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ABSTRACT

EXPERIENCING AS SYSTEMATIC TRAINING: ITS EFFECTS ON COMMUNICATION BETWEEN BLACK AND WHITE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

(April 1976)

Winifred St. Mary Noel

Directed by: Dr. Allen E. Ivey

The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not systematic training in experiencing could improve communication between high school age black and white males and females. A secondary question was the examination of possible effects of sex or race on communication effectiveness. The students were trained in randomly formed same sex dyads, containing one black and one white person, during one experimental session. Three methods of evaluation were used to determine the effectiveness of the training. Two rating scales were used by the participants to rate themselves and each other, and pretest and posttest videotaped conversations between the participants were rated by two trained raters on five dimensions.

An analysis of variance incorporating sex and race in the two experimental conditions was computed for each of the variables. The results of the statistical analysis indicated that systematic training in experiencing was effective for improving communication between the participants. Neither the sex nor the race of the participants produced significant
interaction with the main effect of any of the variables. The absence of sex or race differences is considered a major implication of the study.
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CHAPTER I

AN INTRODUCTION

The major question investigated in this dissertation was whether or not systematic training in experiencing could improve communication between black and white high school students. Experiencing is the ever-changing flow of feeling present in each individual. A secondary question was the examination of possible sex differences among the trainees. A training model was developed and used to teach high school students to become aware of their moment-to-moment experiencing and to communicate these feelings. In order to determine the effectiveness of the training specific evaluation techniques were designed to measure the success of training.

Need for the Study

In the past twenty years, since the Supreme Court decision in Brown V. Board of Education of Topeka, the media has been filled with items concerning the integration of schools in this country. As recently as Fall, 1975, major
controversy has raged over busing to achieve racial balance in the schools, particularly in Boston and Louisville, Ky. In the intervening years, however, many school systems across the country have been integrated.

Equality in education has been the greatest concern of school administrators; little attention has been paid to the relationships between the students who have found themselves in new surroundings with persons of different ethnic backgrounds. The fear and distrust that occur when students from diverse backgrounds are brought together can cause conflict. The conflict is particularly severe in large centralized high schools, since the students no longer come from one neighborhood, but from a wide variety of socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds (DeCecco and Richards, 1975).

In many of the centralized high schools black and white students form exclusive groups based on race. These diverse groups exist within the larger institution without mingling. Recent articles (DeCecco and Richards, 1975; Wald, 1975) point out that black and white students form two separate communities. While the students may work together in various campus activities, social contact during and after school hours is minimal. Thus, students seldom understand each other and learn about each other's feelings. There is little communication between these groups. Naturally, resentment develops and stereotypic beliefs continue.
Since this situation exists in the high schools, a method to develop understanding between students of different backgrounds is necessary.

These exclusive racial groups in the high schools only reflect the greater racial division in this country. Successful relationships between races occur when individuals are able to communicate their ideas, emotions, and goals to one another (Trent and Trent, 1973). Such communication dissolves what Rogers and Roethlisberger (1974) saw as the major barrier to mutual interpersonal communication, which is "...the natural tendency to judge, to evaluate, to approve or disapprove the statement of the other person or group." (p. 244). When this natural tendency evaluates a person of a different race, it often becomes heightened since varied, strongly held attitudes and values are involved. Thus it is easy to see, then that communication between the races in this country is difficult, since there are strong feelings and emotions surrounding all issues.

Communication or the lack of communication between the races or between any individuals is affected by the ideas or attitudes created from an individual perception of reality. Individuals build their perception of reality in their environment (Trent and Trent, 1973). In their environment individuals experience what will be real for
them. What results from such experiencing is expressed through the interaction of words, behaviors, and fantasies.

Experiencing, the central dimension explored in this study, is a flow of feeling present in all individuals at every moment. Experiencing can be further defined as a process of feeling in the immediate present (Gendlin, 1962). These feelings can be implicit, as for example when a person is aware of a specific feeling, but does not express the feeling in words, but is only aware of it. Or experiencing can be explicit, as when a person expresses a feeling or takes an action. The experiencing of hunger, for example causes one to seek food (Gendlin, 1961). Experiencing, then, is that human process that is reflected in thought, feelings, behaviors and actions.

This experiencing process is different for each individual. Since this is the case, we rely on communication to give us clues as to how or what others are thinking and feeling (Laing, 1969). But in order for this communication to take place there must be a similarity in choice of word and behaviors which will have the same meaning to the other person.

People from different racial and ethnic backgrounds often have different meanings for words and behaviors. This is especially true for black and white Americans. For example, a word meaning one thing to a white person could
have a completely different meaning for blacks. Behaviors are often different also. What may be considered an unusual gesture by whites could be the way black people greet each other. Since blacks and whites in this country have not shared similar experiences their feelings and emotions about each other are often confused and misunderstood. Many whites do not understand the social and cultural backgrounds of blacks and therefore, have difficulty communicating with them. Since words and behaviors can mean different things to a white or black person and feelings are misunderstood, it is no surprise that a gap in communication exists.

One way to bridge the communication gap is to encourage people from these diverse racial groups to share their different experience with each other. When people can share their experience real communication can take place, for communication is a function of shared experiences (Combs, Avila, and Purkey, 1971). Individuals can be taught to focus on their experiencing and share it with others (Gendlin and Olsen, 1970). Through the process of sharing experiencing, communication can be improved. There are specific methods which aid in communication through experiencing. First, one must learn to become aware of their moment to moment experiencing and be able to express what they are feeling to another person. The other person, then, must listen carefully so that the sharing of an experience
can be understood fully. To understand, means to experience the world of the other person as completely as possible, without making judgement (Rogers, 1970A). Individuals must be able to "...see the expressed idea and attitude from the other person's point of view, to sense how it feels to him, to achieve his frame of reference in regard to the thing he is talking about." (Rogers and Roethlisberger, 1974, p. 244). By teaching individuals to become aware of their own and others experiencing, "...we would enable many people to resolve their own emotional problems and to listen more helpfully to each other." (Gendlin, 1967, p. 538).

If specific skills in communication can be taught, it is important to begin this training as soon as possible. Gendlin (1967) believes that high school aged people can be taught to become aware of their experiencing and use this awareness in problem solving and thinking. Adolescents begin to develop a multitude of new ways of looking at and thinking about the world (Elkind, 1970; Erikson, 1963). "Among other things, those in adolescence can now think about other people's thinking and wonder about what other people think of them." (Elkind, 1970, p. 4). Adolescence is a time when interpersonal relations with persons outside the family begin to form. It is a time when individuals need skills to help in the development of these
many new relationships.

The question, then, is how to begin to effect change in adolescents from different backgrounds so that they can communicate with each other better? Those in the helping professions, especially counselors have the opportunity to facilitate these changes. Counselors can no longer be content with just one-to-one therapy. While these relationships are still needed, it is important that counselors share their skills so as to reach the largest number of people. This means that:

The role of the counselor should be redefined and expanded and that counselors should assume responsibility for making efforts to increase positive human relations and fostering development of a multicultural view of the world. (Anderson and Love, 1973, p. 667).

One way in which larger numbers of persons can be reached is through the development of effective programs for teaching specific skills. Effective programs are, "...those programs which do indeed 'make a difference' and the evidence at this time is that systematically organized programs are those that are most effective." (Ivey, 1973, p. 114). Systematic training, then, is one positive step toward teaching usable skills that can be transferred to relationships in all spheres of life. The attainment of good interpersonal communication is a key factor to maintaining social and psychological adjustment, and a good self-concept (Hatch and Guerney, Jr., 1975).
In summary, the need that exists for improved communication between persons of different ethnic backgrounds is especially acute in high schools and colleges where young people are just beginning to form new and lasting relationships. Better communication can be established when young people are able to listen to each other and understand the experience of one another. Specific skills which teach individuals how to listen and share the experiencing of others can be taught in systematic programs which emphasize tangible goals. Counselors in schools and other locations where they have access to young people must begin programs that reach as many persons as possible to increase personal growth and improve interpersonal relationships.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to develop a systematic training model which emphasized feelings, experiencing and awareness. The training model was presented in manual form and used to train black and white high school students, to demonstrate its effectiveness in improving communication. The primary concern in this study was to develop a method of training which enabled persons from different ethnic backgrounds to become aware of the feelings and experiences of each other and to learn to communicate these feelings.
and experiences. The training concentrated on the moment to moment experiencing of the participants and their ability to communicate these feelings. The goal of the study was to demonstrate that persons can become aware of their moment to moment experiencing and help each other to express these feelings. And further, that it is possible to train high school students of different races to communicate with each other in a more effective manner. Therefore, the objectives of the study were: (1) to provide a training manual which combined moment to moment experiencing with systematic training, (2) to demonstrate that communication between black and white high school students could be improved through understanding and training, and (3) to test the training model with the use of specific instruments which measured the amount of change between pre and post treatment.

In this study systematic training meant teaching five basic communication skills to the participants. These skills were taught with the use of a written manual, live modeling and demonstration of each skill. The participants had the opportunity to practice the skills and receive feedback via videotape and from the investigator.

For the purposes of this study communication effectiveness was defined in the following manner:

Communication Effectiveness:

A. Students' rating of each other before and after
training on the Communication Effectiveness Scale.

B. Students' rating of themselves on the Understanding and Experiencing Scale before and after training.

C. Ratings by trained raters on videotaped conversations before and after training on the following dimensions: eye contact, body language, self disclosure, mutuality and depth of interpersonal exploration.

D. Ratings by trained raters of each participant on the Communication Effectiveness Scale and the Understanding and Experiencing Scale before and after training.

Hypotheses

The general hypothesis is that black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training.

The following specific hypotheses have been developed.

I. There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white participants from pre to post testing.

II. There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females over black and white males.

III. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

IV. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students.

Delimitations

I. The study was limited to black and white students attending Amherst Regional High School during the Fall, 1975 school year.

II. The study was limited by the effect of videotaping equipment being present in the same room as the participants.
III. The study was limited to a small sample population.

Definitions

The following words were important to the study and were defined as follows:

**Black:** Belonging to an ethnic group having dark skin especially Negroid. *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language.*

**White:** A caucasoid. *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language.*

**Communication:** The exchange of thoughts, messages or the like as by speech, signals, or writing. *American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language.* For the purposes of this study communication included both verbal and non-verbal components.

**Experiencing:** "Experiencing is defined as the felt datum of an individual's inward direct reference in their phenomenal awareness." (Gendlin, 1962, p. 243).

Outline of the Dissertation

This dissertation presents a systematic training model for improving communication between black and white high school students. It consists of six chapters. The first chapter is a general introduction which explains the rational and need for the study along with relevant definitions and hypotheses. Chapter two is a review of the pertinent literature relating to the three important aspects of the study. The literature review will include the theory and research relating to the concept of experiencing, current literature on black and white communication, and
alternative approaches to systematic training. The third chapter explains the method in which the study was conducted, and chapter four will present the results of the training model. The fifth chapter will be a summary and discussion of general conclusions that can be drawn from the study. The final chapter will be in the form of an article for publication which will serve as the dissertation summary.
CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

One of the greatest social problems existing in this country today is the lack of communication between black and white Americans. Evidence of this gap in communication is apparent in the myths and stereotypic beliefs that each group continues to hold about the other (Myrdal, 1944; Thomas and Sillen, 1972; Grier and Cobbs, 1968; Ryan, 1972). The myths and beliefs have grown over years of separation of the races. Because of the separation of blacks and whites, each group has come to their view of the world from different kinds of experiences. Therefore, in order to close the communication gap, these groups must become aware of their experiencing, and then communicate these feelings and thoughts to the other person.

This chapter will present a review of the pertinent literature relating to experiencing, communication between blacks and whites, and systematic training. The literature review will be divided into four parts. The first part will focus on the theoretical foundation for experiencing as a useful concept. The second part will review the research pertaining to experiencing. The next part will contain a review of present approaches used to improve communication
between blacks and whites. Finally, the literature on systematic training as a viable method for effecting change will be reviewed.

Theory

The existential attitude in counseling and psychotherapy emphasizes the concept of experiencing. This approach holds that persons are continuously changing and recreating their lives (Gendlin, 1973). The primary goal in existential counseling is the understanding of the client as a person, a being and as a being-in-the-world (Kemp, 1971). Its aim is "to make the client feel at home in his real work by reshaping his phenomenal world." (Van Kaam, 1962, p. 402).

The existential approach in counseling and psychotherapy was developed from the existential philosophers of the 19th and 20th centuries. Several of the key existential philosophers were Kirkegaard, Nietzsche, Heidegger and Husserl (Barrett, 1962). They sought the ultimate meaning of life. Believing that it was not to be found in the estranged objective world, they sought meaning in the inward experience, the reality as immediately experienced in actual living. This turn toward subjectivity valued man's immediate experience in which both objectivity and subjectivity are rooted (Kemp, 1971).

