vehicles whereby they can change environments which are compatible with their values as human beings.
CHAPTER IV
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Five major sections are presented in this chapter. First is a description of the population from which the sample was drawn. Second is an outline of the procedures used. Third is a specific presentation of the experimental treatment (i.e., Interaction Group Experiences). Fourth is a description, background, and rationale of the criterion measures. Fifth is a presentation of the experimental design and the methods used for data analysis.

Subjects

Subjects participating in this study were obtained from the population of students residing in the Orchard Hill Residential College complex at the University of Massachusetts in Amherst, Massachusetts. This complex houses about 1400 undergraduate students. At the time the study was conducted (1968) approximately 420 of the students residing in that complex were freshmen. Of these freshmen, about 120 were black students enrolled at the University under the CCEBS (Committee for the Collegiate Education of Black Students) designed to provide educational opportunities for "disadvantaged" students in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.
Subjects for both the experimental group and the control group were drawn from this population of undergraduate resident students, composed of freshmen and upperclassmen. The experimental sample, however, was drawn from a population of students involved in a program for the training of residence-hall counselors designed by and directed through the Office of Student Affairs at the University. Because of the unusual nature of the requirements to be met by designing the model basic to this study, the experimental group itself constituted two different populations (i.e., A and B). In order for the reader to understand and appreciate the complexities involved in using such a sample combination and to provide a context for any generalizations to be drawn later, it is essential that a thorough description of these samples be provided. For purposes of clarification, these samples are identified as Experimental Group A (Residence-hall Counselors) and Experimental Group B (Residence-hall Counselor Apprentices). In assigning subjects to groups (for experimental treatment) these two groups were not separated but were treated as one.

**Experimental Groups**

**Group A.** Subjects participating in this experimental group were drawn from a population of residence-hall counselors in the Orchard Hill Complex who were participants in the Residence Hall Staff Training Program developed by the Office of Student Personnel Services. Below is a description of the program, its goals, and a brief statement of the selection process for the counselors.
Rationale for the Residence Hall Staff Training Program. With the rapid growth of the student population in higher education, increasing pressure has been placed on student personnel service programs to develop more effective ways of assisting a greater number of students in their college adjustment, in general. This is particularly true of residential colleges and universities which are faced with students who may for the first time leave home, and be left to be independent. Problems facing these students range from reaction to alienation and other forms of estrangement to more serious adjustment and emotional conflicts.

Because of the shortage of trained personnel in programs designed to assist students, it is observed that students themselves have frequently been found to be more helpful to one another in their daily contact and interaction—in classes, living quarters, and other activities. Further, because many of the adjustment problems have been found to be related to the living conditions of the students, it seemed necessary and imperative that students themselves be trained to make them more effective in assisting other students; hence, the development and implementation of programs for the training of counselors or assistants in many residential colleges and universities. Because these training programs were more concerned with the development of positive interpersonal relationships among students, it was found necessary to expand the goals of these programs, and to change the image and role of existing residence-hall assistants beyond regulatory and maintenance functions.
Research in the area of student affairs confirm the observation that students themselves are often more effective in working with other students. A number of universities are, as a consequence of this observation, increasingly relying on training such "non-professional" personnel. The goals of the counselor training programs involve an expansion of the traditional role of the residence hall counselor, which has often been perceived negatively by other students (i.e., as dormitory "policeman"). This expanded role involves "freeing" counselors to make it possible for them to "deal" with problems affecting the students' personal, academic, social, and other related areas. In some cases this involved resolving conflicts which occurred in daily life and activities of the student.

Research studies, Temby (1961) and Braaten (1963), report that about ten per cent of all college students have serious emotional problems. It is estimated that an additional larger percentage of students have less serious problems that, nevertheless, create discomfort; consequently, Arbuckle (1953) observed that the present situation on college campuses is unfortunate. He stated further, that there was probably no place in a college or university where there was greater need for personal counseling services than in the residence hall, and it was equally likely that the few places where the caliber of assistance available was less effective. Hence, support for improving the skills of lay personnel, such as residence hall counselors, was deemed both necessary and imperative.

Training of lay personnel has had increasing acceptance in
recent years. Harvey (1964) used lay personnel in marriage counseling in Australia. Persons who were accepted for such responsibilities were evaluated in terms of personal qualities such as: a "sincere" regard for others, tolerance, and ability to accept people with values different from one's own, positive self-regard, empathetic understanding, warmth, and sensitivity in relating with others.

In a more thorough investigation, Carkhoff and Truax (1965) found a significant improvement in chronic hospitalized mental patients with trained hospital attendants serving as lay counselors.

Common to all lay counselor training programs is a purpose that is identified as an attempt to assist counselors to learn more about themselves, and in so doing to be open to learning about interpersonal relationships. Because of this, the residential-hall counselor training programs place greater emphasis on the ability to relate feelings to experiences and to communicate these feelings and experiences in an attempt to facilitate personal growth and development. Consequently, residence-hall counselor training programs were basically designed not to provide "skills" or "techniques" on how to manage other students, but rather to offer growth experiences. This was also an important factor in the University of Massachusetts residence-hall counselor training program.

Group B. Students participating in this group were drawn from the CCEBS Program.

In the Fall of 1963, the University of Massachusetts for the first time admitted a relatively large (120) number of black students
under the CCEES Program. However, like most other colleges and universities in the country which were involved in similar efforts, very few, if any, programs were designed to assist these students in adjusting, particularly to an alien and predominantly white university environment. This problem was complicated by the fact that there were no more than three black residence-hall counselors at the time to provide any type of "supports" as role models for these incoming freshmen. A program proposal was designed and presented to the Office of Student Affairs and from this effort was developed a program identified as the "Counselor-Apprentice Program."

The Selection of Resident Counselors

The program designed at the University of Massachusetts had certain specific expectations from the counselors selected and participating in the training process. One of the basic goals of the program was to encourage a variety of role models, recognizing that counselors do not represent any singular model for students. The counselors selected represented the diversity in the total university population in terms of such factors as age, major, personality, and style of life. This goal had important implications when the University, through the "Open Admissions Policy" admitted students from a variety of backgrounds and experiences. The implications of this policy became the motivating factor for developing and implementing the training model basic to the study documented in this report.

The following are some of the criteria used in the selection of
counselors: openness to the new learning experiences, tolerance for ambiguity, ability and interest in helping to develop a sense of community (in the context of residential college complexes), ability to articulate feelings, recognition of and appreciation for diversity in experiences and in people, awareness and sensitivity to current issues and problems on the college scene, and the ability to relate these to social problems and social change. Selection was made by an interview board consisting of students, counselors, heads of residence and student personnel staff.

The students involved in this specific program were required to be in their junior or senior years. In very few cases were sophomores ever selected. Freshmen were never considered for selection.

Selection criteria for Group B were adjusted from the ones stated in the preceding discussion. Black students were invited to apply for the positions. A Committee on Selections was appointed comprising the following: two house representatives (Orchard Hill area) for each of the four houses, two members from the Afro-American Association, one member of the university administration, a member from the university counseling staff, a member of the black faculty (with rotating participation), a residence faculty fellow (rotating membership for each of the four houses), and the co-director of the program. This committee was responsible for developing and outlining the final selection criteria, and these included those outlined for the Residence-hall Staff Training.

The final total number was twenty, and these students
participated in the experimental training program developed for this study. The group was thus composed of twenty white subjects and twenty black subjects. These subjects were all paid members of the Student Personnel Staff.

The twenty white subjects were juniors and seniors with an age range of twenty to twenty-three, and the twenty black subjects were freshmen with an age range of nineteen to twenty-one. The black group came from the inner-city urban areas in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, while the white group came from a variety of geographic backgrounds ranging from farm areas to inner-city areas in Massachusetts. Although the income levels of the subjects were not considered crucial variables to be controlled for in this study, information from subjects indicated that the black subjects came from a predominantly low-income stratum and that the white students were from lower-middle income backgrounds.

The current curricula programs in which all the experimental (and control) subjects were enrolled were equivalent to the majority of the students enrolled in the Arts and Sciences program. The final sample size for the experimental group was forty. The Counselor Apprentice Program was an integral part of the residence-hall staff training program.

Although the assignment of subjects to experimental groups (treatment groups) was done on a random basis, it was essential to use a control group of non-counselors to match each member of the experimental group. The control group was drawn from the same
residential area as the experimental group. Of forty-eight pre-tests administered, thirty-two students met criteria for matching the experimental group.

The Trainers. The rationale for the selection of all four trainers was based on their approach and orientation to counseling and therapy, that is, an unstructured, non-directive approach. In spite of apparent similarities in approach and general orientation for all four trainers, variations among these trainers were expected.

All four trainers were involved as either area group trainers or trainers of area group trainers in the Student Affairs Residence Hall Counselor Training Program. Trainers \( X_1 \) and \( Y_1 \) were area group trainers and trainers \( X_2 \) and \( Y_2 \) were trainers of area group trainers (Figure 1: Procedures).

The aims and "methods" of the experimental treatment required an unusual role on the part of the trainers. Once the general goals of the training program were explained to the trainers, it was necessary for them to explain to the group participants that they were basically responsible for their own learning. In this context trainers were not "directive" in a strict sense, but more "reflective" in approach. Although they were involved in the group process, the group as a whole determined its own direction and pattern of participation. Learning was a joint venture between the trainers and group participants. The main objective for the trainers was to provide a group climate conducive to growth, as described in the definition of the experimental treatment.
Trainers related to issues or concerns that developed from interaction in the group particularly as they related to communication and the expression of feelings. This included the development of relations of group members to each other outside the group and toward other people not involved in the training program. However, interaction outside of the group was not to be substituted for interaction within the group.

Pairing of the trainers followed an arrangement with the same combination of variables as group composition, i.e., race by sex variables, resulting in the following designations: trainer $X_1$ (black and female), trainer $X_2$ (white and male), trainer $Y_1$ (white and female) and trainer $Y_2$ (black and male). Three of the four trainers in this study ($X_1$, $X_2$, and $Y_1$) were doctoral students enrolled in the Counselor Education Program at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts. Trainer $Y_2$ is a professor in the Clinical Psychology Department.

**Procedures**

Forty subjects participated in the experimental training program; these were divided into four groups with random assignment of male and female of black and white subjects to each of the four groups. In Figure I is indicated the assignment of students by pairs of trainers.

Subjects were randomly assigned to groups by sex and race according to the arrangement specified in the experimental design. This arrangement can be seen in Figure 2.
Trainers $X_1$ and $X_2$ $Y_1$ and $Y_2$

Experimental Groups

$P_1$ $R_1$
$P_2$ $R_2$

FIGURE 1.

ASSIGNMENT OF TRAINERS TO GROUPS: EXPERIMENTAL TRAINING

Subjects identified as either Group A or Group B earlier in this chapter were combined to produce heterogeneous but similar groups for the treatment conditions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-Group Codes</th>
<th>Black/Female</th>
<th>Black/Male</th>
<th>White/Female</th>
<th>White/Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R$</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 2.

DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS ACCORDING TO GROUPS (EXPERIMENTAL) RACE AND SEX
Pretesting. Prior to exposing the experimental groups (P and R) to the training program (Interaction Group Experiences) a battery of the measures used in this study was administered to the students. These included The Berger Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Scale, The Absolutism Scales, and The Rating Scale.

The estimated time it took for the subjects to complete these tests was one and one-half hours. The experimental treatment, which comprised eight weekly sessions each of two hours length, was begun as soon as the pretesting was done. The forty subjects in the experimental group participated in these group meetings for a period of eight weeks. Although the same information and pretesting measures were done for the control group, the latter was not exposed to the training program.

Prior to, and during the entire training period, each pair of group trainers met on a weekly basis to discuss group process and to share experiences and strategies related to groups, direction, and status of the training program.

Finally, when all experimental groups had completed the total of eight weekly sessions, post-testing for both experimental and control groups was done at the end of the eighth session.

A short-term follow-up program was designed for the experimental group. Efforts to complete the data required, however, were abandoned because some of the subjects and some of the testers (director and co-director) had changed their residence. Data from this program would have been of value in determining the stability
of changes among the experimental subjects over a period of time. Data secured from these tests were collated and scored for analysis. Specific test instructions for all the measures used are indicated in Appendices A, B, and C.

The Experimental Treatment Defined: Interaction Group Experiences

Background. Much of the theory and specific methodology on group interaction, particularly that related to the broader concept of group dynamics, derives from the activities of the National Training Laboratory (NTL), which has its geographic roots in Bethel, Maine.

Many of the earlier works focused mainly on how to help groups become more effective in achieving their goals, regardless of group definition (Psathas, 1960). This orientation, which was pragmatic, partially reflects the belief that for democracy to be effective, for example, it must do so by demonstrating the results of group effort (Lifton, 1966). Consequently, for the majority of investigations in this concern, the criterion for success in group became the speed with which a group achieved a goal external to the group (Benne and Sheats, 1948). Major preoccupation with this issue led to attempts at developing and adapting the concept of group roles, goals, and objectives.

The early concerns in the NTL Basic Skills Training Group have, however, shifted from this major preoccupation with skills development, to a deeper and more sensitive concern with the
problems confronting people who recognize the need for change, i.e., personal and social change. One of the assumptions made in this study is based on the recognition of the above issue, i.e., problems confronting people on a broader platform involving relationships.

In the context of this study this issue is conceived in terms of interpersonal relations and is seen as having far-reaching personal and social implications, each with different but relevant theoretical and practical dimensions (Harrington, 1964; Sexton, 1964; Conant, 1958; Deutsch, 1951; Kvaraceus, 1965).

The group model used in this study derives from a viewpoint (philosophical and conceptual) formulated by self-concept theorists within the humanistic-philosophical framework. Rogers (1961) identified the dynamics involved in this as the "process of becoming." The main focus of the model is on perceptual experiences and their effects on interpersonal communication and relations. While there may be a number of obvious similarities between this model of group interaction and existing ones (e.g., Sensitivity and Confrontation groups), the former conceives of, and relates data about behavior from a perceptual-phenomenal outlook (Combs and Snygg, 1949). Behavior is "interpreted" from the point of view of the individual himself as the organizer of his own perceptual experiences in terms of past, present, and future responses. These experiences constitute the unique perceptions of himself, other people he relates or interacts with, his relationships in general, and what meanings these experiences and relationships have for him.

These experiences are made available for observation and for
mutual response to and from the other person only through making
inferences.

The development of this model and its implications for inter-
personal relations is intricately bound in and through philosophical
questioning and analysis (Kierkegaard, 1962; Maslow, 1962; Frankl,
1963; Chenault, 1968).

The "Group," within this conceptual framework, and its inter-
action and experiences is perceived only as an influence on individual
and interpersonal interaction and behavior, rather than an entity
that might be used to explain itself. The main focus is upon the
individual and the relationships between and among individuals. The
analysis and explanations of the ways in which group processes con-
tribute toward personal growth and fulfillment, though useful for
accepting and understanding the existence and dynamics of the group,
do not operationally, explain why the group exists or why its processes
take the forms they do, rather, these are seen as merely functional
and experiential explanations.

For a more fundamental level of explanation, on the basics of
this study, we must "look" at the individual, particularly as he
looks at himself, others around him, and the nature of his relation-
ships.

The relationship between the meaning of interaction group
experiences and interpersonal processes are crucial for the basic
assumptions made in this study. That is, we can propose, on the one
hand, that the individual's behavior in group is partly explained by
the attributes of the group, by his own learned social attitudes, and by the relationships between these two sets of attributes. On the other hand, however, group processes, per se do not completely explain the interaction between the individual and other specific individuals within the group. Consequently, identification of the "behavioral event" (perceptual) as an interaction process between two or more individuals requires a level of explanation based on interpersonal dynamics (Leary, 1957). The attributes of individuals (perceptions acknowledged, personal as well as social) are recognized; but there is no preoccupation with the observer's data, but with the individual's responses and reactions (feelings).

In this respect, interaction (interpersonal) dynamics are more specific than group processes in general, for their analysis deals with specific characteristics (in this study, these are self-other perceptions) of particular individuals rather than the dynamics of group itself. In a more favorable sense, interpersonal dynamics provide a more tangible explanation than do group processes in general. This is true particularly because explanation based on only social events tend to hinge on a more general and often nebulous theoretical framework of individual behavior (Combs and Snygg, 1959; Zaleznik, 1964). Because interpersonal behavior and interaction involves more than one person, an individual's behavior, specifically with regard to his self-image (regard), necessarily affects his perceptions of other people as well as his general reactions to, and behavior toward them. Similarly, their perceptions of themselves and of him, and their
behavior patterns in general affect, to a greater extent, his reactions and behavior.

The interpersonal meaning of interaction, as conceived in this study, involves a different level of analysis. Answers to questions like—"How is this person affecting the other?"—"What is the nature of the relationship he wishes to establish through this particular behavior?"—define the person's interpersonal impact on the others.

Approaching this analysis from a theoretical framework, Leary (1957) developed and arranged a scheme for classifying interpersonal behavior along two dimensions or axes: dominance-submission and hostility-affection. These are considered as the underlying dimensions of reciprocal personal-social role expectations described in a variety of writings in the field of social organizations.

According to Leary's observation scheme, interpersonal "acts" emitted by the individual are located around these axes. The central point represents an emotionally neutral event; the distance from the central point represents increasing inferiority. Interpersonal events may, however, lie between the axes, as in the case of the affectionate and dominating responses. Leary further developed sixteen categories of interpersonal behavior around these axes and proposed that there is a complementary response which is likely to be evoked; for example, dominating, bossing, and ordering around tend to evoke obedience from the other person, while attacking, unfriendly actions frequently provoke hostility.

The analysis of interpersonal interaction as conceived by Leary
has significant implications for this study particularly as it relates to the understanding of interactional communication and relationships between black and white.

Basic Assumptions—Certain basic assumptions are made in the proposition of this model:

(1) That personal growth should follow a perceptual model. Growth is seen as more than learning from books and is defined in terms of, and related to the "total" person. This assumption involves perceptual concerns as conceived within the broader context of attitudes. Perceptual and attitudinal realities can only be modified and sharpened through experiences, and these in turn tend to facilitate growth in people.

(2) That growth should be conceived in terms of perceptual development, and is reflected in one's attitudes, values, and beliefs.

(3) That growth is facilitated by a syntonc attitude (Chervait, 1968); the ability to value broadly, to transcend traditional polarities, to avoid extreme either-or judgments, to develop wider, more tentative, non-arbitrary values, to be less eager to judge good or bad and to recognize that conflicting dichotomies can exist compatibly in one's self and in others. Although a truly syntonc person may, on occasion, utilize various defense mechanisms, he has such a degree of self-awareness that he will not maintain his defenses for an extended period.

(4) That the goals of the interaction group experience place major emphasis and focus on the individual. Development of the group
is a secondary goal. The group is important only in its usefulness in facilitating individual growth.

From the assumptions stated above, it can be concluded that the purpose of the interaction group model is to enable group members to learn more about interpersonal behavior with the primary focus on their self-perceptions and how these affect their relationships (i.e., perception of others). This learning is done through direct experiences within a "climate" conducive to such learning. Although there is no specific ideal for this model (in terms of a prescription) beyond a supportive "climate" the aims are to facilitate the member's experiences in his interrelationships with others. This can be facilitated in a specific atmosphere characterized by unconditional regard for, and by others. In addition, the recognition of the member as a person within this climate, the internalizing of experiences into ideas, attitudes, and values which have personal meaning for him, are necessary conditions for growth. The model conceives of interaction as dynamic in relating growth to experience and vice versa.

Within the group, members are encouraged to involve themselves in the process of "self-knowledge," insofar as the they wish. As the same time, they are involved in the interpersonal relations that naturally develop in group interaction. The focus of the experience is on the member's learning and creating choice in his behavioral responses as a result of perceptual modification, rather than on necessarily changing his behavior. Consequently, the main objective is perceptual change which occurs (Rogers, 1954) in the climate with
accepting and non-threatening people.

More specifically, the experiences in such a group provide an opportunity for dealing with real life situations and attitudes associated with these situations, particularly with regard to black-white belief and disbelief systems (Rokeach, 1960). Further, the model provides members with an opportunity to become more aware of and sensitive to some of the basic communication problems involved in interpersonal relations of a variety of kinds.

The primary learning experiences encountered in such groups are conceived, on a broader basis, as development of personal growth related to self-regard and regard for others. Specifically, these experiences include:

1. Increased awareness of self and increased positive feelings and perceptions toward the self.

2. Increased awareness about interpersonal communication—particularly where it relates to people who are different from one's group (e.g., sex, race, religion, etc.).

3. A Sharing of experiences with others without imposing one's values on them. This involves the ability to be free, secure, and trusting in one's attempts to relate with others.

4. Increased tolerance for ambiguous, alien, and conflicting experiences.

5. Increased feelings of openness and a desire to share.

6. Awareness, recognition, and acceptance of diversity among people.

7. Experiencing of self as a person worthy of regard (and respect).

8. The internalizing of meaningful experiences into ideas, attitudes, and values which have a facilitating effect on personal growth.
On the basis of the above experiences, two questions—mainly of a philosophical nature—emerge. These concern the assumptions in relation to the operational definition of Interaction Group Experiences; one is concerned with the role of individual responsibility in the attempt to achieve personal growth. For personal growth to be realized it is important that the motivation come from within the individual. The process of growth has been identified in a variety of ways by different self-theorists as "a process of being" (Rogers, 1954; Sartre, 1956) and "self-actualization" (Maslow, 1965). Within this conceptual framework, the process of growth places responsibility on the individual himself. Thus, Jung (1957) recognized the motivational relevance of this when he observed that "... without intrinsic value, social relations have no importance."

Closely related to the first question is a second—that is one concerned with the concept of self-regard as a necessary ingredient for the desired change to occur. The degree to which a person "profits" from the group experience is considered to bear direct relationship to positive feelings about himself (Chenault, 1969). When a person discovers that whatever he believes has worth and is accepted unconditionally by others, he begins to feel secure in his attempts at expressing his real feelings. Consequently, awareness of the others' responses of unconditional regard adds to the person's feelings of self-worth, which, in turn, provides more opportunities for new learning experiences and facilitation of personal growth.

A climate relatively free from threat encourages the kinds of
understanding necessary for the development of internal motivation, i.e., those which have personal meaning for the person. Examples of such experiences are numerous, particularly those dealing with public school interaction. It is this freedom from threat which reduces the need for defensiveness and leaves the person open and free to understand himself and others. The influence of freedom of expression within the group allows the individual to consider other viewpoints and alternatives to his own convictions. "Lowering" defenses makes it possible for him to evaluate limitations and distortions of his own beliefs, ideas, and perceptions. In this study, the testing of these ideas applies to the general area of perception (with specific emphasis on self-regard and regard-for-others).

Finally, freedom from threat and the focus on people as human beings allows a more real intellectual development, free from superficiality, conformity, and less preoccupation with ego-concerns. Within the interaction group experience, a person has the added experience of understanding others at the same time that he is being understood.

**Criterion Measures**

The measures used in this study are The Berger Self-Acceptance (S-A) and Acceptance of Others (A-O) Scale; The Absolutism Scale; and The Rating Scale. Below is a description and background of these measures.

**The Berger Scale of Self-Acceptance and Acceptance of Others.**

Berger (1952) constructed an "all inclusive" type questionnaire to
measure Self-Acceptance and Acceptance of Others (see Appendices A, B, and C). As a basis for his questionnaire construction he used Sheerer's (1949) definition of the self-accepting and other-accepting person. From preliminary scales, Berger included items on the basis of:

1. Their significant correlation to total scores made by the upper and lower one-fourth of 200 subjects

and

2. Their appropriateness to a given element of the definition. Matched half reliability coefficients for various subgroups were .746 or better.

Construct validity was explored in terms of the correlation with free paragraphs written by twenty subjects and judged by four experimenters on the basis of Sheerer's definitions. The self-acceptance r was .897. As further evidence of construct validity, Berger confirmed his prediction that stutterers and prisoners would score lower on Self-acceptance than did college students matched for age and sex. Further, Berger (1955) found that self-acceptance in college students, as measured by his S-A scale, correlated negatively with certain clinical scales on the Minnesota Multiphagram Personality Inventory (MMPI), D, Pa, Pt, Sc, for all subjects; Hs and Pd for women only. Self-acceptance correlated positively with K (the MMPI K key, is composed of those items which express a positive "facade" or attitude).