All of these philosophers have contributed to existen-
tial thought, but no one of them is viewed as the authority of the contemporary existential image of man. While each philosopher contributed his view according to his own personal or cultural orientation, a consideration of the modern experience is the bond between them (Van Kaam, 1965). Barrett (1962) describes their considerations as "attempts to grasp the image of the whole man, even where this involves bringing to consciousness all that is dark and questionable in his existence." (p. 22)

Jean-Paul Sartre is often thought to be the genius of existentialism in the 20th century (Barrett, 1962). Writing in France after World War II he contributed to the modern existential thought which reached America. He has become the symbol of present day existentialism, a position which is not deserved so much by the originality of his basic concepts, but by the radicalism, consistency and psychological adequacy with which he has carried them through (Tillich, 1952). Tillich (1952) said:

Sartre's famous proposition "the essence of man is his existence" is like a flash of light which illuminates the whole existentialist scene. What it says is that there is no essential nature of man except in one point that he can make of himself what he wants. Man is what he makes of himself. And the courage to be as oneself is the courage to make of oneself what one wants to be. (p. 149-150)

Existential philosophy has penetrated all aspects of modern life. An existential image of man seems to be pre-
sent in sensitive people of most Western nations, cultures and religions and in the representatives of the most diverse professions and disciplines (Van Kaam, 1965). Counseling and psychotherapy are no exception. The existential attitude in counseling and psychotherapy is one of involvement and encounter with another person. This influence has been seen in the work of many psychotherapists who view the therapeutic relationship as an encounter between two human beings. Those approaches which are concerned with understanding clients as they exist in the world are deemed existential (Tillich, 1952; Patterson, 1973).

Gendlin (1973) has defined his theoretical approach which he calls experiential psychotherapy. Two basic concepts of this approach are existence and encounter. The first concept defines a person's existence as experiencing life from moment to moment. Thus, existence is experiencing. A person has access to their own existence through the bodily felt experiencing.

But what a person feels at any moment is always interactional, they are involved with situations, relations with people and physical surroundings in the past, present and future. Gendlin (1973) describes this interaction in his other basic concept: encounter. Bubur (1970) says, "The world as experience belongs to the basic word I-It. The basic word I-You establishes the world of relations...."
All actual life is encounter." (p. 62)

In the therapeutic relations, May (1964) discusses encounter or the ability of the therapist to be with the client, to fully understand the other person as they are. This is an important concept for existential therapists. They believe it to be the ingredient responsible for positive change in the client:

Healing in the therapeutic sense does not result merely from greater knowledge of oneself, but from experiencing oneself as one is in relation to another person and in the struggle toward mutual acceptance in spite of the human-ness that is found in each individual. (Colm, 1965, p. 139)

This experiential approach concentrates on individuals as they are experiencing their world in the moment. It stresses encounter and interaction. Gendlin (1973) makes the concepts of experiencing and encounter clear when he says:

It is a basic concept of experiential theory that human existence or experiencing is an interactional process with the environment. Therefore, in isolation experiencing must be much narrower than in interaction. But if experiencing as bodily felt, is also the interpretive mass, that is to say the sense one has of what is going on and the sense which interprets words, events and so forth, then in isolation one also loses this capacity to interpret what words and events mean. Along with this is lost one's sense of self and sense of ownership of one's own body. (p. 332)

Another approach to counseling and psychotherapy which emphasizes the existential image of the person is Roger's Client-Centered Therapy. While Rogers is not considered
an existential therapist, his basic ideas regarding the therapeutic relationship are close to the existential attitude in psychotherapy (May, 1958). Rogers (1951) put emphasis on the process of becoming through the experience of the client and the relationship between client and counselor. He believes that experience is all that is in the individual's phenomenal field. This field includes past and present events of which the person may be aware or unaware. For example, the loneliness experienced by people in our society is caused by an estrangement from the experiencing organism (Rogers, 1961a). People deny those meanings sensed by the body and cling to a conscious facade. Thus, there is a lack of any relationship in which persons communicate their real self to others. When this happens people feel the loneliness of not being in real touch with any other human being.

It is the quality of the interpersonal encounter which matters most (Rogers, 1962). Because the interaction is so important, Rogers (1957; 1962) has defined three experiential elements which are necessary for change in the client. These are congruence, empathy, and unconditional positive regard. The ability of the counselor to be themselves in the relationship is called congruence. This means that the counselor or therapist is able to create a direct personal encounter with the other person on a person-to-person basis, while being themselves. The second important
element in a relationship is empathy. Empathy as defined by Rogers (1975) means entering the private perceptual world of another person. This involves being sensitive to the moment to moment felt meanings which continue to change within the person. In order to be with another person in this sense means that counselors must put aside their own values and attitudes so that they can understand the feelings of the other person. Finally, Rogers believes that the counselor must have unconditional positive regard for the client. This means that the client is viewed as a person who is becoming and emerging with potential for making choices (Rogers, 1961b).

Many psychotherapists have examined experiencing and encounter in counseling and psychotherapy. Laing in The Politics of Experience (1967) says, "Our task is both to experience and to conceive the concrete, that is to say, reality in its fullness and wholeness." (p. 22). This personal experiencing transforms a given perception into intention and action. Thus, experiencing is an important part of becoming a person. And it involves the body as well as the mind. Allport (1955) refers to the bodily me as the first aspect people encounter in becoming. The emerging sense of self arises from all of the person's sensations. This bodily sense of self remains a lifelong anchor for self-awareness. Experiencing then involves the sense of the body as well as the feelings, desires, wants
and emotions. May (1953) says, "Becoming a person means this heightened awareness this heightened experience of 'I-ness', this experience that it is I, the acting one, who is the subject of what is occurring." (p. 116)

Jourard (1971), another psychoterapist emphasizes encounter in personal interaction. He believes that self-disclosure is necessary for personal growth. His definition of self-disclosure is, "the act of making yourself manifest, showing yourself so others can perceive you." (p. 19) In counseling he finds self-disclosure acts as the catalyst which brings relief, since many people cannot bring themselves to full disclosure. When persons can disclose their inner experiences to another person, then, personal growth is possible (Jourard, 1959).

In summary, experiencing and encounter are existential concepts which have been adapted by counselors and therapists who emphasize the ability of clients to become aware of their experiencing, and the role of the relationship which develops between clients and counselors. The ability of clients to become aware of and reveal their experiencing allows counselors to understand their inner world. To help clients in the experiencing process, counselors provide therapeutic conditions which encourage self-revelation. This interpersonal encounter is viewed as necessary for positive results in therapy.
Related Research

Research in experiencing and existential psychotherapy has been reported in a few studies. It is a difficult area for study since inner experience provides the data for the person's description of self and human beings must describe themselves by means of a distinctly human idiom (Dana and Leech, 1973). It is difficult field since changes cannot be assessed through clinical techniques and existing instruments. Persons must describe their inner experiences in a distinctly human idiom.

One instrument that has been developed is the Experiencing Scale (Gendlin, Beebe, Cassens, Klein and Oberlander, 1968) used to measure the experiential level of clients in therapy. Comprised of seven stages ranging from no experiencing to high levels of experiencing, the scale is used by trained raters who listen to recorded segments of early and late therapy sessions to determine the degree of change in the experiencing of clients. While Gendlin et al., (1968) predicted successful patients would move up the scale over the course of therapy, they found instead that the more successful clients showed higher levels on the scale in both early and late therapy.

Before the Experiencing Scale could be effectively used Gendlin (1969) believed another process was needed. He described this process as teaching clients to focus, so
that they might learn to relate to their experiencing. So a manual designed to teach people the focusing process was developed.

This manual was used in a study (Gendlin et al., 1968) designed to determine whether or not focusing ability could be taught to high school students. The focusing manual, the post focusing questionnaire (developed with the manual) and the Cattell School Personality Questionnaire were administered to forty-seven high school students. A correlation between Cattell's Personality descriptions and the students' focusing ability was obtained. Gendlin et al. (1968) found that, "nine out of the fourteen first order personality factors correlated significantly with the mean focusing score for the five most reliable items on the post focusing questionnaire." (p. 232)

In other research (Gendlin and Berlin, 1961) participants' galvanic skin response and different modes of experiencing were investigated. In this study seventeen subjects were given seven different instructions that differentiated between continuous reference to experiencing and attendance to an external object and speaking. Following the instruction for silent continuous reference to experiencing, significantly fewer GSR's and greater resistance increase occurred than during experimental periods that involved speech or external attention.
Gendlin and Shlien (1961) also investigated the relationship between measures of success in psychotherapy and the development of immediacy of experiencing as measured by an unforced Q sort of time attitude items. This Q sort was given to forty-five clients in time limited therapy. The study examined correlations between success measures and the pre and post therapy scores on the time attitude Q sort. It was found that immediacy of experiencing did not characterize successful clients before therapy, but successful clients did show a high degree of immediacy of experiencing at the end of therapy.

Since the role of the interpersonal relationship between client and counselor is believed to be vital to the process of therapy, Gendlin, Jenney and Shlien (1960) attempted to distinguish between counselor observation of focus on the relationship as a topic of discussion and observations indicating use of the relationship for significant experiencing. They hypothesized there would be a high correlation between counselors' observations of clients using the relationship as a means of increasing experiencing and successful outcome ratings. In this study the hypothesis was supported. This study indicates the importance of experiencing in the therapeutic process.

A massive study of the therapeutic process was undertaken by Carl Rogers and a group of therapists of the Psychology Research Group, Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute at the Univer-
sity of Wisconsin (Rogers, 1967). These client-centered therapists used hospitalized schizophrenics and a control group of normal individuals in the study. The purpose of the study was to determine the facilitative elements in the therapeutic relationship, the characteristics of the therapeutic process in the clients and the kinds of outcome changes which occur.

One important finding indicated that it is possible to test a theory of therapeutic change and the process of therapy with instruments to measure these conceptual elements. These instruments made it possible to measure the therapists' empathy, and genuineness, and the clients' degree of experiencing. Other aspects of the study, moreover, pointed out that the deeper the level of the therapist's understanding and genuineness in the relationship, the more likely the client showed higher levels of experiencing and self-exploration. In view of this, Rogers (1967) said, "the best therapeutic relationship develops between a therapist who is understanding and real, and a client who is able to be somewhat expressive, who is not too remote from his own experiencing." (p. 92)

The research reviewed has pointed out the value of experiencing and encounter in the therapeutic relationship. But these concepts are also important in any relationship when two people attempt to communicate with each other. Another way of describing encounter with others through experiencing is the ability of individuals to make themselves known to
others by disclosing who they are. Self-disclosure and the experiencing process are closely linked because each means allowing others to know the innermost thoughts and feelings.

**Self Disclosure**

A great deal of research has been done in the area of self-disclosure. Self-disclosure is that verbal communication of personal information by which people make themselves know to others. Jourard's (1971) Self-Disclosure Questionnaire is one instrument which has been used successfully for measuring this dimension. It is a useful instrument in existential therapy because "...it provides the client with a formal means of imposing structure in the content areas to be explored" (Dana & Leech, 1973, p. 431).

In a study conducted by Jourard and Lasakow (1958) the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire was used to determine the extent of self-disclosure to different target persons. The target persons were: mother, father, male friend, female friend or spouse. The subjects were male and female black and white persons who were married and unmarried. The findings showed that unmarried persons, white and black disclosed more to mother and less to other target persons. White subjects disclosed more than blacks; and females more than males.

A difference in self-disclosure between males and females has been found in other research studies. Hood and Black (1971) found that females disclose their personal feelings more frequently than males. Similar findings were
reported by Pederson and Breglio (1968) and Pederson and Higbee (1969). In both studies, Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire was used with college age males and females. And the results of these studies indicated that females disclosed more than males.

However, other researchers have obtained different results concerning sex differences in self-disclosure. Using the self-disclosure questionnaire, Doster and Strickland (1969) and Weigel, Weigel and Chadwick (1969) found no difference between males and females in self-disclosure. Brooks (1974) manipulated the sex of the interviewer in dyads to determine differences in self-disclosure between males and females. She found no differences between the sexes.

In a study by Dimond and Hellkamp (1969) the self-disclosure questionnaire was administered to male and female, black and white high school students to determine the self-disclosure of each group. The results of this study indicated that there was no difference between the sexes in self-disclosure.

While the Dimond and Hellkamp (1969) study did not report sex differences, their findings did support the Jourard and Lasakow (1958) study in regard to race. Dimond and Hellkamp found that whites were more self-disclosing than blacks. However, in a study of young adolescents, Jaffee and Polansky (1962) found no differences in self-disclosure between lower-class blacks and lower-class whites. Cozby
(1973) suggested that differences due to race in self-disclosure may be due to social class factors.