Berger and other related researchers have all predicted, on theoretical grounds, that acceptance of self should lead to acceptance
of others (and, therefore, A-S scores should correlate positively with A-0 scores). Generally speaking, these predictions have been confirmed. Berger obtained correlations ranging from +.36 to +.69.

Comparing the Berger Scales (1952), Phillips (1951), and Omwake (1954) found significant correlations across instruments when A-S scores from one instrument were correlated with A-0 scores from another instrument.

The preliminary scales of the Berger consisted of forty-seven statements on self-acceptance and forty on acceptance of others. The statements were modified where necessary so that strong agreement with them sometimes received a high score and sometimes a low score. Items from both scales were interspersed on the same form. The scale had been used with a college population. The constructs of the scale fit closely the theoretical rationale developed for the Interaction Group Experience and thus were appropriate for the investigation reported in this study.

The final selection of items was made on the basis of the appropriateness of the items to the element of the definition and discriminating ability. Thirty-six items were selected for the Self-Acceptance Scale and twenty-eight for the Acceptance of Others Scale, constituting a total of sixty-four test items.

Scoring. An individual's acceptance of self was represented by his score on the scale for self-acceptance and his acceptance of others was represented by his score on the scale for acceptance of others. Thus, Berger's scales are made up of two subscales. It was
recommended by the author (phone conversation and personal correspondence) that the scales be scored by the method of summated ratings using a five-point key. Consequently, the Berger scale has two sets of scores (A-S and A-0) for each subject. The higher the score the lesser the degree of self-acceptance and acceptance of others. A high score indicates low degree of acceptance of others and a low score indicates a greater acceptance of others. Some statements (items) were modified by reversal so that in some cases strong agreement sometimes received a high score and sometimes a low score. Such items were mixed together on the same form. Berger (1952, pp. 778-779) describes a self-accepting person as one who:

1. relies primarily upon internalized values and standards rather than on external pressure as a guide for his behavior
2. has faith in his capacity to cope with life
3. assumes responsibility for and accepts the consequences of his own behavior
4. accepts praise or criticism from others objectively
5. does not attempt to deny or distort any feelings, motives, limitations, abilities, or favorable qualities which he sees in himself, but rather accepts all without condemnation
6. considers himself a person of worth on an equal plane with other persons
7. does not expect others to reject him whether he gives them any reason to reject him or not
8. does not regard himself as totally "different" from others or generally abnormal in his reactions
9. is not shy or self-conscious
The person who is accepting of others is described as one who:

1. does not reject or hate or pass judgment against other persons when their behavior or standards seem to him to be contradictory to his own

2. does not attempt to dominate others

3. does not attempt to assume responsibility for others

4. does not deny the worth of others or their equality as persons with him. This does not imply equality in regard to specific achievements. He feels neither below or above the people he meets

5. shows a desire to serve others

6. takes an active interest in others and shows a desire to create satisfactory relations with them

7. in attempting to advance his own welfare, he is careful not to achieve this at the expense of others including their rights

Consistency between the definitions of the variables related to self-regard and regard-for-others, such as syntony (Chenault, 1966) indicates without question that rationale for using the Berger scales in this study. These definitions and descriptions provide more evidence in support of the proposition by Sheerer (1949) and Rogers (1949); that the person who does not believe himself lovable is unable to love others. Measurement of this proposed relation has been found to be of significance to social psychology with special focus on interpersonal interaction and social relationships. Horney (1937) states that such a relationship implies that self-rejection may be a major factor in individual and group hostility toward other individuals and groups. Measurement of such variables has far reaching implications for attempts at confronting interracial relations
The Absolutism Scale. The absolutism Scale (Appendix D), constructed by Davies (1966), consists of twenty-nine pairs of words or phrases. Leary's (1956) Interpersonal Check List was used as a guide to select words representing the following wide range of characteristics: competitive-narcissistic, managerial-autocratic, responsible-hypernormal, cooperative-overconventional, docile-dependent, self-effacing-masochistic, rebellious-destructful, aggressive-sadistic. According to the author, opposition of items was justified by reference to Webster's New International Dictionary. The exactness of polar opposition was not conceived of as prime significance because the purpose of construction and measurement was to determine the degree to which a subject was able to select terms which were generally considered incompatible in the English language.

Davies recognized that, although some subjects saw the pairs as forced choice and respond accordingly, this is not considered as a reflection of weakness in the test.

Directions state that the subject is free to check either, neither, or both of each pair. Responses made with a forced choice set, therefore, are a function of the individual's perception rather than of the test itself.

The twenty-nine pairs of words or phrases are printed on four pages with four different sets of instructions. The pages are stapled together in a systematically varied order to avoid possible serial effects. On the front page, the subject is instructed to check either,
neither, or both of the items if he sees them as typical of himself. On the second page, the subject is instructed to check either, neither, or both if he sees them as acceptable for himself, while a third set of directions instructs the subject to check either, neither, or both items if seen as typical of others. Finally, on a fourth page the subject is instructed to check either, neither, or both items if he sees them as acceptable in others.

Scoring is done by counting the number of times only one item of a pair of opposites is checked. On each of the four subscales the possible range of scores is from 29-0. The total score, therefore, may range from a high 116 to a low zero.

Theoretical assumptions underlying the Absolutism Scale suggest that people who are open, free and flexible will select more paired opposites.

Closely associated with this assumption is the concept of syntony (Chenault, 1966) or "openmindedness" (Rokeach, 1960) characterized as the ability to recognize that so-called dichotomies can exist compatibly in one's self and in others, which is the recognition and acceptance of the wholeness of human existence (Kierkegaard, 1941). The assumptions form the basic framework for the understanding of human (interpersonal) interaction and relations. Thus, people who are expected to be rigid, close-minded, resistant to perceptual change and change in attitudes and beliefs, often use defensiveness in their interpersonal interactions.

To determine whether there was a sufficient range on a "good-
bad" (Absolutism Items) evaluative dimension, the words were randomly ordered and each of the words was rated on a seven point rating scale by eighty-nine students (Davies, 1966). The mean of each word was computed and the range was from 1.58 to 6.49.

Reliability. Two reliabilities were obtained by a test-retest with six weeks between tests. A high reliability of .89 was obtained from the scores of nineteen students enrolled in a psychological testing class at the University of Pittsburgh. Davies explains this high reliability as partially due to the subjects’ experience with tests and their attitude toward research in testing, resulting in the removal of fear of being known and any attempt to out-guess the test. A test-retest reliability of .65 was obtained from the scores of a group of sixty students enrolled in educational psychology at the same university.

When Davies (1966) examined the tests more closely she found that five of the subjects on the second testing had selected only one of each of the pairs. Such an extreme change in score was believed to be the result of a conscious attempt to out-guess the scoring. These five students were, however, eliminated from the final analysis and a corrected reliability coefficient of .78 was obtained from the scores of the remaining fifty-five subjects.

Validity. A study was conducted by Davies (1966) to determine differences between a group of advanced counselor education students and a group of beginning counselor education students on the "tendency of the subjects to see as typical of others and self, and to see as
acceptable in others and self the possibility of more than one of the paired opposite characteristics" (p. 37). Davies further states that because courses in counselor education (University of Pittsburgh) were expected to reduce absolutism, it could be hypothesized that the beginning students would select more of the paired opposite characteristics than would advanced students on all four of the subscales of the Absolutism Scale.

The Absolutism Scale was administered to twenty-five enrolled in a beginning course in counselor education and to sixteen students enrolled in an advanced course in counselor education. The results partially confirmed the hypothesis. No significant differences were found between groups on Subscales I and III (self-description and other description). Significant differences were found on Subscales II and IV (Subscales concerned with choice of items representing the valuing of characteristics for self and others).

A second study was conducted by Davies and Wrodro (1966) using fifty-seven high school seniors. In the experimental group a student-centered method was used while in the control group a traditional method was used. Their findings confirmed the hypothesis that the student-centered experimental group would have statistically lower scores on the Absolutism Scale than the control group. The greatest differences were found in Subscales II and IV.

On the basis of subscale breakdown on the Absolutism Scale, the total number of scores for this study constitute four subscales, I, II, III, IV, for each student.
Since this study recognizes the role and effects of the process of defensiveness on personal growth and interpersonal relations, the inclusion of the Absolutism Scale for measurement is considered crucial for the understanding of the dynamics involved in interpersonal relations. This is an attempt to determine whether the Absolutism Scale (as well as subscales) is related in any way to self-regard and regard-for-others and to the general area of attitude formation and change.

The Rating Scale. The fifty-nine items used on the Absolutism Scale were randomly ordered and subjects were instructed (Davis, 1966) to judge them on a good-bad evaluative dimension ranging from one to seven (Appendix C). On the basis of this seven point evaluative dimension, the scale consists of a total number of seven scores. The choice of a seven point scale rather than five is based on the evidence cited by Edwards (1957) that the number of points on the scale is not an important variable related to obtaining scale values; however, since the seven point scale gives finer gradations than a five point scale and allows more possible alternatives than a five point scale, the choice of extremes on this longer scale seems more stable. In its more general form, making extreme judgements is related to the attitude of dogmatism, closely associated with an inability to be flexible, to be open to opportunities to learn. This tendency has been found to contribute to resistance to change (Cattell and Tinger, 1949; Goldstein, 1953; Block and Block, 1951; Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford, 1950; Brown, 1953; Ford, 1956;
Research Design and Analysis

Research Design. Data was analyzed by a 2 x 2 analysis of variance design. This design was selected to determine the following measures: A comparison of the experimental and control groups (treatment effect), the main effects of race and sex, and the interaction of these variables. On all dependent measures this basic design was used. A schematic presentation of the design is indicated in Figure 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Blacks</th>
<th></th>
<th>Whites</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
<td>n:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIGURE 3.
SUBJECT DISTRIBUTION BY GROUPS, RACE AND SEX

Assignments of subjects by Groups, Race and Sex is presented in Figures 1 and 2 in the Procedures section.
This method of analysis provided a design for making group comparisons within the experimental groups (i.e., Sex and Race) and comparisons between the experimental and control groups on the personality variables under study.

Finally, for determining the interrelationships between the criterion measures used, and the variables under study, correlational techniques were used. A detailed presentation of these is given in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V
RESULTS

Presentation and Analysis of Data

Data presented in this chapter were examined following the nature of problems under investigation as stated in the hypotheses. Analysis was performed according to the categories outlined below, using primarily correlational and analysis of variance techniques.

A. Cross-validation of the Measures.

An intercorrelational analysis of relationships between variables used as criterion measures as defined through the scales and subscales is described here. Data is presented for pre- and post-test intercorrelations for the combined groups.

B. Hypotheses Testing.

Hypothesis I: Pre-experimental treatment comparisons of experimental and control groups. For testing this hypothesis, group means and univariate F tests were computed on all pre-test measures for the experimental and control groups.

Hypothesis II: Experimental treatment effect. For testing this hypothesis group means and univariate F tests were computed for post-test and change-scores.

Hypothesis III: Race variable.

Hypothesis IV: Sex variable.

Data for testing Hypotheses III and IV were examined to determine differences between and within groups with respect to main effects of the
race and sex variables, and interaction effects of these variables. To examine these effects data were computed and presented in two ways:

1. Group means on pre- and post-tests and change-scores for the experimental and control groups.

2. Analysis of variance F ratios on post-tests and change-scores for all measures, computed separately.

Analysis followed a 2 x 2 design for Hypotheses III and IV.

Levels of significance for all the hypotheses were established at the .05 level of confidence or better.

A. Cross-validation of the Measures.

To examine the nature of relationships as reviewed in the basic assumptions made in this study, The Pearson Products Moment Correlations were computed for all the subscales. Briefly, these relationships evolve around the basic assumption that self-regard and regard-for-others are related variables and that changes in one variable are concomitant with changes in the other variable. Data from these intercorrelations are presented in Tables 1 and 2. These intercorrelations are computed for the combined experimental and control groups. Findings presented in Tables 1 and 2 indicate significant correlations on the following measures: The Berger Self-acceptance (S-A) and Acceptance of Others (A-O) scales for both pre- and post-test measures, and the Absolutism Self-evaluative (S-Ev) and Self-descriptive pre- and post-test measures.

Other significant correlations for pre-test measures were: The Berger Self-acceptance (S-A) and Absolutism Other-evaluative (O-Ev); The Berger Self-acceptance (S-A) and Absolutism Other-descriptive (O-Desc);
TABLE 1
PRE-TEST INTERCORRELATIONS ON ALL MEASURES
FOR THE COMBINED GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Berger Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.53**</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of Others (A-0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.40**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Absolutism Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evaluative (S-Ev)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rating Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polar 7 Selections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

n = 72
## Table 2

**Post-Test Intercorrelations on All Measures for the Combined Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Berger Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.24*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of Others (A-O)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Absolutism Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evaluative (S-Ev)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.39*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Rating Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polar 7 Selections</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
<td>.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

n = 72
The Berger Self-acceptance (S-A) and the Polar 1 Ratings; The Berger Acceptance of Others (A-0) and the Absolutism Other-evaluative (O-Ev); and The Berger Acceptance of Others (A-0) and the Polar 7 Ratings.

Significant post-test correlations were also found for the following measures: The Berger Acceptance of Others (A-0) and Absolutism Self-evaluative (S-Ev); the Absolutism Self-evaluative and Other-evaluative; the Absolutism Other-evaluative and Self-descriptive (S-Desc); the Absolutism Other-evaluative and Other-descriptive; the Absolutism Self-evaluative and Polar 1 Ratings; and the Absolutism Other-evaluative and Polar 1 Ratings.

In addition to the correlations listed above, some of the measures indicated significant negative correlations. Significant negative pre-test correlations are: The Berger (S-A) and the Absolutism (S-Ev); and The Berger (A-0) and the Absolutism Self-evaluative significant negative post-test correlations are: The Berger (S-A) and Absolutism Self-descriptive; The Berger (S-A) and the Absolutism Other-descriptive; The Berger (S-A) and Polar 7 Ratings; and the Absolutism Other-descriptive and Polar 1 Ratings.

Finally, data show that none of the pre-test measures had significant correlations with either 1 or 7 Polar Ratings.

B. Hypotheses Testing.

Hypothesis I:

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between the experimental and control groups before initiating the experimental treatment.
This hypotheses needed to be tested to insure that the two groups did not differ in any systematic way from each other before the experimental group was exposed to the experimental treatment. Any differences on these measures might suggest that the groups were different before initiating treatment.

Data for testing this hypothesis are presented on Table 3 in the form of group means and univariate F tests computed from pre-test measures. Table 3 shows significant differences between the experimental and control groups on all but three measures.

The measures which are not significantly different are the Polar Selections of 1's and 7's on the Rating scale, and the Other-evaluative subscale on the Absolutism Scale.

Group means indicate higher group measures for the experimental group on all measures which are significantly different.

Hypothesis II:

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between the experimental and control groups on all measures after introducing the experimental treatment.

Data for testing this hypothesis can be examined and presented in two ways: either by indicating post-test measures for both experimental and control groups (Table 4), or by concentrating on change-score measures (Table 6).

The data presented in Table 4 show that the experimental group is significantly different from the control group on all measures, except on the Berger Acceptance of Others and the Absolutism Self-descriptive Measures.
### TABLE 3

**GROUP MEANS AND UNIVARIATE F TESTS ON ALL PRE-TEST MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental (n = 40)</td>
<td>Control (n = 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Berger Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td>128.58</td>
<td>98.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of Others (A-O)</td>
<td>100.98</td>
<td>80.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Absolutism Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evaluative (S-Ev)</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>14.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>13.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>13.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Rating Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>14.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polar 7 Selections</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>14.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

***Significant at the .001 level

df = 1 and 64
### TABLE 4

**GROUP MEANS AND UNIVARIATE F TESTS ON ALL POST-TEST MEASURES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental (n = 40)</td>
<td>Control (n = 32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Berger Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td>83.80</td>
<td>94.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of Others (A-O)</td>
<td>77.08</td>
<td>76.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Absolutism Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evaluative (S-Ev)</td>
<td>12.08</td>
<td>13.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>11.68</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td>12.78</td>
<td>13.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td>11.15</td>
<td>14.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rating Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td>11.30</td>
<td>13.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polar 7 Selections</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>14.41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level  
**Significant at the .01 level  
***Significant at the .001 level  

df = 1 and 64
TABLE 5
MEANS AND F RATIOS ON ALL PRE- AND POST-TEST MEASURES FOR BOTH THE EXPERIMENTAL AND THE CONTROL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Experimental Group (n = 40)</th>
<th>Control Group (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Berger Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td>128.58</td>
<td>83.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of Others (A-O)</td>
<td>100.98</td>
<td>77.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Absolutism Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evaluative (S-Ev)</td>
<td>15.40</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>14.42</td>
<td>11.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td>15.90</td>
<td>12.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>11.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rating Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>11.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polar 7 Selections</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>10.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

***Significant at the .001 level

df = 1 and 39

*Significant at the .05 level

df = 1 and 31
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Experimental (n = 40)</td>
<td>Control (n = 32)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Berger Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td>44.78</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>7.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of Others (A-O)</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Absolutism Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evaluative (S-Ev)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>43.96***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
<td>21.47***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>35.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>40.95***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rating Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>15.93***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polar 7 Selections</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>69.70***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level
**Significant at the .01 level
***Significant at the .001 level

df = 1 and 39
It should be noted that the means indicated for both these measures in Table 3 for pre-tests, are higher for the experimental group (100.98 and 15.90, respectively), and that these means come closer to the control group on the post-test measures as indicated in Table 4. Table 5 shows these comparisons very clearly, and at a glance.

**Presentation of Data for Hypotheses III and IV**

Although analysis of data for testing these two hypotheses is done separately for each, the data is presented jointly, following the problems identified in the statement of each of the hypotheses (i.e., race and sex differences and the interaction of these variables).

As stated in the preceding section, data reviewed in this chapter can be presented in two ways: First, by using group means computed on pre- and post-tests and change-score measures. Comparisons for the experimental and control groups using this method are presented in Tables 7, 8 and 9. These data show differences between and differences within the two groups studied. These differences are reflected on each of the measures according to the problems under investigation (i.e., groups x sex x race).

The second method of presenting this data is through the analysis of variance F ratios computed separately for each of the measures used. Tables 10, 11 and 12 give summaries of post-test and change-score F ratios for each of these measures. Corresponding complete source tables for all of the analyses performed may be found in Appendix D, Tables X-XII, inclusive.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Experimental Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Berger Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td>130.60</td>
<td>146.10</td>
<td>123.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of Others (A-O)</td>
<td>102.80</td>
<td>102.00</td>
<td>102.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Absolutism Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evaluative (S-Ev)</td>
<td>15.60</td>
<td>15.80</td>
<td>15.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>14.20</td>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>14.40</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td>13.60</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rating Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>15.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 8

**GROUP MEANS - COMPARISONS WITHIN THE CONTROL GROUP (n = 32)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-test</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>Black Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>White Male</td>
<td>White Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Berger Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td>86.88</td>
<td>108.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>98.00</td>
<td>84.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of Others (A-O)</td>
<td>75.75</td>
<td>85.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>82.88</td>
<td>66.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Absolutism Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>13.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>15.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>15.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>13.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.62</td>
<td>12.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td>13.12</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.62</td>
<td>15.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Rating Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>15.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14.88</td>
<td>14.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polar 7 Selections</td>
<td>15.12</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.75</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.88</td>
<td>14.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures</td>
<td>Experimental Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Black Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Berger Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td>43.10</td>
<td>54.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Absolutism Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evaluative (S-Ev)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rating Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polar 7 Selections</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 9
MEAN CHANGE SCORES FOR GROUPS WITHIN GROUPS
(GROUPS X SEX X RACE)
Hypothesis III (Race Variable):

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between males and females on any of the measures used. Likewise, it was hypothesized that there would be no interaction effects involving the race variable with the variables of group or sex.

A review of the findings summarized in Tables 10, 11, 12 and 13 are used to test Hypothesis III.

The Berger Scales

Berger Self-acceptance. Significant F ratios indicating race differences for both post-test (p < .01) and change-scores (p < .05) are presented in Table 10. An inspection of the means presented in Table 13 clearly indicates that these significant F ratios are a function of higher scores for the black subjects. It is therefore concluded that the black subjects in this study were generally less self-accepting than the white subjects in the study.

These findings need to be elaborated by referring to the interaction effects which are also presented in Table 10. First, there are significant race x group interactions on both the post-test scores and change-scores. Inspection of the means in Table 13 indicates that the significant interaction F ratios are a function of the fact that in the experimental group the blacks are higher than the whites, whereas in the control groups the blacks are lower than the whites. This suggests that the experimental treatment had a greater impact on the black subjects than on the white subjects with regard to self-acceptance. This is simplest to see with the change-scores rather than the post-test scores. Clearly, in the experimental group the blacks had greater positive change than did the whites, but in the control group the blacks showed lower positive change than did the whites.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Post-test F Ratios</th>
<th>Change-Score F Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Berger Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Comparisons between the experimental and control groups.

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .01 level
TABLE 11
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F RATIOS FOR
THE ABSOLUTISM SUBSCALES
(A Summary Table of Post-test and Change-Score F Ratios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Post-test F Ratios</th>
<th>Change-Score F Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Self-evaluative (S-Ev)</td>
<td>10.48**</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>13.64**</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-descriptive (S-Desc)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Desc)</td>
<td>16.43***</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Comparisons between the experimental and control groups.

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

***Significant at the .001 level
TABLE 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE F RATIOS FOR THE RATING SUBSCALES FOR POLAR 1's & 7's

(A Summary Table of Post-test and Change-Score F Ratios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Post-test F Ratios</th>
<th>Change-Score F Ratios</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Groups</td>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Polar 1 Selections</td>
<td>13.14***</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Polar 7 Selections</td>
<td>27.22***</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Comparisons between the experimental and control groups.

* Significant at the .05 level

** Significant at the .001 level
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Control Group (n = 32)</th>
<th>Experimental Group (n = 40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-tests</td>
<td>Change-Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post-tests</td>
<td>Change-Scores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blacks Whites</td>
<td>Blacks Whites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 13: Group Means by Race*
The Absolutism Scales. Data for testing Hypothesis III on the Absolutism measures are summarized in Table 11. (Complete analysis of variance sources tables can be found in Appendix D, Tables XI.a-XI.d inclusive.) Again, the focus in this presentation will be limited to the F ratios based on change-scores rather than post-test scores.

As indicated in Table 11, neither a race main effect nor any interaction effects involving race were found to be significant. The overwhelming and consistent differences between the experimental and control groups appear to account for virtually all variance in these analyses.

The Rating Scales. Data for testing Hypothesis III on the Rating Scale measures are summarized in Table 12. (Complete analysis of variance source tables are found in Appendix D, Tables XII.a and XII.b.)

As is clear from Table 12, neither a race main effect nor any interaction effects involving the race variable were found to be significant. Since both Polar 1 Selections and Polar 7 Selections show large F ratios for the main effect of group, it is clear that regardless of race of subjects the experimental treatment made a difference.

Second, as indicated in Table 10, a significant race x sex interaction effect was found on the Berger Self-acceptance score, using both the post-test and the change-scores. Inspection of Tables 7, 8 and 9 indicates that among the black subjects the females show higher self-acceptance and more improved self-acceptance than did males, but among whites the females showed lower self-acceptance and less improvement in self-acceptance than did males. Again, this is clearest when one inspects the mean change-scores in Table 9 rather than the post-test scores in Tables 7 and 8. Careful inspection of Table 9 also suggests that the
original significant race main effect is primarily a function of the exceptional improvement among the black females in the experimental group.

Berger Acceptance of Others. Essentially the same statistically significant differences between the races were found on Acceptance of Others as was found on Self-acceptance. Therefore, a brief summary of the findings based on Table 10 may suffice. Moreover, since the findings are essentially the same with post-test scores and change scores, only change scores will be referred to henceforth.

1. Main effects. There is a significant race difference on Acceptance of Others, which is shown in Table 9 to indicate higher scores on Acceptance of Others as compared to whites.

2. Race x group interaction. As indicated in Table 10 there is a significant (p < .05) race x group interaction effect. Inspection of Table 9 indicates that within the experimental group, the black subjects showed greater increase in Acceptance of Others than do the white subjects, but within the control group the black subjects show less increase in Acceptance of Others than do the white subjects.

3. Race x sex interaction. Table 10 shows a significant (p < .05) race x sex interaction effect. Inspection of Table 9 indicates that among black subjects the females show greater increase in Acceptance of Others than do the males, but among the white subjects the females show less increase in Acceptance of Others than do the males.