Because self-disclosure involves interaction between two people, studies have been conducted to determine its dyadic effect. Jourard and Landsman (1960) investigated the amount of self-disclosure among men when the target person was another male who was liked or who was well known by the subject. It was found that the amount of self-disclosure among men correlated with the degree to which they knew the other man and the amount the other man had disclosed himself. In a similar study (Jourard and Richman, 1963) the dyadic effect was studied in relation to significant others and the degree of self-disclosure. The amount of self-disclosure input versus output was investigated in relation to mother, father, opposite sex friend and the same sex friend. The main finding of this study was that subjects who reported that they revealed a great deal about themselves to parents and close friends, also reported that these persons had disclosed a lot to them. The implication is that the dyadic effect is a general phenomenon extending to many types of interpersonal relationships.

Since many factors are considered important in self-disclosure this dimension has been studied under many different conditions. For example, Truax and Wittmer (1971) investigated self-disclosure and personality adjustment. And the appropriateness of self-disclosure to different target persons
was studied by Chaiken and Derlega (1974). Jourard and Resnick (1970) studied the effects of self-disclosure between know high and low disclosers.

Self-disclosure, then, is the interaction between two individuals that allows each to share their moment to moment experience. It is an important aspect in all interpersonal relationships. The dyadic effect that appears to be present in self-disclosure indicates that if one person in the relationship offers warmth and openness, it is likely that the other person will reciprocate. This reciprocal sharing increases real understanding and communication between people who are willing to try and break down the barriers which keep human beings apart.

Black and White Communications

Thus far the literature review has concentrated on the theory and research of the concepts of experiencing and encounter. The value of these concepts in interpersonal relationships have been shown. But little mention has been made in the literature of how people of different races and cultural backgrounds communicate their differences to each other. Yet, such differences must be considered. Since the experiences of a black person in America is significantly different; mutual communication and understanding with whites is difficult. Because of America's turbulent history of race relations, the initial phase of any interracial relationship is often characterized by caution on the part of both parties
(Gardner, L.G., 1972; Vontress, 1969).

To alleviate this caution and increase communication and understanding between blacks and whites the interracial encounter group, or sensitivity training has been effectively used. Katz (1975) and White (1970) see the encounter group experience as one in which blacks and whites have the opportunity to explore the feelings of each other and learn to communicate these feelings.

Wilkinson (1973) sees the goal of interracial encounter groups as:

1. The opening of new levels of communication that has previously been repressed by both groups.
2. Establishing personal acquaintances and friendships which can be maintained, and
3. The development of steps whereby blacks and whites take realistic action in working toward high levels of understanding, acceptance, cooperation and communications. (p. 158)

These goals can be reached when people from diverse backgrounds are willing to spend time together to talk to each other. The interracial encounter group provides an opportunity for the exorcising of intergroup and interpersonal tensions (Rogers, 1970b).

The effectiveness of sensitivity training to improve communication between the races has been reported by Cobbs (1972). He calls his group process Ethnotherapy. Ethnotherapy has been successful in bringing together many people of different backgrounds to explore themselves and each other. These encounter groups result in freed emotions and feelings, which enable the participants to understand each other better.
Walker and Hamilton (1973) reported their results of an encounter weekend in which black, Chicano and white college students participated. Their conclusions indicate that encounter groups are helpful in reducing racial tensions and improving communication between group members. Through the small group interaction myths about different groups are dispelled and stereotype beliefs are weakened.

Winter (1971) reported her work with interracial groups in a university setting. She found that as the groups progressed, enough trust and group solidarity developed to support the group members as they worked through difficult personal racial attitudes. In another study concerning interracial groups at a junior college, the students who participated felt that the group had served to increase positive racial feelings and attitudes (Kranz, 1972).

In one study employing the T group method, communication bias between blacks and whites was investigated (Patterson and Smits, 1974). While there was an initial lack of communication between group members, communicative inhibitions began to break down near the end of the group sessions.

Interracial encounter groups, then, are one way in which members of different ethnic backgrounds can learn to communicate and to understand the experiences of each other. These groups provide psychological safety and support for individuals who wish to increase awareness and decrease ethnic prejudice (Rubin, 1967). Sensitivity training is
meaningful for everyone who is interested in furthering racial understanding, but for those in the helping professions, especially counselors who would work with people with different cultural and ethnic backgrounds, it should be mandatory.

Effective counselors not only must learn to increase communication between the races, but they must fully understand the ethnic background of their clients (Barnes, 1972; Vontress, 1969). An approach useful in increasing ethnic understanding for counselors is cognitive learning. This education should be provided through experiences which would enable the counselor to relate to blacks from a black point of view (Bell, Jr., 1971; Mitchell, 1970; Cobbs, 1970). Lewis and Lewis (1970) and Calia (1966) suggest a model curriculum for training counselors which includes sensitivity training, course work related to the history and psychology of blacks and field experiences within the black community. This kind of educational experience would be a beginning toward closing the gap between the races and increasing the interaction of blacks and whites (Banks and Hayes, 1972).

This kind of education is necessary because the present literature concerning interracial counseling refers to the difficulty involved when the counselor is white and the client is black (Grier and Cobbs, 1968; Vontress, 1970, 1971; Lewis and Locke, 1969). These authors agree that it is often difficult for white counselors to establish a relationship
with black clients. This difficulty stems from a lack of trust and the inability of black clients to disclose themselves (Vontress, 1971).

The lack of trust and self-disclosure in interracial counseling is evident in those research studies that indicate black clients prefer a counselor similar to themselves. A study designed to determine the effects of counselor race and training on black clients in initial interviews was conducted by Banks, Berenson and Carkhuff (1967). In this study four counselors—one black and three white—with varying amounts of training and education interviewed black students. From students ratings, the black counselor, who was among the least experienced, was found to be the most effective. All of the black students indicated that they would return to the black counselor, while none indicated they would return to the most experienced white counselor.

Studies designed to investigate the effects of race and social class on a client's depth of self-exploration produced similar results. In their study, Carkhuff and Pierce (1967) found that schizophrenic female patients tended to explore themselves more deeply when they were working with a therapist of the same social class and racial background as themselves. In his study, Banks, (1972) indicated that racially similar pairings did result in greater self-exploration but social class was not a factor.

Another group of studies, however, produced results which indicate the experience and training of the counselor make the
difference in client satisfaction. Cimbolic (1972) investigated the effects of counselor race and experience on black clients. His results indicated that the black students did not show a preference for counselors on the basis of race, but on counselor experience. All of the students were willing to return to at least one of the white counselors in the study. Experience and facilitative conditions were viewed as more important in choosing a counselor than race.

Gardner, W.E. (1972) studied the effects of a counselor race, education and experience on black clients choice of a counselor. He found race and experience to be major factors in effectiveness with black clients. But when counselors are provided with the kinds of educational experiences which make a difference in their functioning, race becomes less important.

In a study which investigated trust and self-disclosure among black college students Williams (1974) utilized white professional counselors and black peer counselors. The goal of this study was to determine which group of counselors would receive the higher levels of self-disclosure. She found that the levels of self-disclosure were no different in the different race and experience categories.

While there is no conclusive evidence to support a general statement concerning interracial counseling, experience and training appear to be important factors. Those white counselors who were able to achieve good therapeutic
conditions were judged effective by black clients. It is important, therefore, for the counselor working with black clients to possess good therapeutic skills and to be understanding of the black client's internal frame of reference (Pine, 1972).

Systematic Training

Counselors and psychotherapists who relate to their clients with openness and understanding are those whose clients show the greatest degree of positive change (Carkhuff, 1969). In order for this positive change to take place counselors must be able to understand the world of their clients, as the clients are experiencing it. Learning to understand the experiencing of others and communicating this understanding requires good therapeutic skills. Good therapeutic skills can be taught through systematic approaches that emphasize the concept of experiencing. There are many different systematic training methods. These methods have certain elements in common. These elements are:

1. to provide verbal or written didactic instruction,
2. to provide models,
3. to provide or arrange feedback on performance and
4. to administer and coordinate an integrated program (Authier, Gastafson Guerney, Jr., and Kasdorf, 1975, p. 41).

Three different approaches for systematic training will be reviewed here. These methods were initially developed to teach specific skills in communication to counselors so that they would be more understanding of the experiencing of others and able to interact in more responsive ways. However, all of
these approaches have been found useful in teaching these skills to many other professional and non-professional people.

Microcounseling

One approach that improves the attendance to and understanding of another person is microcounseling. Microcounseling (Ivey, 1971) was developed to teach inexperienced counselors more effective interview techniques. In this systematic approach four skill clusters must be learned. These basic skill clusters are: attending behavior, reflection of feeling, paraphrasing and summarization, and interpretation. Each skill is taught in a predetermined order to insure that each skill learned will contribute to the understanding of the next one.

Each of Ivey's teaching sessions facilitate the learning of an individual skill. Usually a five minute session of the trainee conducting an interview is videotaped. Then the trainee reads a written manual describing the specific skill to be learned. Next video models demonstrating the skill are viewed by the trainee. Then the trainee views the initial interview. The supervisor is always available for discussion at each step. After the trainee understands the skill being learned, another five minute session is videotaped and viewed. This process is followed for all skills in the microcounseling approach.

In this approach the skills learned are those which enable the counselor to become aware of and attend to the mo-
ment to moment experiencing of clients. For example, the skills in the reflection of feelings cluster teach the counselor how to recognize the feelings and emotions that are being experienced by the client. Once the immediate experiencing of the client is recognized, the counselor can respond to this experiencing. Microcounseling, then, teaches the existential concepts of experiencing and encounter in a skill by skill approach to insure full understanding of the experiential world of the client.

The first studies investigating the use of microcounseling in counselor training was done by Ivey, Normington, Miller, Morrill and Haase (1968). In three separate studies with pre-practicum counseling students, attending behavior, reflection of feeling, and summarization of feeling were taught to three different groups. In each of these studies the findings indicated that a significant increase in each skill occurred.

Since its inception as a tool for training in interview skills, microcounseling has been used in different settings for training a variety of helpers. In one investigation using the microcounseling paradigm, Haase and Demattia (1970) trained paraprofessionals in the skills of attending behavior, expression of feeling, and reflection of feeling. The trainees exhibited significant learning of these skills in a twelve hour training period.

Moreland (1971) compared microcounseling with a traditional approach for training medical students in a psychia-
tric course. In this study all of the microcounseling skills were taught to one group of students, while another group received traditional training. It was found that the microcounseling group showed greater improvement in interviewing skills than the traditionally trained group.

Aldrige (1971) replicated the Ivey et. al. (1968) study when he taught attending behavior to junior high school students. His goal was to determine if this age group could learn the skills of attending behavior. The findings indicated that the group trained in attending behavior showed improvement over the control group.

Gluckstern (1972) used microcounseling with other human relations skills to train parents as lay drug counselors. In this community based program, the parents showed retention of microcounseling skills when tested seven months after training.

In a recent study (Kriesel, 1975) microcounseling skills were taught to theology students within a values context. Values clarification was integrated with microcounseling. Each skill practice session included a discussion of what values it represented. When compared with a control group the microcounseling group improved to a greater extent.

An extension of microcounseling is media therapy (Higgins, Ivey and Uhlemann, 1970). Media therapy attempts to teach skills which enable individuals to focus on their relationship at the moment and share their present experiencing with
each other. Through the mutual sharing of experience, individuals are able to increase their understanding of the feelings of others. In media therapy specific behavioral skills are taught to pairs of individuals or to a single individual, while the counselor acts as a consultant. The consultant observes the interaction and makes suggestions to encourage behavior changes.

In the initial media therapy study, (Higgins et. al., 1970) pairs of individuals were taught the skill of direct mutual communication. People were taught how to focus on their interaction in the present, and share their experience with each other. In this study, three groups of paired individuals were used; each group received a different treatment. It was predicted that the group receiving the full media therapy treatment would show the greatest increase in direct mutual communication. The full treatment consisted of a written text describing direct mutual communication, video and live modeling, with feedback sessions after each of three, five minute video interactions. Other groups received varying degrees of the media therapy treatment. In this study the hypothesis was supported. The other groups showed some degree of change, but not as great as the full treatment group. In a replication of this study, Forti (1975) used female nursing students as participants. He found that the group receiving the full media treatment showed the greatest change in direct mutual communication.
Media therapy has also been used with hospitalized psychiatric patients (Ivey, 1973). Here the approach was a bit different in that the patients were interviewed on videotape by a counselor. The patients were shown the videotape and asked what behaviors they would like to change. The patients were then taught the specific skill which would enable them to change that behavior. In this self-selection approach to learning the patients were allowed to begin working on those things that they wanted to change; thereby allowing them to be what they wanted to be without imposed societal pressures. Speaking of this approach Ivey (1974) said, "the major focus on efforts with media therapy in a psychiatric facility has centered on finding ways in which patients can define and program their own course toward recovery" (p. 179).