4. Group x sex x race interaction. Interpretation of the significant three-way interaction effect is complicated by the large mean differences overall between the experimental and the control groups. Inspection
of the means in Table 9 suggests that the major source of this effect is found in the race x sex interaction, which has already been described.

**Hypothesis IV (Sex Variable):**

It was hypothesized that there would be no significant differences between males and females on any of the measures used. Likewise, it was hypothesized that there would be no interaction effects involving the sex variable with the variables of group or race.

Table 9 is a presentation of the means for all measures, with female and male group means separated. Tables 10, 11, and 12 are summaries of the analyses of variance, showing the F ratios for the main effect of sex on each measure as well as the F ratios for the interaction effects involving sex.

Again, because it has been demonstrated that there were significant differences between the experimental and control groups in the pre-test, only the change scores will be focused upon in this presentation. Another reason for limiting the presentation of results to the change scores is that they are very similar to the results based on the post-test scores for the various measures.

**The Berger Scales**

**Berger Self-acceptance.** There is a significant F ratio for the sex main effect on Self-acceptance (Table 10). Inspection of the means in Table 9 indicates that females show a greater degree of improvement in Self-acceptance than do the males. This finding is quite misleading, however, because there is considerable variation in terms of sex comparisons if one considers the racial groups separately and the experimental and control groups separately.
This interpretation is supported by the fact that each of the interaction F ratios involving sex is statistically significant. The significant group x sex interaction effect is understood by referring to Table 9. There, it is clear that whereas in the control group the males show the greatest improvement, in the experimental group the opposite is true—i.e., the females show somewhat greater improvement in Self-acceptance.

The significant race x sex interaction and the group x sex x race interaction have already been discussed in connection with Hypothesis III. It is worth pointing out, however, that inspection of the means in Table 9 indicate that among blacks, females improved more, but among whites males improved more.

Berger Acceptance of Others. The findings are essentially the same for Acceptance of Others as was found for Self-acceptance. Significant sex main effects as well as significant interaction effects on all analyses involving sex were found. However, an overall inspection of the means in Table 9 suggests that females improved more on Acceptance of Others than did the males.

Inspection of the means in Table 9 also indicates that the significant sex x group interaction effect is a function of the greater improvement of males in the experimental group while there is little sex differences in the control group. Likewise, the significant sex x race interaction effect indicates that the black males improved more than the black females, but that the white females improved more than did the white males. The three-way interaction effect has already been discussed in connection with Hypothesis III.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Experimental Group (n = 40)</th>
<th>Control Group (n = 32)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-tests</td>
<td>Post-tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Berger Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-acceptance (S-A)</td>
<td>126.95</td>
<td>130.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Acceptance of Others (A-O)</td>
<td>102.70</td>
<td>99.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Absolutism Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Other-evaluative (O-Ev)</td>
<td>14.35</td>
<td>14.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Other-descriptive (O-Des)</td>
<td>14.30</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Rating Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 14**

GROUP MEANS BY SEX
The Absolutism Scales. There is only one significant F ratio for the sex main effect among the Absolutism Scales. Table 11 indicates a difference between the sexes on the Self-descriptive scale. Inspection of the means in Table 9 indicates that females showed greater improvement than the males.

No significant interaction effects were found on change-scores with any of the Absolutism Scales.

The Rating Scales. As indicated in Table 12, neither Polar 1 selections nor Polar 7 selections showed significant F ratios for the main effect of sex. There was a significant sex x group interaction effect found for the Polar selections. Inspection of Table 9 indicates that within the experimental group the males improved more than did the females, whereas within the control group the females improved more.

A discussion of these findings and their implications will be presented in the next chapter. In addition, an attempt will be made to relate these findings to the broader implications of black-white interpersonal (intergroup) relations.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION

It is the purpose of this chapter to discuss the findings reviewed in the preceding chapter in such a manner as to yield answers to the research hypotheses; and to interpret these findings in an attempt to explore the broader meaning of these answers by relating them to other available knowledge. This study was, therefore, planned and executed against the background of a number of investigations which suggested that one tends to perceive others in ways consistent with one's perception of oneself (Horney, 1945; Maslow, 1962; Stock, 1949; Berger, 1952; and Rogers, 1954).

The aim of this study is to obtain insight into the relationship between self-regard and regard for others, and to determine variations in the behavior of these variables as a function of Interaction Group Experiences. Finally, findings of this study are reviewed within the broader context of interpersonal relationships with specific implications for black-white relations.

Before proceeding with a discussion of the findings, or with a consideration of some of their broader implications, it may well be to review briefly the major findings. All the four hypotheses tested were not supported by the results.

1. Pre-treatment differences were not anticipated between the experimental and control groups. Statistically significant differences between the groups were found. The original basis for
the inclusion of this hypothesis (1) was to provide assurance for the initial absence of systematic differences between the experimental and control groups. The difference between the two groups is relevant to the expected treatment impact and, therefore, to the research design and criteria.

2. It was anticipated that interaction group experiences (experimental group) would not lead to significant (change) differences between the experimental and control group. The findings are contrary to this prediction. The experimental group changed in self-regard and regard for others, Absolutism and a tendency to make extreme judgements more than did the control group. The differences between the groups are statistically significant. It was shown that on each of the measures the experimental group showed significantly greater change toward the positive direction, than did the control group. Using the statistical techniques indicated in the preceding chapter for testing hypothesis II, one must conclude that the Interaction Group Experience had a significant impact on the experimental group.

3. It was predicted that no significant differences would be found between blacks and whites in the experimental and control groups. Results did not uphold this prediction. Significant initial and change race differences were found. Change differences indicate that although blacks show greater post-treatment change, in absolute terms they demonstrate lower self-regard and regard for others.

4. It was predicted that no significant differences would be found between males and females in the experimental and control groups. Results did not support this prediction. Significant sex differences
were found, however, only to the extent that the sex variable was compounded by the racial variable. On all measures the degree of change as a function of interaction group experience was greater for females than for males in the experimental group. The interaction effects indicated, (race x sex x groups) force one to ask not only whether experimental and control treatments are "working" differently on blacks and whites (Hypothesis III); males and females (Hypothesis IV), but on black males as against black females and white males as against white females (interaction effects).

Other results, not required for testing the hypothesis were also presented in the preceding chapter. These findings, listed below, do not differentiate between experimental and control groups but are related to the relationship between the variables studied; the findings are indicated for the total group (i.e., experimental plus control) for both pre and post tests. Below is a summary of these findings:

1. Data indicate a relationship between self-regard and regard for others.

2. In addition, findings indicate that changes in one variable (self-regard) lead to corresponding changes in the other variable (regard for others).

3. In summary, the findings also indicate a relationship between self-regard, regard for others, absolutism, and a tendency toward extreme judgements. A more detailed discussion of findings having bearing upon these variables is presented later in this chapter.

Evidence will be discussed later in this study which indicates
the implications of the relationship found between the variables studied. It is sufficient at this stage to indicate that change on the Absolutism and Rating Scales (Polar Selections of 1 and 7's) from the beginning to the end of the treatment program would be a function of the degree of positive self-other regard (perceived by the subject). Data indicated that the change on the total score (all four subscales) of the Absolutism Scale was not significantly related to positive self-regard and regard for others. Analysis of Subscales IV and VI, however, revealed that pre-tests on these subscales was significantly related to self-regard and regard for others.

Fluctuations (pre and post test intercorrelations) in findings are indicated reflecting possible subject variations within and between the experimental and control groups. A significant polar 1 selection (ratings) and self-other regard relationship is indicated for pre-tests, but not for post-tests. A possible explanation of variations in these findings might be attributed to differential sensitivity of the measures used.

Discussion and Interpretation of Data Testing the Hypotheses

Hypothesis I: Pre-Treatment Comparisons. Findings indicate significant pre-treatment differences between the experimental and control groups on all but three measures.

Group means indicate higher group measures for the experimental group. This finding means that the experimental group started significantly lower on self-regard and regard for others than did the control group. As will be shown later, this finding is of major significance in the interpretation of the other hypotheses, and, consequentially, was included in order to provide assurance that the other
hypotheses could be tested. However, the finding warrants some attention on its own. Indeed, such a finding requires some explanation. Why is it that a group which had been specially selected (presumably on the basis of the adequacy of their personal qualities as well as academic performance) for participation in the training program look "worse" than the control group on five out of eight measures?

Perhaps it is within this question itself that one might find the best perspective from which to discuss this finding.

By way of explanation one can most easily and fully focus upon the characteristics of the experimental group. On the basis of the measures themselves one would characterize the experimental group as initially being less self-accepting and less accepting of others (Berger Scales) and more prone toward absolute judgments (Absolutism Scales). An inspection of the means presented in Tables 8 and 9 suggest that this difference between the experimental group and the control is present within each race and sex group. (A detailed discussion of these variables will be presented under Hypotheses III and IV). Perhaps the most relevant question concerns the reasons for lower self-regard and regard for others in the experimental groups and higher self-regard and regard for others in the control group, before initiating the experimental treatment. Note that for the experimental group the administration of the criterion measures actually was part of the research program. For this group, it is, therefore, impossible to measure group adequacy before measuring "group adequacy"—it would have been more appropriate to have done
so, for then some light would have been cast upon the effect of the administration of the measures.

If the assumption can be made that the control group was, in fact, more self-accepting and accepting of others than the experimental group, then a bias in the selection of the groups did exist. Such a bias might well be attributed to a selection process in which groups that perceive themselves as less adequate gravitate toward training (Residence Hall Counselor Program) as a mechanism to alleviate personal and interpersonal inadequacies. If this is the case, then the measures are merely validly reflecting these inadequacies.

An alternative explanation, which incorporates and develops upon the above concepts, suggests that differences between these groups are artificial and are due to tester-testee interactions. It is quite possible that the process of examining and responding to test items served as important stimuli upon each group member, and that the nature of these stimuli differed for experimental members as opposed to control members.

For example, in this study, experimental trainees had:

1. already decided to participate in a training program when they completed the tests
2. had, therefore, considered at least some of the issues raised by the test items
3. hoped that something was going to be done about these issues

and

4. perhaps reacted with greater acceptance and reality and with less defensiveness to the test items.
Although the control group was selected from a volunteer sample, members of this group on the other hand had:

1. probably not considered the issues raised by the test items

2. were informed that they were participating only as a control (comparison) group

3. furthermore, since no training was planned--nor was any likely to be planned for them--increased dissonance of the control group would have resulted from their admission to the tester and to themselves of any inadequacies with no corresponding remedy (experimental treatment).

These findings have implications for possible biases in the selection of experimental and control samples. In a study of this kind, the researcher obviously has little prerogative in selecting matched groups for training and control purposes. She must generally abide by the decisions of the organizational groups (Residence Hall Training Program) with which she deals. The question then arises as to the similarity of the experimental and control groups prior to initiating training. This question has, of course, been dealt with in the preceding discussion.

It is adequate to state that the true basis for the difference between the experimental and control groups cannot be discerned only on the basis of the data collected. A more satisfactory next research project might focus upon the personal characteristics of voluntary and self-selecting groups as those used in this study.

**Hypothesis II: Treatment Effect.** Findings reviewed in the preceding chapter indicated that the interaction group experience resulted in significant changes in self-regard and regard for others,
Absolutism, and the tendency to make extreme judgements (Polar Ratings 1 and 7). That analysis was basically concerned with first, changes in overall group scores in experimental and control subjects, and second, variations in changes as a function of race as well as of sex.

Further analysis of the findings demonstrated that the impact of the interaction group experience had diverse impacts across individuals according to their racial and sex attributes. Results show that on each of the measures used the experimental group showed significantly greater change in the positive direction, than did the control group.

This is an appropriate point at which to build the needed bridge between the first two hypotheses and to briefly discuss methodological points involving these hypotheses. As noted in the preceding chapter, certain of the measures showed differences between the experimental and control group on the pre-tests. These differences indicated that the experimental group was further away from the optimal end (i.e., low on self-regard, regard for others, Absolutism, and Polar Selections) than the control group. This issue is important to identify because if the experimental group had been significantly different (positive direction) from the control group on pre-tests, there would have been grave questions about the validity of testing subsequent hypotheses.

On the contrary, findings indicate that after the experimental treatment there is a reversal of scores for both groups from pre- to
post-tests in the direction of closeness to the optimal ends of the measures used. Since the experimental group started significantly further away from the optimal end of the measures, and ends up significantly closer after the experimental treatment, the evidence for the real effect of the treatment seems to be strengthened.

In the analysis of the data for testing hypothesis II, the first step in the comparisons between the experimental and control groups was to identify the existence of changes from the beginning to the end of the experimental treatment. The second step was to identify the trends or patterns of these changes between and within the groups for each of the groups studied. The kinds of changes under investigation (self-other regard) in this study, however, represent only a limited sampling of the many kinds of changes possible as a result of experiences in interaction groups. It is assumed that these changes, though limited, will lead to generalizations about their effect on increased effectiveness in interpersonal situations, specifically of a black-white nature; and this, rather than change per se, is the raison d'être for the experimental treatment utilized in this study. In the context of this investigation; the most rigorous and thorough understanding of change in general would take into account all possible factors (socio-cultural, psychological, historical, economic, etc.) that have contributed to a person's development (personality; self concept). For example, change in self-percept in one person might reflect a strengthening of defenses against the awareness of some more basic conflict. Whereas change in self-percept in another person might
indicate an increased freedom to express certain needs (or feelings). A change in self-percept might indicate temporary conformity to the experimental group (as might be expected in this investigation), or it might represent a shift that is also reflected in complementary modifications in self-percepts and group or cultural-intercultural percepts. A more detailed discussion of this will be presented under Hypotheses III and IV indicating intergroup variations.

Suffice it to indicate that the "real meaning" of changes in the relationship between self-regard and regard for others is communicated as an interpretation of relationships among all factors affecting the individual. These have been clearly identified and reviewed in the preceding chapters.

In this study the problem was defined in such a way that interest was focused in only one aspect of the changes, i.e., self-concept and its relation to the perception of others. It is this writer's contention that a consideration of the dynamic relationship among all the factors—socio-cultural, psychological, physical, etc., is required to first, clarify the kind of change one is making reference to, and second, to interpret the meaning of the change for each group (experimental vs. control; black vs. white; male vs. female) studied. The fact that findings in this study indicate differences in these variables from group to group (Race x. Sex) may be accounted for by the possibility that the socio-cultural patterns as a whole had encouraged the development of certain kinds of self-concepts and inhibited the development of others. In other words; the socio-cultural structure was more congenial to some members (whites) os society than to others (blacks).
A more detailed discussion and interpretation of this issue is presented in the next two hypotheses. Implications of these findings are reviewed with the broader issue of interpersonal relations. A further discussion of the treatment effect indicating differential race and sex impacts is presented in subsequent discussions of this chapter.

The finding discussed in the preceding section is consistent with the rationale employed in the present study. That is, subjects in the interaction group were expected to develop positive self-regard and regard for others, and as a consequence to show lower gains or decrease in absolutism scores and polar selections on the rating scale. Actual results favor the experimental group. The groups were initially highly incomparable on all but one measure (ratings), where statistical significance was found for the difference between the groups. The experimentals who gained more on final tests were significantly very low on initial measures. The degree of difference between the groups is an important consideration. In the procedure used for selecting subjects, it was difficult to avoid having a highly artificial or obviously forced situation inconsistent with the researcher's responsibility to the Residence Hall Counselor Training Program.

Hypotheses derived from Rogerian personality theory and its extension in the principle of client-centered therapy were tested in an investigation using "normal" groups of subjects. There were several reasons why the use of subjects selected from a normal population may have been considered desirable. If similar results could be obtained with both patient and normal groups, greater generalization from
conclusions would be warranted.

The potentially available normal population is probably much larger than the patient population available for experimental investigation, and there is more latitude with normals for manipulating a variety of experimental variables. A probably very important difference exists between studies applying psychotherapeutic treatments to normal groups and similar studies using patients who voluntarily seek help for their personal adjustment. The patient is often strongly motivated to change; the "normal" person is usually not so motivated. There are obvious similarities between this group and the experimental subjects used in this. Although we can by no means identify these subjects as "patient" subjects, they were, however, a self-selected, voluntary, and highly motivated group, and consequently, more subject to change in their attitudes (self-other) than a non-voluntary group. Another similarity was that the situation (residence hall training) was reflected as one beneficial for personal growth and facilitating interpersonal relationships. This issue has been fully discussed under Hypothesis I.

Individual within-groups differences were found on nearly all the measures used. It is not contended that similarities (initial) did exist between the experimental and control groups with respect to the variables under investigation, but it is recognized that appreciable initial similarities could have existed and may have been easily obscured by the large variance within groups (i.e., motivated group x race x sex). In future studies it would be well to pre-test a population very large relative to the sample size to be used, prior
to selection for training in residence hall programs. Individuals may then be drawn so that matching of subjects could include close matching on actual similarity on issues raised by the test items. Comparison of the groups would necessarily involve direct comparison of self-other regard scores and any other of the variables under investigation.

From these results, it would appear that subjects who perceived themselves positively tended to perceive others in a positive way. This relationship was found, in a general way, to be positively correlated with low scores on absolutism and rating scales—reflecting a lower tendency to make rigid, either-or judgements and assumption of extreme polarities on issues and feelings.

An index of the level of self-other regard over the period of group experience was provided by the correlation of pre and post test scores of the same subject. Although initial similarities between the experimental and control groups were expected, it was anticipated that interaction group experience, in accordance with the rationale of the study, would provide better opportunity for the experimental subjects to revise their initial inadequate self-perceptions and perceptions of others in the group. Results clearly supported this. This finding had been explained under Hypothesis I. Experimental subjects were expected to be less rigid and less "stereotyping" and to show this increased differentiation among others to a more marked degree than controls, over the period of training. This finding lends support to an interpretation that initial low other-perceptions were partly corrected when subjects recognized the other group participants to be
less different from himself and less different from each other than they originally perceived (believed) them to be.

Gage and Gronbach (1955) believe that global dispositions play the dominant role in the perception of others. A subject will generally perceive another person according to his "implicit personality theory" and according to a disposition to regard others favorably or unfavorably. Only when a high degree of acquaintance exists between two persons will personal anxiety and threat be eliminated, and consequently will these global dispositions yield to judgements based appreciably on knowledge of the other person. The decrease in absolutism and polar selections found in this study is consistent with the position taken by Gage and Gronbach.

In accordance with the view expressed by Gage and Gronbach, it would be expected that had the experimental group continued to meet over a very long period of time, or had they met more frequently and under more varied conditions, the increased knowledge of the interacting subjects about each other would lead to an even greater differentiation than was found. Evidence for an increase in friendly, positive, or accepting attitudes may be found in the studies reported by Wylie (1961). These studies show that in both the "good" therapeutic and the "good" social relationship positive self-other regard tends to be high. Of specific interest are findings to suggest that self-attitudes may be used as a measure of one's attitudes toward others.

Virtually all of the findings in the present study achieve a certain unity, when examined from Fiedler's position, if we assume an increased interest in and positive attitudes toward others in experimental
treatment group over the period of group experience. A striking feature of the findings in this study is the overall trend in the measures used whether of self or of others, toward greater homogeneity. Subjects increasingly saw others to be more like themselves. This increased sensitivity in self-other perceptions which was found appears to be a function of the overall leveling of the perceptions of self and of others over the period of interaction group experience. This finding, however, should be checked by further future studies using appropriate experimental control samples.

**Hypothesis III: Race Difference.** The prediction that the greater a difference between groups, the more likely that difference will appear in the stereotypes (attitudes) they hold of each other seems obvious when one starts from the anthropological position that groups, cultures, etc., do, in fact, differ, and asks then the question as to how these differences will be treated in the process of socialization.

Still more relevant is the extensive sociological analysis of the effects on personality, aspirations, achievement, effort, and moral behavior caused by minority status, oppression, segregation, lack of access to upward social mobility, and exclusions from the general activities of the "larger" community. As Allport (1954) has emphasized, minority status has effects, producing certain characteristics "due to victimization." Such differences might be expected to appear in majority group stereotypes of minority groups. Such stereotypes would have the great unfairness of justifying segregation by "validly" accusing minority group members of having the very traits which
segregation had produced. Nonetheless, taken as descriptions (rather than as justifications or causal explanations), they would have a "grain of truth."

The third hypothesis in this study has direct bearing on the statements made in the preceding discussion. Hypothesis III predicted that there would be no differences between blacks and whites in the experimental and control groups. Results did not lend support to this prediction. Significant race differences were found on the Berger Scales of Self acceptance and Acceptance of Others. The significant F ratios being a function of higher scores for the black subjects. It was, therefore, concluded that although blacks showed greater change as a function of the interaction group experience, in absolute terms they have lower self-regard and regard for others than whites, assuming that scales are valid. This finding is consistent with observations made on the differential process of socialization for blacks and whites. Additional evidence of this is provided in clinical studies (Grier and Cobbs, 1968; Kardiner and Ovesey, 1962) and in studies of race awareness in young children (Goodman, 1952). Sears, Maccoby, and Levin in their massive Patterns of Child Rearing, 1957, observed that, "... lifelong immersion in an implicitly a authoritarian substructure establishes the frame of reference underlying one's perception of the world and the value judgements made about human nature ...." (p. 467).

Prior to the 1930's, much of the research in racial differences reflected the influence of the prevailing racial biases on the attitudes and hypotheses of the research workers. In the 1930's
Otto Klineberg brought a more objective approach to the study of the psychology of racial differences. His work demonstrated that racial differences in personality traits were significantly influenced by environment. The basis for this study evolved around an environmental influence based on thought and feeling (perceptual) systems—upon the awareness of racial differences and feelings about these differences. The findings on racial differences in self-regard and regard for others, as presented in the preceding chapter have significant social relevance, particularly with respect to the current activities of the Black Revolution and the development of black consciousness, self-esteem, and group-identity. The social, political, and ideological implications of these findings are presented in the next section.
Self-Esteem, Separatism, and Race Consciousness. This investigation provides some indirect (but profound) evidence concerning the appropriate context for the development of black self-esteem and black consciousness.

The notion that blacks necessarily have lower self-esteem than do whites has been challenged in recent years (McCarthy and Yancey, 1971; Heiss and Owens, 1972). In both cases the evidence suggests that blacks have lower self-esteem only with regard to particular traits—i.e., primarily those having to do with work-related instrumental characteristics. One interpretation of this phenomenon suggests that it is only such traits which show the impact of oppression. The widespread and abiding occupational discrimination against black Americans has been demonstrated many times (see Blau and Duncan, 1969 for a summary of such research). It is simply very logical that such long-standing oppression would have its effect upon black self-perception. But there is some evidence (Turner and Turner, 1973) that black self-regard may be higher than that of whites if one is considering traits having more to do with interpersonal intimacy.

A second dimension of black self-regard has focused on the role that interactions with whites play. Separatist ideology, which has been on the rise in the last decade, is partly based on the notion that blacks (and especially black children) are victimized by social comparisons with whites. Black children confronted by white children, white teachers, and other whites in their lives, will be subjected to
negative evaluations because of the prejudices of these groups and by the unfair comparisons that must go on (Introduction). This position implies that, since whites have been advantaged in acquisition of skills, blacks who interact with them must feel inferior and, therefore, experience a lowering of personal or self worth.

The findings of this investigation suggest quite the contrary. The findings do not support such a contention. Not only are positive perceptions of the self increased after group experiences with whites, the net increase in self-esteem appears to be greater for blacks than for whites having the same interracial (Interaction) experience. Perhaps this suggests that, when black students have an occasion to interact closely with whites, the mystique of white superiority is readily and quickly shattered. On the other hand, the findings of this investigation by no means suggest any increase in estrangement from whites. Black students having been involved in the interaction group experience increased in positive views of others as well as of the self. Since they were interacting with whites, it is reasonable to assume that at least some had included whites in the population rated as "others."

Going somewhat beyond the data of this investigation, but still within the context of this discussion, the author wishes to juxtapose the concept of race consciousness. Unlike the belief in separatism (self determination) and other views based on very negative attitudes towards whites, the concept of race consciousness can be thought of as the positive valuing and identification with the cultural and physical
characteristic of the black race (Wilson, Turner, Darity, 1973).