Micorcounseling and media therapy represent an educational approach toward teaching specific skills to counselors and others in order to increase their self-awareness and their understanding of others. The concept of experiencing is inherent in the microcounseling model. Those skills taught enable counselors to recognize and respond to the moment to moment experiencing of others. The ability to respond to the experience of others increases communication and understanding.

Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR)

Another method in systematic training which emphasizes
the concept of experiencing is Kagan's Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR). Kagan (1973a) first developed this method to improve supervisory techniques for beginning counselors. The goal was to develop a method of training which would lead to more effective counselors. The process by which this goal was to be reached involved immediate playback of a videotaped counseling session so that counselors could observe their responses and recall what they were feeling at that time. Kagan also allowed clients to view the videotape, so that both could recall their feelings as they progressed. Through the immediate playback of the counseling session, both client and counselor were able to recall their moment to moment experiencing and respond to these feelings. By stressing immediate experiencing, each person could recognize their feelings, gather insight, and respond to each other in the present (Kagan, 1973b).

Recognizing that these kinds of responses required complex therapeutic behaviors, Kagan (1972) developed a method to teach counselors developmental tasks. The training is comprised of seven units, with specific tasks in each. The training involves a didactic presentation, modeling and feedback.

The process by which these steps are accomplished begins when a counseling session is videotaped (Archer, Jr., Fiester, Kagan, Rate, Spierling and Van Noord, 1972). Once a session is completed, the counselor leaves the room and another person,
called the interrogator, enters. The interrogator views the just completed session with the client. At the same time the counselor views the session with another interrogator in a separate room. Both client and counselor are encouraged to stop the tape whenever they recall a feeling or reaction to what was happening at that moment. Thus, each examines the recalled interaction at the same time. Viewing the tape simultaneously enables both persons to analyze their behavior and become aware of their immediate experiencing. Through this approach both are able to engage in deeper self-exploration and insight (Kagan, Krathwohl and Miller, 1963).

A number of studies have been conducted using IPR in counselor training. In a study designed to evaluate IPR with a more traditional method of training practicum counselors, three groups were tested under different treatment procedures (Ward, Kagan, and Krathwohl, 1972). One group received an IPR video treatment, the second group received an IPR audio treatment and the third group acted as a control group. While the data in this study did not show that the video treatment group improved significantly, improvement in skills was observed.

In one of the first studies, IPR was compared with a traditional method of supervision (Kagan and Krathwohl, 1967). In this study significant differences between groups were found. The counselors trained in the IPR method showed more improved counseling skills, and client satisfaction was
significantly higher. Spivack (1972) replicated this earlier study with students in a pre-practicum course. He compared the IPR method with a traditional seminar approach. After fifteen hours of training significant differences were found in favor of the IPR group.

In a study using IPR with groups Hartson and Kunce (1973) compared the IPR method with sensitivity training. They found the IPR method to be favorable over the traditional group method.

Dendy (1971) compared a group of undergraduates trained in IPR with a group of Ph.D level counselors. While there were large differences between the two groups in interviewing skills before training, after training there were no significant differences between the groups on scales measuring empathy and communication. Archer and Kagan (1973) then used the same undergraduates to train others. In this study it was found that the peer trained group improved more than a similar group which had encounter group training.

These studies in IPR show that this method can be used effectively in different settings to aid communication and understanding.

**Didactic Experiential Approach**

The didactic experiential approach (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) is an integrated approach to teaching good therapeutic behavior to beginning counselors. The goal of this training model is to teach beginning counselors the therapeutic condi-
tions that Truax and Carkhuff have used to develop successful counselors. These conditions are warmth, empathy and genuineness. They are taught to the beginning counselor through the didactic learning of specific skills in an atmosphere where the conditions of empathy, warmth and genuineness are constantly modeled by the supervisor.

The training model includes a variety of experiences for the beginning counselor. The trainees begin by reading the theory of the leading theorists, and listening to taped therapy sessions intended to increase their number of therapeutic responses. The trainees then rate the taped sessions on the therapeutic conditions of warmth, empathy and genuineness. Once the trainees understand these conditions, they begin to practice making correct responses with each other. Practice sessions are videotaped so that the trainees can receive feedback. While the training is going on the trainees meet once a week for two hours to participate in a group session. During this time the trainees explore their personal growth. When the beginning counselors are able to integrate the conditions into their responses they are assigned a regular client.

The didactic experiential method incorporates the concepts of experiencing and encounter in an integrated approach to training. This approach teaches the therapeutic conditions of warmth, empathy and genuineness in an atmosphere which encourages trainees to become aware of their moment to moment
experiencing. Thus, the trainees are learning these conditions and are also experiencing them. These conditions are necessary ingredients for counselors so that they can relate to the experiencing of others. Through this integrated method trainees learn to facilitate the experiencing process for others and to become aware of their own experiencing.

Using this approach Carkhuff has trained counselors and lay persons. In one study (Carkhuff and Truax, 1965) graduate students in a psychology course and lay hospital personnel were trained simultaneously and compared with experienced therapists on the levels of the therapeutic conditions that were reached. The results showed that the experienced therapists ranked highest, with the graduate students followed by the lay personnel. But the findings indicated that the differences between ranks were not significant.

In another study, (Carkhuff, Friel and Kratochvil, 1970) counselor response and counselor initiated dimensions were investigated. Two groups were used: one group was trained to use the more facilitative counselor responses first and then the more action oriented counselor initiated dimensions. The second group was taught these dimensions in reversed order. It was found that those counselors who focused upon counselor responsiveness with the conditions of empathy, warmth and genuineness first, demonstrated greater changes in communication with their clients.

The didactic experiential approach was used to train black human relations specialists to work in newly integrated junior high schools (Carkhuff and Griffin, 1970). A group
of fourteen persons was selected and trained to counsel black students and parents and to assist teachers in seven schools. Since these human relations specialists were able to function at high levels of the therapeutic conditions, the program was judged successful after one year. But not only did they function as lay counselors, they taught and trained others (Carkhuff, 1971). This group of human relations specialists trained parents, students and teachers to exhibit the conditions of empathy, warmth and genuineness in interpersonal relationships, and they also conducted workshops in black history.

In other social action programs Carkhuff's method was used to develop interpersonal skills in fourteen trainers for an employment program in the inner city (Carkhuff and Griffin, 1971). The first phase of their training focused on the therapeutic conditions necessary to function as helpers, the second phase taught them to train others. The trainees were able to function at above minimal levels of the therapeutic conditions, and as trainers, continued to function at above average levels.

Similarly, Carkhuff and Berenson (1972) trained black males and females to help troubled families. It was found that whether the families were black or white, high level functioning helpers were effective. They were able to improve the relationship within the troubled families.

In summary, these systematic approaches each stress
specific skills which enable trainees to become aware of and respond to the immediate experiencing of others. In order to respond to the experiencing of others, counselors do need specific skills because learning how to be with another person, and fully understanding the world of that person is indeed a difficult task. This task is simplified somewhat by teaching skills in a step-by-step manner as exemplified in these systematic approaches. Each of these approaches provide some didactic learning, modeling, and feedback so that the trainees are able to judge their responses and determine their ability to understand the experiencing of others.

While these approaches have been used in research studies and shown to be effective, little research has been reported in which both black and white people have participated. Carkhuff's work with blacks in inner city training programs, and his efforts to train black human relations specialists for positions in schools represent the extent of the use of systematic training with interracial groups. This study is an attempt to apply systematic training to improving communication between black and white people.

Summary

This chapter has presented a review of the literature relevant to this study. Those aspects with which this study are concerned are the concepts of experiencing and encounter
when developed into a systematic training model to improve communication between black and white people. The literature pertaining to each of these aspects was reviewed.

The theoretical foundation for experiencing and encounter was defined. Experiencing is the ever-changing flow of feeling present in each individual at every moment. Encounter occurs when individuals can communicate these feelings and have them understood by others. But communication and understanding is often difficult when individuals do not share similar experiences. The experiences of black and white people in America has been radically different, therefore, methods which help these groups toward better understanding and communication are needed.

To increasing understanding and communication between the races, the interracial encounter group is one method which has been used with some success. Better understanding of the black experience can also be achieved through cognitive approaches which include black history and psychology, and experiences in the black community. Another approach to improve communication between blacks and whites is the teaching of specific skills through systematic training which enables individuals to recognize and respond to the experiencing of each other.

Three systematic training approaches which emphasize the experiencing process have been discussed in this review of the literature. Each of these approaches teach specific
skills in careful listening and responding to the feelings and emotions of others. These systematic approaches have been used in research and shown to be effective. However, only the didactic experiential approach has been used to train black people to function in interracial settings.

This study presents a systematic training model which uses the concepts of experiencing and encounter to increase communication and understanding between blacks and whites. The goal of this research is to teach individuals to become aware of their experiencing and verbalize these feelings. Through this process black and white people can begin to understand the experiencing of each other and communicate this understanding.
CHAPTER III
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this study was to improve communication between black and white high school students through training in experiencing. This chapter will describe the manner in which this research was conducted. The chapter will describe the participants, the design of the study, treatment procedures and instruments used in the research.

Participants

The participants for this study were black and white high school males and females. The students ranged in age from 14 years 9 months to 18 years 6 months; the mean age was 16 years 5 months. The sample population was comprised of a total of thirty-two students: eight white males, eight black males; eight white females and eight black females. The participants were all attending Amherst Regional High School during the fall term of the 1975-76 school year. Each student was paid $2.00 for participating in the study.

The students were first approached by one of the high school counselors who asked if they were interested in participating in the research study. Those students who expressed interest in the study met in a group with the investigator at which time the purpose of the study was explained. The students were also told that they would be talking to a
person of a different race than themselves and that video-tape equipment would be used as part of the study.

After this meeting a form letter was mailed to the parent or guardian of each of the students. The letter explained the purpose of the research and asked that the parent sign and return the accompanying permission sheet so that the student could participate in the research study (see appendix I).

General Design of the Study

This research study was designed to teach specific communication skills to high school students. A training manual was developed by the investigator which consisted of three parts: (1) definition of experiencing, (2) examples of what experiencing is and is not, (3) five specific skills adapted from the Ivey and Gluckstern (1976a) direct mutual communication manual. The five skills were: (1) eye contact, careful listening and paraphrasing, (2) expressing personal reactions about what has just been said, (3) getting the other person's reaction to what has just been said, (4) the use of first names and personal pronouns, and (5) talking in the present tense. These skills were modeled by the trainer and taught during the training part of the session (see appendix II).

The design included two groups of students: one male group containing eight white males and eight black males; and
one female group containing eight white females and eight black females. Both groups experienced the same treatment. Same sex dyads were formed within each group, with one black and one white person. The students were randomly assigned to dyads depending on the availability of each person during free periods during the school day.

The dyads were each trained individually during a single session, which included a pretest condition, treatment (training period) and posttest condition (Issac and Michael, 1971). The investigator acted as the trainer for all dyads. Two rating scales were used which were completed by the participants. In addition videotape was used to record pre and post conversations between the students. These videotapes were later rated by trained raters. A description of instruments will be presented later in this chapter.
**Design of the Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black and White Females</th>
<th>A. Pretest</th>
<th>B. Training</th>
<th>C. Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Five minute videotaped conversation between same sex dyads. Completion of CES* and UES*.</td>
<td>Presentation of training manual, viewing of initial conversation. Modeling and demonstration of skills. Practice of skills by dyads.</td>
<td>Second five minute videotaped conversation. Completion of CES and UES. Viewing of second videotaped conversation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*CES: Communication Effectiveness Scale  
UES: Understanding and Experiencing Scale

**Treatment Procedures**

Treatment procedures for both groups of participants were the same. The research was conducted at Amherst Regional High School in a private office with the videotape camera and equipment in the same room. The equipment was operated by the trainer. During the session only the members of the dyad and the trainer were present in the room.

When the participants reported to the trainer at their scheduled time, the trainer introduced herself to them and introduced the students to each other. Before beginning the session, the trainer tried to put the students at ease by
talking with them briefly about herself and the research. Time was allowed for the participants to become accustomed to the videotape equipment. The camera and monitor were turned on so that the students could have an opportunity to see themselves on videotape before the session began. When the participants indicated that they were ready to begin, the trainer asked them to read the front page of the training manual. This page consisted of a brief paragraph which asked the students to talk about their feelings about being a black or white person at their high school.

This conversation was videotaped and served as a pre-test. The conversation was timed and after five minutes the video tape camera was turned off. The participants were then asked to complete two rating scales. When the scales were finished the trained instructed the trainees to read the training manual. The students were then asked if they had any questions, if there were questions, the trainer answered them.

The first five minute conversation was viewed by the trainees and the trainer. The trainer encouraged the students to talk about their feelings as they viewed the videotape. The trainees were told that they could ask that the videotape be stopped at any point when they remembered how they felt at that time. The trainer also stopped the videotape to point out specific instances of experiencing. Through self confrontation, via videotape, the trainees had
the opportunity to see their own behavior and determine what they wanted to change. Berger (1970) said, "...seeing oneself and reflectively re-experiencing meaningful interactions frequently allows a person to acknowledge something about himself which he had not previously been ready to accept" (p. 23).

Once the pretest videotape had been viewed, the trainer formed a triad with the two students in order to demonstrate the five skills to be learned. The trainer defined each skill and demonstrated it. Then she talked with one trainee and used the skills, encouraging the student to respond and use the skills also. The other trainee acted as an observer and tried to pick out the skills being used and identify them. In this manner the trainer modeled the skills to be learned. Bandura and Walters (1963) pointed out that there is a tendency for persons to reproduce actions and responses that have been modeled. Once the trainer had talked with both participants, she asked them to practice the skills with each other while she acted as observer. The trainer offered suggestions and pointed out the specific skills as they were used, reinforcing the trainees when they used the skills correctly.

When the trainer was satisfied that the participants understood the skills which they had been taught and were using them, a second five minute conversation was videotaped. This conversation was the posttest.

When the conversation was completed the participants were
asked to complete the two rating scales once more. The second videotaped conversation was then viewed and discussed. At this point the session was over, the trainer thanked the students and allowed them to leave. The entire session lasted approximately one hour and fifteen minutes.

Instruments

In order to test the hypotheses in this study three methods of evaluation were used. A semantic-differential type of scale was used by the participants to score the effectiveness of each other before and after training. Each student rated the other member of the dyad on this scale. A second semantic-differential scale was used which enabled the participant to rate their own feelings of experiencing and understanding before and after training. And the pre and posttest videotaped conversations were rated by trained raters in order to determine the verbal and nonverbal behavior of the dyad.

Communication Effectiveness Scale (CES)

The Counselor Effectiveness Scale (Ivey, 1971) is a semantic-differential type scale which has been used frequently in microcounseling. The word "communication" was substituted for the word "counselor" in the title of the scale in this study. The CES was used by both members of the dyad to rate the effectiveness of each other in communication. It was administered in the pre and posttest conditions. It was also
used by the raters to score each individual after the raters viewed the videotaped conversations.

The CES is comprised of two parallel forms of twenty-five items each. It has been tested for reliability and validity (Ivey, 1971). The parallel forms have a reliability of .975. For the purposes of this study, ten items from Form 1 were selected and used. The items were those which appeared to be most relevant to the age of the sample population and which best defined experiencing (see appendix III).

Understanding and Experiencing Scale (UES)

The Understanding and Experiencing Scale, developed by the investigator was used to measure the students own feelings of experiencing and being understood. The semantic-differential type scale was developed in part from Van Kaam's (1959) constituents of the experience of really feeling understood. The method used by Van Kaam to arrive at these constituents was phenomenal analysis. The purpose of the analysis was to discover the moments common to all individual experiences of the same kind. This kind of analysis aims to "...give a descriptive definition of certain experiences which people in a given culture or subculture have in common" (Van Kaam, 1959, p. 70).

In order to arrive at the constituents of feeling understood, 365 high school and college students were asked to recall situations in which they felt they were being under-
stood by another person and to describe how they felt in these situations. The descriptions were examined to see if each met the criterion of being a necessary and sufficient constituent of the experience of really feeling understood. The analysis of the descriptions were processed according to six operations which were carried out by three independent judges. From this analysis, nine items were identified as being necessary and sufficient for the experience of really feeling understood (Van Kaam, 1959).

From these nine items and the addition of three other items a semantic-differential type scale was constructed for use in this study. The validity of the scale was tested to determine if it could be used to discriminate between different degrees of understanding and experiencing. In order to do this, three videotapes ranging from low levels of understanding and experiencing to high levels of understanding and experiencing (Ivey and Gluckstern, 1976b) were shown to an undergraduate counseling class at the University of Massachusetts during the Fall 1975 semester (N=14). After each videotape the members of the class were asked to complete the scale. The means of each item on the three different ratings were computed and a significant difference between the means was obtained on all but two of the items. These two items were discarded. The resulting ten item scale was used in this study in pre and post conditions to measure experiencing and the feeling of being understood of each member of the dyad
(see appendix IV). The UES was also used by the raters to score each individual after they viewed each videotaped conversation.

Rating of Videotapes

Verbal and nonverbal behaviors of the dyads in the pre and post videotaped conversations were scored on specific dimensions relating to the process of experiencing. Two nonverbal dimensions--eye contact and body language--were chosen because experiencing is a physical as well as psychical process. Therefore, specific aspects of nonverbal behavior can be observed as part of the experiencing process (Gendlin, 1973). Nonverbal behaviors play a number of separate roles including the communication of interpersonal attitudes, the expression of emotions, indicating mutual attentiveness and providing feedback (Argyle, Salter, Nicholson, Williams and Burgess, 1970; Berger, 1970). Both body language and eye contact are easily identifiable behaviors and both have been studied extensively (Ellsworth and Ludwig, 1972; Exline, 1963; Exline, Gray and Schuette, 1965; Mehrabian, 1968; Duncan, Jr., 1969).

Three verbal dimensions were also selected to be scored. These were: self-disclosure, mutuality and depth of interpersonal exploration. These dimensions were intended to measure the degree of interaction between the members of the dyad. Gendlin (1973) explained the interaction this way:
"experiencing means to interact with others. . . Human beings are encounterings in the world and with others" (p. 323). The first dimension, self-disclosure, was intended to determine the degree to which the participants were able to become aware of their experience and disclose this awareness. The awareness of one's feelings is an essential aspect of being understood, since one must become aware in order to make feelings and thoughts known to others (Bugental, 1965; Buhler, 1967). When there is awareness it is possible for individuals to share their feelings and thoughts with others. The mutual sharing of experiences result in what Buber (1947) called dialogue. When there is genuine dialogue the participants are able to turn to each other with the intention of establishing a living mutual relationship between them. Thus, mutuality was selected to determine the degree to which the participants could reciprocate in sharing their feelings. The third dimension, depth of interpersonal exploration was included to determine the degree to which the dyads were willing to increase their knowledge of each other by exploring their thoughts and feelings more deeply. Increased knowledge, respect, and caring for another person results in deeper understanding and improved communication (Fromm, 1956; Maslow, 1954).

Eye contact. Eye contact was selected because it is an important dimension of communication, since by simply looking at each other, individuals establish that they are attentive.
The communication of attentiveness plays an important role in establishing an initial relationship, for shared eye to eye interaction is one way in which human beings communicate with each other (Tomkins, 1967; Ivey, et. al., 1968; Banks, 1974). The use of eyes in influencing the behavior of others and the significance of the eyes in communication can be seen in daily conversation.

**Body language.** "Body language can include any non-reflexive or reflexive movement of a part, or all of the body used by a person to communicate an emotional message to the outside world" (Fast, 1971, p. 2). Body language is a kind of silent language that makes up a large part of whatever meaning flows between one person and another (Argyle, et. al., 1971; Rosenthal, Archer, DiMatteo, Koivumaki and Rogers, 1974; Beier, 1974). This dimension was selected because body language reflects the emotions and feelings of individuals and it can easily be observed on videotape.

**Self-disclosure.** The self-disclosure dimension was intended to measure the degree to which the students were willing to express their immediate felt experiencing. Self-disclosure is the willingness of persons to make themselves known to others through verbal interaction. Through this process people learn more about each other and thereby improve interpersonal relationships (Jourard, 1971; Truax, 1971; Cozby, 1973).
Mutuality. This dimension was meant to measure the degree to which both members of the dyad could define their feelings, express them and have these feelings understood by the other person. Mutuality was best defined by Buber (1947) when he said that when on person experiences the presence of another as real, there is mutuality. For the purposes of this study mutuality was determined on the ability of the students to follow what each other was saying and communicate their understanding of the feelings of each other. Another important part of judging mutuality was whether or not the participants could share their feelings and experiences.

Depth of interpersonal exploration. This dimension was included to determine the degree that the members of the dyad could understand and explore the experiencing of each other. Depth of interpersonal exploration was defined in this study as the ability of the students to talk about themselves in the present and to explore the feelings of each other in depth. To get to know another person better, it is necessary to understand fully and share the experiencing of that person. Sharing the experience of another person means to be in touch with that person and to care about their hopes and suffering, thus expanding the communication process beyond mere factual information (Van Kaam, 1966; Fromm, 1956; Rogers, 1970).

These five dimensions were each rated on a five point scale, especially developed for this study. Each point on the scale carried a numerical value of from one to five (one
low--five high). Anchor statements were provided for each point on the scale regarding the type of behavior or verbal expression which would receive that numerical value (see appendix V).

The Raters

The raters were two females, one white and one black (the investigator). The second rater was paid $2.00 per hour for rating the videotapes. The two raters worked together before beginning the rating of the videotapes to agree on the guidelines for rating. Discussion of the rating scales and the meaning of each point on the scale was continued until consensus was reached as to the meaning of each item. The raters, then, rated practice tapes to determine whether or not they were in agreement. If there were any questions concerning a particular rating, the raters redefined the meaning of the points on the rating scale. The two raters completed the rating of the students videotaped conversations independently. The tapes were also viewed in a random manner so that the raters would not know which was the pre or post-test condition. The investigator, of course, knew which tapes were being rated. The raters viewed each five minute videotaped conversation twice so that each member of the dyad could be rated separately. Score sheets were provided upon which each rater recorded a numerical value for each individual on each dimension (see appendix VI).
Correlation Coefficient was computed for rater agreement between the two raters. Table 1 shows the interrater reliability for each dimension and for the scoring of the UES and the CES.

**TABLE 1**

THE PEARSON CORRELATION COEFFICIENT FOR TWO INDEPENDENT RATERS ON VERBAL AND NONVERBAL DIMENSIONS ON PRETEST AND POSTTEST CONDITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIMENSIONS</th>
<th>r</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td>.906</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body language</td>
<td>.948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disclosure</td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of interpersonal exploration</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Effectiveness Scale</td>
<td>.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and Experiencing Scale</td>
<td>.669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pretest Intercorrelation Matrix

A pretest intercorrelation matrix was computed for participants on all nine of the criterion variables. The purpose of the intercorrelation matrix was to determine pretest relationships between the variables. The correlation coefficient values of r at the .01 and .05 levels of significance with 30 d.f. were .449 and .349 respectively (Edwards, 1964). The
intercorrelation matrix is presented in Table 2.

Thirteen of the forty-five correlations were significant at the .01 level of significance. The nonverbal dimensions obtained an r of .790. These nonverbal dimensions, eye contact and body language, could be expected to correlate highly. If the participants maintained good eye contact, they probably exhibited good body language as well. On the verbal dimensions the correlation of depth of interpersonal exploration with self-disclosure and mutuality indicated the need for partners to engage in mutual self-disclosure, so that they could explore the feelings of each other.

The correlation of the students' ratings on the CES and UES at the .01 level of significance pointed to the fact that the participants tended to rate each other on the CES as they rated themselves on the UES. The UES correlated at the .01 level of significance with mutuality. This was a likely correlation since the students were rating their feelings of being understood on the UES, and mutuality would be important for this feeling of understanding. The raters' scoring of the participants on the UES and the CES were correlated at the .01 level of significance on three of the five dimensions rated on the videotapes. The raters were apparently influenced by the ratings of the videotapes on eye contact, body language and mutuality.

Five of the variables correlated at the .05 level of significance. One of the important correlations was that of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eye Contact</th>
<th>Body Language</th>
<th>Self-disclosure</th>
<th>Mutuality</th>
<th>Depth of interpersonal exploration</th>
<th>Understanding and Experiencing Scale</th>
<th>Communication Effectiveness Scale</th>
<th>Raters UES</th>
<th>Raters CES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body language</td>
<td>.790**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disclosure</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.409*</td>
<td>.562**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of interpersonal exploration</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.789**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding and Experiencing Scale</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.366*</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.1000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Effectiveness Scale</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.368**</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.713**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raters UES</td>
<td>.578**</td>
<td>.626**</td>
<td>.405*</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>.369*</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raters CES</td>
<td>.700**</td>
<td>.722**</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.571*</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.247</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.840**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at .01 level
*Significant at .05 level
body language and mutuality. This correlation seemed likely since the degree of mutuality between two individuals could be dependent upon the body position of the partners. Mutuality and the CES were also correlated at the .05 level of significance. Since the participants were rating each other on the CES, a correlation between this scale and mutuality could be expected. Mutuality was correlated with the greatest number of other variables indicating the interrelationship of this dimension with other verbal as well as nonverbal variables in communication effectiveness.