Abiola Irele (1965) has fully developed a similar concept with the term Negritude. In both concepts the presence of whites and the situation of oppression created by them is put into a secondary position. What is central is the commonality of cultural heritage and personal experience which creates a viable basis for the creation of the loved self as well as group strength.

The importance of this focus cannot be underestimated in placing the findings of this study into proper focus. It is not the writer's contention that separatism is an evil notion, or for that matter that it need be faulted as a reasonable political strategy. The conceptual error that it is based upon must, however, be understood when it is applied to individual psychology and the well-being or the developing person. If one believes, as I do, that the race of black people need not construe itself as inferior to whites, then individual whites and the white race can be faced and challenged in any context that black people regard as worthy. It is not only important to assert that blacks can meet "the man" on his own ground. What is possible more important is the notion that the black person brings a richly different self to his interpersonal relations. Much of the negativism carried along with black self-esteem has been its reactive quality. That is, the construction of much of what is black American ideology is based on responding to the machinations of white people. Race consciousness is not reactive. It is simply a fuller awareness and exploitation of reality. In this case the reality
is that of true black beauty and humanness. It means being willing (gradual as that might be) to receive the evidence of the beauty of black culture and the importance of black people in distant and contemporary history. It means putting aside the socialization into the concept of the self as "one who is discriminated against" and as one who deserves to be treated so. As Cross (1971) has pointed out, the "Negro-to-Black conversion experience" (i.e., development of race consciousness) can often be a painfully slow process, but the critical ingredient is not hatred of whites, nor the retreat into separatist isolation, nor excessive fears, nor alienation; what is critical involves the positive assessment of one's black self and of black people generally. That is possible only through an awareness of the pluralism of culture. Black is beautiful because of the richness of African heritage, because of the richness brought to other cultures of African heritage, because of the very humanness of black people. Black is beautiful because it is beautiful.
Hypothesis IV: Sex Differences. It was predicted that there would be no differences between males and females in the experimental and control groups on the measures used. Results on the measures as a whole show a significant sex main effect, with females showing a greater degree of improvement in self-acceptance than do the males.

This finding is quite misleading, however, because there was significant variation in terms of sex comparisons if one considers racial groups separately and the experimental and control groups separately. This interpretation is supported by the fact that each of the interaction F ratios involving sex is statistically significant.

The available studies of sex differences in self-concept have been directed mainly toward two questions. To what degree have males and females accepted sex role stereotypes as applicable to men or to women in general? To what degree have males and females accepted particular sex role stereotypes as applicable to their own actual or ideal self concepts in particular?

Again, like the issue on race differences, an analysis of sex differences in self-regard and regard for others should be reviewed within the context of socialization. One aspect of the questions posed concerns the favorability of the stereotypes and the reflection of such values in the self-regard of individual male and female persons. Closely akin to the matter of sex stereotypes are questions concerning society's expectations of each sex. In what respects, if any, do males and females feel that society's expectations of them differ. What discrepancies, if any, occur between subjects' perceptions of society's
expectations of them and their personal ideals of themselves. If such personal-social conflicts exist, do subjects see themselves as conforming to their own ideals more than to society's expectations or vice versa.

The findings in this study are of particular relevance when considering the (present) changing role of women as defined by such movements as "The Women's Liberation," etc. In the past the overwhelming majority of adolescent girls remained dependent upon others for feelings of affirmation. Loss of love became for the girl the gravest source of injury to the self, and predictably girls would not gamble with that critical source of esteem. In the absence of independent and objective achievements, girls and women knew their worth only from others' responses, knew their identities only from their relationships as daughters, girl-friends, wives, or mothers, and, in a literal sense, personalized the world. According to Erickson (1959), the most important task in adolescence is the establishment of a sense of identity. This has been more difficult for girls than for boys and on an interactive basis is and has been even more difficult for black girls. Findings in this study on the interaction of race by sex provide additional support for this position. The black female is presented as a problem of double jeopardy, which in turn has overwhelming impact on the feelings about herself and the world around her. This attitude is articulately presented in Joyce Ladner's (1970) *Tomorrow's Tomorrow*. From her personal observations and experiences she states that, "Becoming a woman in the low-income
income black community is somewhat different from the routes followed by the white middle-class girl. The poor black girl reaches her status of womanhood at an earlier age because of the different prescriptions and expectations of her calibre. There is no single set of criteria for becoming a woman in the black community . . . ."

She continues to state that, "Structural and psychological variables are important as focal points because neither alone is sufficient to explain the many factors involved with psychological development. Therefore, the concepts of motivation, roles, and role-model, identity, and socialization, as well as family income, education, kin and peer group relatives are important to consider in the analysis."

The findings in this study suggest that, on the whole, women "develop" (self perceptions) along somewhat different lines from men. Although the final interpretation of sex differences in self-regard and regard for others, absolutism, and a tendency to make either-or judgements (usually attributed to women) awaits further research, what is confirmed is that the key to the difference between boys and girls and men and women lies in the kind of socialization process they go through. The inference is strong that behind the fact that few women are represented in the different professional careers such as law, medicine, engineering, etc. is the difference in cognitive style (not innate intellectual ability) of male
and female, which is in turn the result of differences in the process of socialization.

The preceding analysis of the findings in this study has some implications for current changes in sex role patterns. The most critical implication of this being concerned with the effect of this change on men.

The more sensational statements have implied the immediate emasculation of males, concern about a possible increase in children's confusion about sex roles because of alleged changes; and the problem of adjustment to sex roles rooted in the differential pressures associated with respective developmental stages in each sex.

In view of the above findings and discussion current trends toward greater freedom of action for women would seem to be positive implication since this would have a greater impact on the perception of self and of the world around them.

If self-regard is correlated with regard for others as indicated in this study, and if women are slightly less self-accepting they might be expected to accept others less (Zuckerman, Baer, and Monashkin, 1956; Berger, 1955; Martire and Hornberger's, 1957; and Rosen, 1956 a. and 1956 b.).

Summary on sex differences: Although the rationale underlying some of the studies on sex differences involves cause-effect relationships most of the studies relate the sex of the subject with the subjects response. It is difficult to synthesize the results of past studies with present findings since methods, criteria, and types of
subjects varied widely across studies. Some of the investigations were not primarily set up to explore sex differences, some dependent variable measures were probably not chosen to be especially relevant to sex roles, and sex groups may not have been matched on variables relevant to the self-concept measures.
APPENDIX A

THE BERGER SCALES - CRITERION MEASURES
APPENDIX A.1

THE BERGER SELF-ACCEPTANCE AND
ACCEPTANCE OF OTHERS SCALES

This is a survey of how you feel about certain things. There is, therefore, no right or wrong answer for any statement. The best answer is what you feel is true of yourself.

You are to respond to each question by marking the appropriate number on the answer sheet according to the following scheme:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all true of myself</td>
<td>Slightly true of myself</td>
<td>About Half Way True of Myself</td>
<td>Mostly True of Myself</td>
<td>True of Myself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

REMEMBER, the best answer is the one which applies to you. Go across the answer sheet.

1. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

2. I don't question my worth as a person, even if I think others do.

3. I can be friendly with all varieties of people . . . from the highest to the lowest.

4. I can become so absorbed in the work I'm doing that it doesn't bother me not to have any intimate friends.

5. I don't approve of spending time and energy in going things for other people. I believe in looking to my family and myself more and letting others shift for themselves.

6. When people say nice things about me, I find it difficult to believe they really mean it. I think maybe they're kidding me or just aren't being sincere.

7. If there is any criticism or anyone says anything about me, I just can't take it.

8. I don't say much at social affairs because I'm afraid that people will criticize me or laugh if I say the wrong thing.

9. I realize that I'm not living very effectively, but I just don't believe I've got it in me to use my energies in better ways.
10. I don't approve of doing favors for people. If you're too agreeable they'll take advantage of you.

11. I look on most of the feelings and impulses I have toward people as being quite natural and acceptable.

12. Something inside me just won't let me be satisfied with any job I've done—if it turns out well, I get a very smug feeling that this is beneath me, I shouldn't be satisfied with this, this isn't a fair test.

13. I feel different from other people. I'd like to have the feeling of security that comes from knowing I'm not too different from others.

14. I'm afraid for people that I like to find out what I'm really like, for fear they'd be disappointed in me.

15. I am frequently bothered by feeling of inferiority.

16. Because of other people, I haven't been able to achieve as much as I should have.

17. I am quite shy and self-conscious in social situations.

18. In order to get along and be liked, I tend to be what people expect me to be rather than anything else.

19. I usually ignore the feelings of others when I'm accomplishing some important end.

20. I seem to have a real inner strength in handling things. I'm on a pretty solid foundation and it makes me pretty sure of myself.

21. There's no sense in compromising. When people have values I don't like, I just don't care to have much to do with them.

22. The person you marry may not be perfect, but I believe in trying to get him or her to change along desirable lines.

23. I see no objection to stepping on other people's toes a little if it'll help get me what I want in life.

24. I feel self-conscious when I'm with people who have a superior position to mine in business or at school.

25. I try to get people to do what I want them to do in one way or another.

26. I often tell people what they should do when they're having trouble in making a decision.

27. I enjoy myself most when I'm alone, away from other people.
28. I think I'm neurotic or something.

29. I feel neither above nor below the people I meet.

30. Sometimes people misunderstand me when I try to keep them from making mistakes that could have an important effect on their lives.

31. Very often I don't try to be friendly with people because I think they don't like me.

32. There are very few times when I compliment people for their talents of jobs they've done.

33. I enjoy doing little favors for people even if I don't know them well.

34. I feel that I'm a person of worth, on an equal plane with others.

35. I can't avoid feeling guilty about the way I feel toward certain people in my life.

36. I prefer to be alone rather than have close friendships with any of the people around me.

37. I'm not afraid of meeting new people. I feel that I'm a worthwhile person and there's no reason why they should dislike me.

38. I sort of only half-believe in myself.

39. I seldom worry about other people. I'm pretty self-centered.

40. I'm very sensitive. People say things and I have a tendency to think they're criticizing me or insulting me in some way and later when I think of it, they may not have meant anything like that at all.

41. I think I have certain abilities and other people say so too, but I wonder if I'm not giving them an importance way beyond what they deserve.

42. I feel confident that I can do something about the problems that may arise in the future.

43. I believe that people should get credit for their accomplishments, but I very seldom come across work that deserves praise.

44. When someone asks for advice about some personal problem, I'm not likely to say, "It's up to you to decide," rather than tell him what he should do.
46. I feel that for the most part one has to fight his way thru life. That means that people who stand in the way will be hurt.

47. I can't help feeling superior (or inferior) to most of the people I know.

48. I do not worry or demean myself if other people pass judgment against me.

49. I don't hesitate to urge people to live by the same high set of values which I have for myself.

50. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.

51. I don't feel very normal, but I want to feel normal.

52. When I'm in a group I usually don't say much for fear of saying the wrong things.

53. I have a tendency to sidestep my problems.

54. If people are weak and inefficient I'm inclined to take advantage of them. I believe you must be strong to achieve your goals.

55. I'm easily irritated by people who argue with me.

56. When I'm dealing with younger persons, I expect them to do what I tell them.

57. I don't see much point to doing things for others unless they can do you some good later on.

58. Even when people do think well of me, I feel sort of guilty because I know I must be fooling them--that if I were really to be myself, they wouldn't think well of me.

59. I feel that I'm on the same level as other people and that helps to establish good relations with them.

60. If someone I know is having difficulty in working things out for himself, I like to tell him what to do.

61. I feel that people are apt to react differently to me than they would normally react to other people.

62. I live too much by other peoples' standards.

63. When I have to address a group, I get self-conscious and have difficulty in saying things well.

64. If I didn't always have such hard luck, I'd accomplish much more than I have.
SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION REGARDING SCALES OF
SELF-ACCEPTANCE AND ACCEPTANCE OF OTHERS
E. M. Berger

Items Corresponding to the Various Elements
of the Definitions of Self-acceptance
and Acceptance of Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Item Number on Scale for Self-acceptance</th>
<th>Item Number on Scale for Acceptance of Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14, 18, 45, 62</td>
<td>3, 21, 50, 55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9, 20, 38, 42</td>
<td>22, 25, 49, 56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1, 16, 53, 64</td>
<td>26, 30, 44, 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6, 7, 48, 58</td>
<td>29, 32, 43, 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11, 12, 35, 41</td>
<td>5, 10, 33, 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2, 15, 34, 59</td>
<td>4, 27, 36, 39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>8, 31, 37, 40</td>
<td>19, 23, 46, 54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13, 28, 51, 61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17, 24, 52, 63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A.3

THE DISCRIMINATING POWER OF THE ITEMS ACCEPTED FOR USE IN THE FINAL FORM OF THE SCALES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A.4
BERGER SCALES ANSWERING SHEET

Expressed acceptance of self: 
Expressed acceptance of others: 

Keyed for +5 score, other scores +4, +3, +2, +1, follow logically.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>CITY</th>
<th>PART</th>
<th>204</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCORES</th>
<th>DATE OF BIRTH</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>SET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ERASE COMPLETELY ANY ANSWER YOU WANT TO CHANGE.
THE ABSOLUTISM SCALES - CRITERION MEASURES

APPENDIX B
APPENDIX B.1

SELF-EVALUATIVE

The following are paired words or phrases. Look at each item separately and check (✓) if you feel it is all right or okay for you to be this way. Check either, neither, or both of the paired items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tactful</th>
<th>rebellious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outspoken</td>
<td>conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>forceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>docile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pessimistic</td>
<td>impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express feelings</td>
<td>aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control feelings</td>
<td>shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trusting</td>
<td>complain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeptical</td>
<td>silently endure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceitful</td>
<td>calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truthful</td>
<td>excitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like people</td>
<td>dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resent people</td>
<td>irresponsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>give in to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>demanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generous</td>
<td>curious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td>inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cowardly</td>
<td>spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compassionate</td>
<td>practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intolerant</td>
<td>idealistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-reliant</td>
<td>consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>greedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servile</td>
<td>sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B.2

OTHER-EVALUATIVE

The following are paired words or phrases. Look at each item separately and check (✓) if you feel it is all right or okay for another person to be this way. Check either, neither, or both of the paired items.

_______ tactful  _______ rebellious
_______ outspoken  _______ conforming
_______ honest  _______ forceful
_______ dishonest  _______ docile
_______ optimistic  _______ patient
_______ pessimistic  _______ impatient
_______ express feelings  _______ aggressive
_______ control feelings  _______ shy
_______ trusting  _______ complain
_______ skeptical  _______ silently endure
_______ deceitful  _______ calm
_______ truthful  _______ excitable
_______ like people  _______ dependable
_______ resent people  _______ irresponsible
_______ competitive  _______ dissatisfied
_______ cooperative  _______ content
_______ afraid  _______ give into others
_______ confident  _______ demanding
_______ selfish  _______ indifferent
_______ generous  _______ curious
_______ brave  _______ inhibited
_______ cowardly  _______ spontaneous
_______ compassionate  _______ practical
_______ intolerant  _______ idealistic
_______ dependent  _______ changeable
_______ self-reliant  _______ consistent
_______ proud  _______ greedy
_______ servile  _______ sharing
_______  _______ fair
_______  _______ unfair
APPENDIX B.3

SELF-DESCRIPTIVE

The following are paired words or phrases. Look at each item separately and check (✓) if you feel it describes you in some way. Check either, neither, or both of the paired items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tactful</th>
<th>outspoken</th>
<th>rebellious</th>
<th>conforming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>forceful</td>
<td>docile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>pessimistic</td>
<td>patient</td>
<td>impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express feelings</td>
<td>control feelings</td>
<td>aggressive</td>
<td>shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trusting</td>
<td>skeptical</td>
<td>complain</td>
<td>silently endure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceitful</td>
<td>truthful</td>
<td>calm</td>
<td>excitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like people</td>
<td>resent people</td>
<td>dependable</td>
<td>irresponsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive</td>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>confident</td>
<td>give in to others</td>
<td>demanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>generous</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
<td>curious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td>cowardly</td>
<td>inhibited</td>
<td>spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compassionate</td>
<td>intolerant</td>
<td>practical</td>
<td>idealistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>self-reliant</td>
<td>changeable</td>
<td>consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>servile</td>
<td>greedy</td>
<td>sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B.4

### OTHER-DESCRiptIVE

The following are paired words or phrases. Look at each item separately and check (✓) if you feel it describes a typical other person. Check either, neither, or both of the paired items.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>tactful</th>
<th>rebellious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>outspoken</td>
<td>conforming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>forceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>docile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pessimistic</td>
<td>impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express feelings</td>
<td>aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control feelings</td>
<td>shy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trusting</td>
<td>complain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeptical</td>
<td>silently endure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceitful</td>
<td>calm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truthful</td>
<td>excitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like people</td>
<td>dependable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resent people</td>
<td>irresponsible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive</td>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>give in to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>demanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>indifferent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generous</td>
<td>curious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td>inhibited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cowardly</td>
<td>spontaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compassionate</td>
<td>practical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intolerant</td>
<td>idealistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-reliant</td>
<td>consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>greedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servile</td>
<td>sharing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unfair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B.5

#### MEAN VALUES OF WORDS ON ABSOLUTISM SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Mean Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>honest</td>
<td>6.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>truthful</td>
<td>6.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependable</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confident</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-reliant</td>
<td>5.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fair</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patient</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>curious</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>generous</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like people</td>
<td>5.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sharing</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>trusting</td>
<td>5.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>optimistic</td>
<td>5.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compassionate</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practical</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consistent</td>
<td>5.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tactful</td>
<td>5.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td>5.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competitive</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>express feelings</td>
<td>5.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proud</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spontaneous</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aggressive</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>content</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idealistic</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outspoken</td>
<td>4.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>forceful</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control feelings</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changeable</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>demanding</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>excitable</td>
<td>3.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skeptical</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complain</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>silently endure</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conforming</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>give in to others</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>docile</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inhibited</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dissatisfied</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pessimistic</td>
<td>3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rebellious</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shy</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>servile</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indifferent</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impatient</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>2.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resent people</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cowardly</td>
<td>2.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intolerant</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selfish</td>
<td>2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>irresponsible</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unfair</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>deceitful</td>
<td>1.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greedy</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

THE RATING SCALES - CRITERION MEASURES
Below is a list of adjectives. Mark on the seven-point scale your evaluation of each adjective. If you consider it very bad, circle 1; moderately bad, circle 2; bad, circle 3; neutral, circle 4; good, circle 5; moderately good, circle 6; very good, circle 7.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 give in to others
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 irresponsible
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 pessimistic
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 sharing
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 indifferent
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 competitive
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 excitable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 skeptical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 idealistic
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 curious
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 dissatisfied
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 fair
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 docile
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 brave
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 generous
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 calm
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 cowardly
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 practical
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 confident

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 cooperative
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 rebellious
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 proud
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 inhibited
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 control feeling
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 compassionate
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 changeable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 express feeling
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 dependable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 deceitful
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 optimistic
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 trusting
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 silently enduring
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 unfair
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 conforming
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 afraid
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 intolerant
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 content
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 demanding
patient
self-reliant
dependent
selfish
forceful
complain
dishonest
greedy
tactful
resent people

impatient
servile
consistent
shy
like people
outspoken
truthful
aggressive
honest
spontaneous
APPENDIX D

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE SOURCE TABLES
APPENDIX D: TABLE X.a

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A SUMMARY OF POST-TEST AND CHANGE-SCORE F RATIOS FOR THE BERGER SELF-ACCEPTANCE SCALE
AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: 1. Berger Self-Acceptance</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Change-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group ~(Experimental--Control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>838729.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>931419.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>934066.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>915718.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>102003.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>985698.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>914306.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94986.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.
APPENDIX D: TABLE X.b

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A SUMMARY OF POST-TEST AND CHANGE-SCORE F RATIOS FOR THE BERGER ACCEPTANCE OF OTHERS SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: 2. Berger Acceptance of Others</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th></th>
<th>Change-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Squares</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (Experimental--Control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>497996.42</td>
<td>9.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>493469.20</td>
<td>9.46**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>463361.50</td>
<td>8.88**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>494580.53</td>
<td>9.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>476730.83</td>
<td>9.14**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>501125.53</td>
<td>9.60**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>470636.87</td>
<td>9.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>52179.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.
APPENDIX D: TABLE XI.a

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A SUMMARY OF POST-TEST AND CHANGE-SCORE F RATIOS FOR THE ABSOLUTISM: SELF-EVALUATIVE SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP, SEX AND RACE

| Measure: 3. Absolutism: Self-Evaluative | Post-test | | Change-score | |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------|---|---------------|
| Source                                  | df | Mean Squares | F | df | Mean Squares | F |
| Group (Experimental--Control)           | 1  | 42.71        | 10.48**| 1  | 93.53        | 43.96***|
| Sex                                     | 1  | 5.14         | 1.26 | 1  | 6.81         | 3.20 |
| Race                                    | 1  | 0.28         | 0.07 | 1  | 0.03         | 0.02 |
| Group x Sex                             | 1  | 14.80        | 3.63 | 1  | 3.31         | 1.55 |
| Group x Race                            | 1  | 6.94         | 1.70 | 1  | 0.20         | 0.09 |
| Sex x Race                              | 1  | 0.07         | 0.02 | 1  | 1.28         | 0.60 |
| Group x Sex x Race                      | 1  | 1.74         | 0.43 | 1  | 6.01         | 2.82 |
| Error                                   | 64 | 4.07         |      | 64 | 2.13         |      |

**Significant at the .01 level.

***Significant at the .001 level.
### APPENDIX D: TABLE XI.b

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A SUMMARY OF POST-TEST AND CHANGE-SCORE F RATIOS FOR THE ABSOLUTISM: OTHER-EVALUATIVE SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP, SEX AND RACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: 4. Absolutism: Other-Evaluative</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Change-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (Experimental--Control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level.**

***Significant at the .001 level.
### APPENDIX D: TABLE XI.c

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A SUMMARY OF POST-TEST AND CHANGE-SCORE F RATIOS FOR THE ABSOLUTISM: SELF-DESCRITIVE SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP, SEX AND RACE**

| Measure: 5. Absolutism: Self-Descriptive | Post-test | | Change-score | |
|----------------------------------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Source**                             | df        | Mean Squares    | F               | df        | Mean Squares    | F               |
| Group (Experimental—Control)           | 1         | 11.92           | 2.05            | 1         | 213.91           | 35.95***        |
| Sex                                    | 1         | 14.60           | 2.51            | 1         | 31.51            | 5.30*           |
| Race                                   | 1         | 3.31            | 0.57            | 1         | 4.78             | 0.80            |
| Group x Sex                            | 1         | 2.10            | 0.36            | 1         | 0.95             | 0.16            |
| Group x Race                           | 1         | 46.58           | 8.01**          | 1         | 3.12             | 0.52            |
| Sex x Race                             | 1         | 3.50            | 0.60            | 1         | 5.26             | 0.88            |
| Group x Sex x Race                     | 1         | 40.33           | 6.94**          | 1         | 0.37             | 0.06            |
| Error                                  | 64        | 5.82            | -               | 64        | 5.95             | -               |

*Significant at the .05 level.
**Significant at the .01 level.
***Significant at the .001 level.
### APPENDIX D: TABLE XI.d

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A SUMMARY OF POST-TEST AND CHANGE-SCORE F RATIOS FOR THE ABSOLUTISM: OTHER-DESCRIPTIVE SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP, SEX AND RACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure:</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Change-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Absolutism: Other-Descriptive</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (Experimental--Control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the .01 level.**

**Significant at the .001 level.**
### APPENDIX D: TABLE XII.a

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A SUMMARY OF POST-TEST AND CHANGE-SCORE F RATIOS FOR THE RATING: POLAR 1's SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP, SEX AND RACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: 7. Rating: Polar 1's</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Change-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Source</strong></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (Experimental--Control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>69.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

**Significant at the .001 level.
APPENDIX D: TABLE XII.b

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: A SUMMARY OF POST-TEST AND CHANGE-SCORE F RATIOS FOR THE RATING: POLAR 7's SCALE AS A FUNCTION OF GROUP, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: 8. Rating: Polar 7's</th>
<th>Post-test</th>
<th>Change-score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>Mean Squares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group (Experimental-Control)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20930.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>653.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>653.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1936.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>370.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1050.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group x Sex x Race</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>769.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.

***Significant at the .001 level.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Axline, V. "Play Therapy and Race Conflict in Young Children." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1948, 43, 300-310.