Among those variables which were not correlated was the CES and the nonverbal dimensions. A similarity between the present study and the Aldrige (1971) study on these variables can be noted. In the Aldrige study, number of eye contact breaks and the CES obtained a correlation of .23 (p. 60) and in the present study, the correlation between the CES and eye contact was .343. An even greater similarity was evident on the dimensions of arm and hand movement and the CES in the Aldrige study and the CES and body language in the present study. These correlations were .21 (p. 60) and .230, respectively. None of these correlations were significant in either study.

In summary the intercorrelation matrix provides the correlations of the nine criterion variables in this study. Some interrelationships were found among the variables.
The two nonverbal dimensions tended to correlate highly, as did the three verbal dimensions. But there was some correlation between the verbal and nonverbal dimensions indicating the importance of both in communication effectiveness. The UES and the CES tended to correlate, indicating a halo effect in the students' rating of themselves and each other. The raters also appeared to have rated the participants on the CES and UES similarly to the manner in which they rated the five dimensions on the videotaped conversations.

Summary

This chapter has presented the methodology for this research study. The participants were high school aged black and white males and females who met with the trainer for one training session in communication through experiencing. The training session involved three parts; pretest, training period, and posttest. The participants were asked to complete two scales for the pre and post conditions. These scales were the Communication Effectiveness Scale (CES) upon which each student rated the other member of the dyad; and the Understanding and Experiencing Scale (UES) upon which the students rated their own feelings of being understood. The training period consisted of reading the experiencing manual, watching the skills being modeled and then practicing the skills.
Videotape was used to record pre and post conversations between the participants. These videotapes were later rated by two trained raters on two nonverbal and three verbal dimensions. Each of these five dimensions were rated on a five point scale developed for this study. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient was computed to determine interrater reliability between the two independent raters.

A pretest intercorrelation matrix was computed to determine the relationship between the variables. The variables were found to correlate with each other in some instances. The verbal and nonverbal dimensions correlated with each other indicating interdependence between the dimensions.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS

The purpose of this research study was to determine if communication between black and white high school students could be improved through systematic training in experiencing. The study also sought to determine whether or not there were race or sex differences in communication effectiveness. This chapter will present the results of the study. An analysis of variance incorporating sex and race in the two experimental conditions was computed for each variable. The general hypothesis and the four specific hypotheses will be examined for each of the nine variables used for evaluating communication effectiveness.

Results of Students Scoring on the CES and UES

Communication Effectiveness Scale (CES)

The CES was used in this study by the participants to rate each other on communication effectiveness. The data for the CES are presented in Table 3. An F value of 22.68 was obtained which was beyond the .01 level of significance with 1,28 d.f. These data showed improvement after training in communication effectiveness, as judged by the students on their ratings of each other. Examination of the mean scores in Table 3, for each group show that there was positive gains for all groups from pretesting to posttesting.
There was a difference in the mean scores obtained by males and females which was beyond the .05 level of significance. This difference indicated that the female groups tended to rate each other higher on the CES than the male groups. The pretest and posttest mean scores for white males were 43.00 and 55.75; black males pre and post mean scores were 44.75 and 54.63, respectively. For white females the pretest mean score was 54.50, posttest mean was 65.50. Black females pretest and posttest mean scores were 50.25 and 59.88. The interaction between the CES and the sex of the participants was not significant, indicating that there

### TABLE 3
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CES, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1024.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1024.00</td>
<td>6.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>110.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110.25</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>4146.12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>148.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>1870.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1870.56</td>
<td>22.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES X Sex</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES X Race</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES X S X R</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>2309.13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64**
* F value at .05 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 4.20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cell Means (N = 8)</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>50.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>55.75</td>
<td>54.63</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>59.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
was no difference in the manner in which males and females responded to the training.

**General Hypothesis.** Black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training. From the data on the CES, the general hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis I.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white participants from pretesting to posttesting. The data obtained on the CES indicated that this hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis II.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females over black and white males.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between sex and the CES.

**Hypothesis III.** There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between race and the CES.

**Hypothesis IV.** There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students.

This hypothesis can be accepted since there was a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and males students on the CES.
Understanding and Experiencing Scale (UES)

As another measure of communication effectiveness, the UES was used by the students to rate themselves on their feelings of being understood. The data for the UES are presented in Table 4. On this scale an F value of 51.07 was obtained, which was greater than the .01 level of significance with 1,28 d.f. These data indicated that all of the students, regardless of sex and race felt better understood after training. The mean scores for all groups presented in Table 4, indicate that all groups profited significantly from the training.

TABLE 4
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR UES, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>770.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>770.06</td>
<td>6.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>3267.63</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>116.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UES</td>
<td>2575.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2575.56</td>
<td>51.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UES X Sex</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.64.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UES X Race</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UES X S X R</td>
<td>72.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.25</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>1412.13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cell Means (N = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>43.00</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>54.50</td>
<td>50.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>55.75</td>
<td>54.63</td>
<td>65.50</td>
<td>59.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** F value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64
* F value at .05 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 4.20
There was a difference in the mean scores obtained by males and females which was beyond the .05 level of significance. This difference showed that the female groups rated themselves higher on the UES than the male groups. The pretest and posttest mean scores for white males were 40.75 and 58.00; black males pre mean and post mean scores were 39.00 and 51.13 respectively. For white females the pretest mean score was 49.75, posttest mean was 58.75. Black females pre and posttest mean scores were 47.88 and 60.25. The interaction between the UES and the sex of the participants was not significant, indicating that there was no difference in the manner in which males and females responded to the training.

**General Hypothesis.** Black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training. From the data on the UES the general hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis I.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white participants from pretesting to posttesting.

The data obtained on the UES indicated that this hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis II.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females over black and white males.
This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between sex and the UES.

**Hypothesis III.** There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between race and the UES.

**Hypothesis IV.** There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students. This hypothesis can be accepted since there was a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students on the UES.

Results of Ratings on Videotapes

**Eye Contact**

The results of ratings on eye contact are presented in Table 5. The analysis of variance showed that an F value of 143.51 was achieved by students from pre to post-testing. This F value was well beyond the .01 level of significance with 1,28 d.f. There was a significant increase on eye contact as a result of training. Examination of the mean scores for each group in Table 5 indicate that these groups were almost equal in their improvement on the eye contact dimension. While the female groups obtained slightly higher mean scores, these scores did not
### TABLE 5

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EYE CONTACT, SEX AND RACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td>58.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.14</td>
<td>143.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact X S</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact X R</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Cont. X S X R</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(N = 8)</th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F** value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64

reach significance.

**General Hypothesis.** Black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training. Based on the data on eye contact, this hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis I.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white participants from pre to posttesting.

The data obtained on eye contact indicated that this hypothesis can be accepted.
Hypothesis II. There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females over black and white males.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between sex and eye contact.

Hypothesis III. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between race and eye contact.

Hypothesis IV. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students.

This hypothesis must be rejected. There was no difference between male and female students on the eye contact dimension.

Body Language

The results of ratings for the body language variable are presented in Table 6. On this dimension an F value of 82.56 was achieved by the students from pre to post-testing. This F value was well beyond the .01 level of significance. There was a significant increase on the body language ratings as a consequence of training. From the cell means in Table 6, it can be seen that after training the mean gain scores were fairly consistent for all
TABLE 6

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR BODY LANGUAGE, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>41.80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body language</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>82.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body lang. X S</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body lang. X R</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body lang. X S X R</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cell Means
(N = 8)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64 groups.

**General Hypothesis.** Black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training. From the data on body language, this hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis I.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white participants from pre to posttesting.

The data obtained on the ratings of body language indicated that this hypothesis can be accepted.
Hypothesis II. There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females over black and white males.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between sex and body language.

Hypothesis III. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no interaction between race and body language.

Hypothesis IV. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students.

This hypothesis must be rejected. There was no difference between male and females students on the body language dimension.

Self-disclosure

On the self-disclosure dimension, the results of the analysis of variance showed an F value of 97.76. These results were beyond the .01 level of significance with 1,28 d.f. These data are presented in Table 7. There was a significant increase in self-disclosure as a result of training. The mean scores for each group, presented in Table 7 indicated that the two female groups obtained slightly higher mean gain scores in the posttest but these
### Table 7

**Analysis of Variance for Self-Disclosure, Sex and Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disclosure</td>
<td>31.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.64</td>
<td>97.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disc. X S</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disc. X R</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disc. X S X R</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell Means**

(N = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F** value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. - 7.64

differences did not reach significance.

**General Hypothesis.** Black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training.

From the data on self-disclosure, this hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis I.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white participants from pre to posttesting.

The data obtained on the ratings of self-disclosure indicated that this hypothesis can be accepted.
Hypothesis II. There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females over black and white males.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between sex and self-disclosure.

Hypothesis III. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no interaction between race and self-disclosure.

Hypothesis IV. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students.

This hypothesis must be rejected. There was no significant difference between male and female students on the self-disclosure dimension.

Mutuality

On the ratings of mutuality, the participants obtained an F value of 82.20, which is beyond the .01 level of significance. These data are presented in Table 8. From these data, it can be seen that the students did improve in mutuality as a consequence of training. Examination of the mean scores for each group in Table 8, show that there were positive gains for all groups from pretesting to posttesting.

A difference in the mean scores obtained by the males
TABLE 8
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MUTUALITY, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>82.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut. X Sex</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut. X Race</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mut. X Sex X Race</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cell Means (N = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64
*F value at .05 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 4.20

and females on this dimension was beyond the .05 level of significance. This difference indicated that the female dyads obtained higher mean scores before and after training. However, both males and females showed positive gains from pre to posttesting. The pre and posttest scores for white males were 1.81 and 2.94; for black males the pre and post mean scores were 2.00 and 2.94, respectively.

The white females obtained a pretest mean score of 2.19, and a posttest score of 3.36. Black females pre and posttest mean scores were 2.25 and 3.50. The interaction be-
tween the sex of the participants and mutuality showed no significant difference in the manner in which the two groups responded to the training.

**General Hypothesis.** Black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training.

From the data on the ratings of mutuality, the general hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis I.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white participants from pre to posttesting.

The data obtained on the ratings of mutuality indicated that this hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis II.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females over black and white males.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between sex and the ratings on mutuality.

**Hypothesis III.** There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between race and the ratings on mutuality.
Hypothesis IV. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students.

This hypothesis can be accepted since there was a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students on the ratings of mutuality.

Depth of Interpersonal Exploration

The results of ratings on depth of interpersonal exploration are presented in Table 9. The analysis of variance showed an F value of 87.52 on this dimension. This F value was well beyond the .01 level of significance with 1,28 d.f. Thus, the participants improved in their ability to explore the feelings of each other more deeply, after training. The mean scores for each group are shown in Table 9. The mean scores on depth of interpersonal exploration indicated a similarity between the groups in the manner in which they were rated on this dimension.

General Hypothesis. Black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training.

Based on the data on depth of interpersonal exploration, this hypothesis can be accepted.

Hypothesis I. There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white
**TABLE 9**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATINGS ON DEPTH OF INTERPERSONAL EXPLORATION, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Interper. Exploration</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>87.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth X Sex</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth X Race</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth X Sex X Race</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cell Means
(N = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F** value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64

participants from pre to posttesting.

The data obtained on the ratings of depth of interpersonal exploration indicated that this hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis II.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females over black and white males.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between sex and depth of interpersonal exploration.
Hypothesis III. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between race and depth of interpersonal exploration.

Hypothesis IV. There will be a significant difference in communication between female students and male students.

This hypothesis must be rejected. There was no difference between male and female students on depth of interpersonal exploration.

Scoring by Raters on the CES and UES

Raters' Scoring of CES

The raters scored the CES for each participant in the pre and post conditions. These data are presented in Table 10. An F value of 110.74 was obtained on this variable. This F value is well beyond the .01 level of significance, which indicated that the raters saw improved communication effectiveness from pre to posttesting. Examination of the mean scores for each group show the degree of improvement as rated on the CES by the raters. While the females groups obtained higher pre and post mean scores, these scores did not reach significance.
**TABLE 10**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATERS SCORING OF CES, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1097.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1097.27</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>189.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189.06</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>8553.84</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>305.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R CES</td>
<td>3937.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3937.56</td>
<td>110.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R CES X Sex</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R CES X Race</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R CES X Sex X Race</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>995.59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cell Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(N = 8)</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Males</td>
<td>Females</td>
<td>Females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>37.38</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>42.56</td>
<td>47.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>52.25</td>
<td>52.88</td>
<td>61.00</td>
<td>65.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F** value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. - 7.64

**General Hypothesis.** Black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training.

From the data obtained on the raters' scoring of the CES, this hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis I.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white participants from pre to posttesting.

The data obtained on the raters' scoring of the CES indicated that this hypothesis can be accepted.
Hypothesis II. There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females students over black and white males.

This hypothesis must be rejected. There was no significant interaction between the sex of the participants and raters scoring of the CES.

Hypothesis III. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between race and the raters' scoring of the CES.

Hypothesis IV. There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students.

This hypothesis must be rejected. There was no significant difference between male and female students on the raters' scoring of the CES.

Raters' Scoring of the UES

The data for the raters' scoring of the UES are presented in Table 11. An F value of 155.80 was obtained by the students on this variable. This F value was well beyond the .01 level of significance. According to these results, the raters saw great improvement from pre to post-testing in communication effectiveness. The cell means
TABLE 11
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATERS SCORING OF UES, SEX AND RACE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>976.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>976.56</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>9038.31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>322.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R UES</td>
<td>5833.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5833.14</td>
<td>155.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R UES X Sex</td>
<td>135.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135.14</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R UES X Race</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R UES X Sex X Race</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>1048.31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cell Means (N = 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>29.75</td>
<td>32.44</td>
<td>35.38</td>
<td>36.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>48.06</td>
<td>46.50</td>
<td>56.81</td>
<td>59.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F value at .01 level of significance for 1, 28 d.f. = 7.64**

for each group are presented in Table 11. The mean scores obtained by each group indicated a high degree of improvement between pre and posttesting.

General Hypothesis. Black and white students' communication effectiveness can be improved through systematic training.

From the data obtained on the raters' scoring of the UES, this hypothesis can be accepted.

Hypothesis I. There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white
participants from pre to posttesting.

The data obtained on the raters' scoring of the UES indicated that this hypothesis can be accepted.

**Hypothesis II.** There will be a significant increase in communication effectiveness between black and white females over black and white males.

This hypothesis must be rejected. There was no significant interaction between the sex of the participants and raters' scoring of the UES.

**Hypothesis III.** There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between black participants and white participants.

This hypothesis must be rejected since there was no significant interaction between race and the raters' scoring of the UES.

**Hypothesis IV.** There will be a significant difference in communication effectiveness between female students and male students.

This hypothesis must be rejected. There was no significant difference between male and female students on the raters' scoring of the UES.

**Summary**

This chapter has presented the results of the study. The results indicated that systematic training in experiencing
did improve communication between black and white high school students. Nine variables were used to evaluate communication effectiveness before and after training. The data obtained from these variables were subjected to an analysis of variance to determine statistical significance. The results of the statistical analysis revealed that the training model did produce significant improvement in the students' ability to communicate with each other. From these data, the general hypothesis and hypothesis I could be accepted for all nine variables.

A secondary question asked in this study was whether or not there were any sex or race differences in communication effectiveness. It was hypothesized that there would be differences between blacks and whites, and between males and females. On three of the variables a significant sex difference in the mean scores was found. On these three variables the female groups obtained significantly higher mean scores than the male groups. However, there was no significant differences due to race on any of the variables.
CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to improve communication between black and white males and females through systematic training in experiencing. This chapter will discuss the results of the study in relation to the questions which the study sought to answer. The chapter will present a discussion of results, and limitations and implications.

Discussion and Conclusions

The major question investigated in this research was whether or not systematic training in experiencing could improve communication between black and white high school students. Nine variables were used to evaluate communication effectiveness. From the data obtained on these variables this training model was effective for improving communication between the participants.

A secondary question was the examination of possible effects of sex and race among the participants. Significant sex differences were found in the mean scores for three of the nine variables. These three variables were the females' ratings of themselves on the UES, females' ratings of each other on the CES, and the ratings of the
females on mutuality. In each case the female groups obtained higher mean scores, but in no instance was there a significant interaction between the sex of the participants and the main effect of the variable. There was no significant difference due to race on any of the variables.

Students' Ratings on the CES and UES

Students' ratings of each other on the CES indicated all the students felt better able to communicate with each other after training. The CES has been shown to be a useful instrument when measuring short term attitude change (Ivey, 1971). This instrument has been used in previous research (Aldrige, 1971; Gluckstern, 1972) to measure attitude change from pre to posttraining with positive results. These previous studies lend support to the present findings on the CES. The attitudes of the participants towards each other showed positive change from pre to posttraining.

The students used the UES to rate how well they felt they were being understood. Since this instrument was developed and validated especially for this study, no previous research on its effectiveness exists. However, the UES appeared to be a useful instrument when used to compare pre to posttraining. The items on this instrument were designed to enable the participants to determine if
they felt real involvement and sharing with their partner. Each item allowed the students to rate their feelings on a continuum from one to seven, indicating the degree to which they felt understanding and sharing of experience. From the data on this instrument the students did feel better understood after training.

From the students' ratings on the UES and the CES it can be concluded that the training in experiencing is useful for improving communication. The fact that the female groups obtained significantly higher mean scores on these instruments apparently indicated that they felt more comfortable, both in the training and with each other. The training situation required the students to discuss their feelings about being black or white in their high school. This required them to express feelings which may have been difficult for many to discuss. Jourard (1971) pointed out that males have more difficulty expressing feelings than do females. Therefore, it may have been an easier task for females which was evidenced by the ratings on these instruments.

Ratings of Videotapes

Two nonverbal dimensions, eye contact and body language were rated on the videotapes. The findings on the eye contact variable are inconsistent with existing lit-
erature. Research on visual behavior in same sex dyads (Exline, 1963; Exline, Gray & Schuette, 1965) reported that females look at one another more and maintain eye contact for longer periods of time. In these studies eye contact breaks were directly observed and recorded. In the present study eye contact was rated from videotapes on subjective scales, and judged by the ability of the participants to look at each other in a manner that would be acceptable in interpersonal interaction. This meant maintaining appropriate eye contact while speaking and listening. Appropriate eye contact was judged by the absence of staring behavior and the students' ability to engage in mutual glances which demonstrated attention and sensitivity. The difference in methodology could account for the inconsistent findings.

Body language was rated on whether or not the participants appeared comfortable and relaxed in the experimental situation. Good body language meant a slight trunk lean toward the partner and body synchrony with each other. Relaxation of the body and forward trunk lean communicates a positive attitude toward the partner (Mehrabian, 1968).

Eye contact and body language was modeled by the trainer during the training period. The students did become aware of these dimensions and imitated the modeled
behavior during the posttest. All of the students showed positive change on these dimensions from pre to posttesting.

The three verbal dimensions rated on the videotapes were self-disclosure, mutuality and depth of interpersonal exploration. These dimensions were rated on subjective scales which were meant to determine the degree of information about self shared with the other person, and the ability of the participants to explore the feelings of each other. From the ratings on the videotapes the students did improve on these dimensions after training.

Although no sex difference was found on self-disclosure in this study, the issue is a controversial one in the literature. Studies using the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard & Lasakow, 1958; Pederson & Breglio, 1968; Pederson & Higbee, 1969) indicated that females disclosed more than males. Other studies using the same instrument (Doster & Strickland, 1969; Weigel, Weigel & Chadwick, 1969; Dimond & Hellkamp, 1969) found no differences between the sexes on self-disclosure. Since a different method was used in the present study to judge self-disclosure, it is difficult to compare the results with existing research.

Those studies in self-disclosure which have investigated race indicated a difference between blacks and whites. Jourard and Lasakow (1958) and Dimond and Hell-
kamp (1969) reported that whites disclosed more than blacks. One explanation for the findings in the present study could be the fact that the participants were all from middle-class backgrounds. Cozby (1973) has suggested that social class could be a factor in self-disclosure between blacks and whites.

On the ratings for mutuality the participants all showed positive change from pre to posttraining, indicating that the training did enable the students to share their feelings with each other. Mutuality was rated on the ability of the students to share personal feelings, to understand the feelings of their partner and to communicate this understanding. The fact that the females received higher mean scores probably implied that these groups were able to relate to each other more rapidly. The training session lasted approximately one hour and fifteen minutes and it may have been difficult for all individuals, especially the male groups, to achieve mutual understanding in that time span.

Depth of interpersonal exploration was judged on the participants' skill in talking in the present tense about present feelings and exploring the feelings of each other. The ratings of the videotapes on this dimension indicated that all of the students showed positive change from pre to posttraining. This implied that the students learned
this skill and was able to use it when talking with their partner.

Raters' Scoring of CES and UES

The raters' scoring of the students on the CES and UES showed that all of the students changed in a positive direction from pre to posttraining. Although the raters saw no sex difference on these instruments, male and female students did rate themselves and each other differently on these two scales. This discrepancy could be due to the fact that the raters were viewing the videotapes and making perceptual judgements, the students were scoring their feelings at the moment. The difference between the perceptions of the raters and the moment to moment feelings of the participants could account for this discrepancy between the ratings on these instruments.

There is no doubt that the systematic training model was successful in improving communication effectiveness between the participants. The data from the scales indicated that attitudes were changed and that better understanding was achieved. Ratings on nonverbal behaviors showed that the participants improved in their ability to make eye contact and use body language which communicated attention and careful listening. The verbal expressions of the students included increased disclosure about their
feelings and a willingness to share their feelings with each other. Thus, those students who participated in this study learned the skills taught and applied them to communicate with each other.

Limitations and Implications

From the results of this study, systematic training in experiencing appears to be a viable approach to improving communication and understanding between the races. These findings are important, since methods that increase understanding and communication between black and white people are badly needed. This study showed that this kind of training can be used successfully to teach communication skills.

The major implication of this study was that there was no difference between the black and white students in communication effectiveness. This finding could be attributed to the high school in which they study was conducted. The school is located in a suburban, university community. Although the black population in the school is small, the student body is fairly homogeneous. Consequently, the black and white students performed the experimental task equally well. This finding was important because it implies that, in the future, the race factor must be examined more carefully with consideration of the specific
group of blacks and whites investigated in research.

Another implication of the study was a lack of a significant sex difference among the participants. That the males and females responded equally well to the training model probably indicated that the skills taught were applicable to all students in this age group, whether male or female. This finding implies that males as well as females were eager to improve communication between, and understanding of each other.

Although the training model proved to be effective, there were some factors which limited the investigation. These limitations should be pointed out. One of these factors was the small size of the sample. There were thirty-two participants in the study: eight white males; eight black males; eight white females and eight black females. All of these students were volunteers and all come from middle-class family backgrounds. Those students who did volunteer for the study were those who felt comfortable with a member of another race.

Even though many of the students were comfortable with each other, the presence of the videotaping equipment in the same room in which the training was conducted proved to be disruptive to many of them. This disruption could have been eliminated if it had been possible to videotape from an adjoining room. Thus, the presence of the video
camera and monitor was a limitation to the study.

Another limitation to the study was the absence of a control group. Therefore, it could not be determined whether or not the training alone served to improve communication between the students. No control group was used because in the high school in which the study was conducted, there were not enough black students who could be matched with the black participants in the study to form a comparable group.

One remaining limitation to the study must be considered. Many of the variables used to measure communication effectiveness were found to correlate at a high level of significance. For example, the two nonverbal variables correlated at the .01 level of significance. And the three verbal dimensions were all found to correlate with each other. The CES and the UES were also found to correlate at the .01 level of significance. It would appear, from these correlations, that the variables were all measuring the same thing in different ways. Of course, this was not the intention of the investigator, but must be viewed as a limitation to the study.

For future investigations those limitations mentioned should be kept in mind. And other aspects of the study should be considered as well. While the results showed positive changes in communication effectiveness, a review
of the mean scores on many of the dimensions show that the participants moved from low levels of communication effectiveness to middle levels, but did not reach the higher levels on the scales. This would indicate a need for further training. An additional training period and a third videotaping probably would have resulted in higher mean scores. Future studies should include this additional training.

Moreover, provision should be made for follow-up evaluation to determine if the skills have been retained after some time has elapsed. This study reported the results of short term change from pre to posttraining. No provision was made for retesting the participants at a later time to determine the retention of skills.

In summary, the experiencing concept as systematic training is useful in helping individuals to get in touch with their feelings, learn to verbalize these feelings to others, and communicate understanding. This approach did produce significant results among the participants in this study. A repetition of this study would appear to be a worthwhile endeavor since research in the area of black and white communication is limited. However, by taking the limitations and implications of this study into consideration, additional information and increased knowledge about communication between black and white people could be obtained.
CHAPTER VI

DISSERTATION SUMMARY: A PUBLISHABLE ARTICLE

EXPERIENCING AS SYSTEMATIC TRAINING: ITS EFFECTS ON COMMUNICATION BETWEEN BLACK AND WHITE HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Abstract
The purpose of this study was to determine whether or not systematic training in experiencing could improve communication between high school age black and white males and females. A secondary question was the examination of possible effects of sex or race on communication effectiveness. Three methods of evaluation were used to determine the effectiveness of the training; participant ratings of themselves, and each other, and the ratings of videotaped conversations in the pretest and posttest conditions by trained raters. The results indicated that communication effectiveness was improved between the participants. There was no significant interaction between the sex or race of the students and the main effect on any of the variables. The absence of sex or race differences is considered a major implication of the study.
One of the greatest social problems existing in this country today is the lack of communication between black and white Americans. Evidence of this gap in communication is apparent in the myths and stereotypic beliefs that each group continues to hold about the other (Thomas and Sillen, 1972; Grier and Cobbs, 1968; Ryan, 1972). Because of the separation between blacks and whites each group has come to their view of the world from different kinds of experiencing. If individuals can become aware of their experiencing process, and make their experience known to others, then, it may be possible to bridge the distance between the races. This paper describes a systematic training model which teaches the black and white participants to become aware of their experiencing and, then, to communicate these thoughts and feelings to another person.

Experiencing is an existential concept which is defined as the flow of feeling present in all individuals at every moment (Gendlin, 1962). These feelings can be implicit, for example, when a person is aware of a specific feeling but does not express it in words or behaviors. Or experiencing can be explicit, as when a person expresses a feeling or takes an action. Experiencing, then, is that human process that is responsible for thoughts, feelings, behaviors and actions. These thoughts and feelings
are different in each individual, and the communication of these different thoughts and feelings is necessary for full understanding (Laing, 1969). But since the experience of black and white people in America is significantly different, mutual communication and understanding is difficult. One way to bridge the communication gap is to encourage people from these diverse racial groups to share their experience with each other. When people can share their experiencing real communication and understanding can take place.

One method which has been used, with some success, to increase understanding and communication between the races is the interracial encounter group (Cobbs, 1972; Walker and Hamilton, 1973; Winter, 1971; Kranz, 1972). Another way to improve communication between blacks and whites is by teaching specific skills through systematic training which enables individuals to recognize and respond to the experiencing of each other. Three systematic training approaches which emphasize experiencing are micro-counseling (Ivey, 1971), interpersonal process recall (Kagan, 1973) and the didactic-experiential approach (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967). These three approaches encourage trainees to focus on and respond to the experiencing of others. However, the didactic-experiential approach is the only one of these methods which has been used to
train black people to function in an interracial setting (Carkhuff and Griffin, 1970; Carkhuff, 1971; Carkhuff and Berenson, 1972).

Systematic training has been shown to be effective when used to teach specific communications skills (Carkhuff, 1969; Authier, Gastafson, Guerney, Jr., and Kasdorff, 1975). Therefore, the general hypothesis in the present study was: Communication effectiveness between black and white students could be improved through systematic training in experiencing. The specific hypothesis examined the interaction of sex or race with the training.

Method

Participants. The sample population consisted of thirty-two high school students: eight white males, eight black males, eight white females and eight black females. The students were approached first by one of the high school counselors, who asked if they would like to volunteer for the research study. Those students who did volunteer then met in a group with the investigator. The purpose of the study was explained and the students were told that they would be talking to a person of another race and that videotape equipment would be present.

Procedure. The students were randomly assigned to same
sex dyads with one white person and one black person in each dyad. Each dyad was trained individually during one experimental situation, which included a pretest condition, treatment (training period) and a posttest condition. The experiment lasted for one hour and fifteen minutes for each dyad. There were seven discrete sections to the experiment. The pretest condition included a five minute videotaped conversation between the dyads which established a base line for their communication ability. Each person then rated two scales. The training period involved viewing and discussing the first videotape and learning the skills presented. The posttest condition included videotaping a five minute conversation, rating the two scales and viewing and discussion the second videotape.

**Insert Table I About Here**

**Training** The training period was based on a training manual in experiencing developed by the investigator. The manual consisted of three parts: 1. definition of experiencing, 2. examples of what experiencing is and is not, 3. five specific communication skills adapted from the Ivey and Gluckstern (1976A) direct-mutual communication manual.

During the training period the trainees first read the experiencing manual and, then, viewed and discussed their
first videotaped conversation. The investigator demonstrated and modeled the five communication skills. Each member of the dyad practiced the skills with the investigator, while the other person acted as an observer. Then, the trainees practiced the skills with each other, while the investigator observed. After the trainees practiced the skills the training period was over and the dyad began the posttest condition of the experimental situation.

**Instrumentation** Three methods of evaluation were used to test the hypotheses. The Communication Effectiveness Scale (CES) (Ivey, 1971) allowed the dyads to rate each others' effectiveness in communication before and after training. The CES is a semantic differential type Scale comprised of two parallel forms of twenty-five items each. For the purposes of this study, ten items from Form 1 were selected. These were the items which appeared most relevant to the age of the participants and which best described experiencing.

The Understanding and Experiencing Scale (UES) was used by each member of the dyad to rate themselves on their feelings of being understood before and after training. The UES is a ten item semantic differential type scale especially developed and validated for this study. The scale was developed, in part, from Van Kaam's (1959)
constituents of the experience of really feeling understood.

To validate the scale an undergraduate counseling class at the University of Massachusetts (N=14) was shown three different videotapes: one depicting low levels of understanding and experiencing, one depicting medium levels of these conditions and a third showing high levels of understanding and experiencing (Ivey and Gluckstern, 1976b). After viewing each videotape the members of the class rated it using the UES. The means for each item on the scale were computed from the three different ratings. A significant difference between the means on the three different ratings was obtained on each of those items which were used on the UES for this study. Thus, the UES was judged to be a useful instrument for determining high or low levels of experiencing and understanding.

The third method of evaluation was the rating of pre and posttest videotaped conversations. Trained raters scored the students on two nonverbal and three verbal dimensions according to scales developed for the study. The nonverbal dimensions were eye contact and body language; the verbal dimensions were self-disclosure, mutuality and depth of interpersonal exploration. These dimensions were each rated on a five point scale with anchor statements provided for each numerical value (one low—three medium—five high).
The raters on the randomly arranged videotapes were a teacher in the local school system and a graduate student in counseling. Prior to rating the student conversations, guidelines were established regarding the meaning of each point on the several scales. The raters, then, used practice tapes to determine whether or not they were in agreement.

The two raters independently rated the participants' videotaped conversations. After rating each individual on the nonverbal and verbal dimensions, the raters also used the CES and UES to rate each participant in the pretest and posttest condition. A Pearson Correlation Coefficient was computed for rater agreement between the two raters on the five dimensions rated on the student videotapes and on the CES and UES. The correlations ranged from .95 to .85 on the videotape ratings and the r for the CES and UES was .75 and .67, respectively.

Since nine different variables were being used to measure communication effectiveness, a pretest intercorrelation matrix was computed to determine the relationship among the variables. Some of the variables were found to be correlated with each other. The two nonverbal dimensions tended to correlate highly (.79) as did the three verbal dimensions (.47 to .79). The CES and UES ratings also produced high correlations (.71 and .84). No corre-
lation was found between the verbal dimensions and the two scales on the eye contact variable, or the CES and either of the nonverbal dimensions. These intercorrelations should be kept in mind in interpreting data from the study.

Insert Table 2 About Here

Results

An analysis of variance incorporating sex and race in the two experimental conditions was computed for each of the nine variables (Tables 3 through 11). An F value beyond the .01 level of significance was obtained on each of the variables. The results of the statistical analysis supported the general hypothesis and indicated that systematic training in experiencing was effective for improving communication between the black and white students. Although the female groups received significantly higher mean scores on three of the variables, the CES the UES and observer ratings on mutuality, (See Tables 3, 4, and 8), neither the sex nor the race of the participants produced significant interaction with the main effect of the variable.
Discussion

The major question investigated in this study was whether or not systematic training in experiencing could improve communication between black and white high school students. The results indicated that the students did improve greatly in their ability to communicate with each other. A secondary question was the examination of possible differences in communication skills due to sex or race. The female groups did seem able to relate to each other more rapidly and were more comfortable in the training situation. The females obtained higher mean scores on all of the variables (although only three reached significance) and the general trend was toward a sex difference. However, there was no significant interaction between sex and the main effect of the variables.

There was no significant effect of race on any of the nine variables. It had been hypothesized that there would be differences between blacks and whites based on research in the literature. Those studies which have investigated the effect of race on self-disclosure, for example, indi-
cated that whites tended to disclose more about themselves than blacks (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958; Dimond and Hellkamp, 1969).

One explanation for the finding in the present study could be Cozby's (1973) suggestion that social class may be a factor in explaining the difference in self-disclosure. The participants in this study all had middle-class backgrounds and were attending a high school which is located in a suburban, university community. Although the black population in the school is small, the student body is fairly homogeneous. Consequently, the black and white students performed the experimental task equally well. This finding was important because it implies that, in the future, the race factor must be examined more carefully, with consideration of the specific group of blacks and whites investigated in research.

The results pertaining to sex also differed in some instances from existing literature. The findings on the ratings of eye contact indicated no sex differences. These findings are inconsistent with the literature on this variable. Research on visual behavior in same sex dyads (Exline, 1963; Exline, Gray and Schutte, 1965) reported that females look at one another more and maintain eye contact for longer periods of time. In the studies cited eye contact breaks were directly observed and recorded. In the present study eye contact was rated from videotapes
on a subjective scale and was judged by the ability of the participants to engage in mutual glances which demonstrated attention and sensitivity. The difference in methodology could account for the inconsistent findings.

Another variable which produced no significant sex differences was self-disclosure. Self-disclosure is a controversial issues in the literature. Studies using Jourard's (1971) Self-Disclosure Questionnaire (Jourard and Lasakow, 1958; Pederson and Breglio, 1968; Pederson and Higbee, 1969) indicated that females disclosed more than males. Other studies using the same instrument (Doster and Strickland, 1969; Weigel, Weigel and Chadwick, 1969; Dimond and Hellkamp, 1969) found no differences between the sexes on self-disclosure. Since a different method was used to determine self-disclosure in the present study, it is difficult to compare the results with existing research.

The two rating scales used by the students were intended to measure their attitudes toward each other and their own feelings of being understood. The CES, which was used by the students to rate each other, has been shown to be a useful instrument when measuring short term attitude change (Ivey, 1971). This instrument has been used in previous research (Aldrige, 1971; Gluckstern, 1972) to measure attitude change from pre to posttraining with
positive results. The UES was used by the students to rate how well they felt they were being understood. The items on this instrument were designed to enable the participants to determine if they felt real involvement and sharing with their partner. From the data on these two instruments, the attitudes of the participants toward each other showed positive change from pre to posttraining and the students did feel better understood after training.

From the data obtained on the nine variables there is no doubt that the training model was successful in improving communication effectiveness between the participants. The data from the scales indicated that attitudes were changed and that better understanding was achieved. Ratings on nonverbal behaviors showed that the participants improved in their ability to make eye contact and use body language which communicated attention and careful listening. The verbal expressions of the students included increased disclosure about their feelings and a willingness to share their feelings with each other. Thus, those students who participated in this study learned the skills taught and applied them to communicate with each other.

While the results indicated that the training model was effective, the discussion brings to light some limitations which must be considered. The participants were all volunteers who perhaps already felt comfortable talk-
ing to someone of another race. Another important factor was the lack of a control group. Thus, the results may not be due exclusively to the training, but may represent simple effects over time.

Table 12 presents the posttest intercorrelation of the nine dependent variables. It may be noted that a considerable increase in correlation may be found among all variables. A major issue in the study is the correlation of the variables. This presents some problems of interpretation of these data. However, it was not surprising that the several dimensions correlated with each other more highly after training. Dimensions of eye contact and body language are closely related and if the participants maintained good eye contact, they probably exhibited good body language as well, particularly in the follow-up session. The correlation of the verbal dimensions was not unexpected since those dimensions being rated required the students to engage in mutual self-disclosure and exploration. The correlation of the CES and UES probably indicated a halo effect in the students ratings of themselves and each other and suggest that the instruments are measuring the same thing, perhaps a general evaluation of the quality of the interview. The sharp increase in intercorrelations would seem to mean that trainees have been made more similar in communication ef-
feci

However, it is becoming increasingly apparent that when any investigator uses multiple measures to study the impact of any program, there is need to examine the inter-relation among the dependent variables. One could argue in a study such as this that the effects of training represent improvement on some general construct of communication effectiveness. Nonetheless, the findings of some of the expected sex differences and the lack of black/white differences do seem to represent important and solid findings, contrary to much of the literature. Clearly, socio-economic class and educational background need to be taken into account in defining any study of black/white communications.

Implications

From the results of the study systematic training in experiencing appears to be a viable approach for improving communication and understanding between the races. These findings are important since methods that increase understanding and communication between black and white people are badly needed. This study demonstrated that this kind of training can be used successfully to teach specific skills which enable individuals to relate to one another by exploring their moment to moment feelings.
Systematic training in experiencing would be valuable for teachers and counselors who work with people from many different ethnic backgrounds. Through this kind of training these professionals could increase their knowledge of the experiencing of their pupils and clients. They could, then, share these skills by teaching their pupils and clients the experiencing process. Using this training model, counselors could train a core group of students who could, then, function as peer trainers in experiencing, so that communication barriers between students of different ethnic backgrounds could be broken down.

This kind of systematic training in communication between blacks and whites is a good vehicle for future research since existing research in this area is limited. In future research it would be important to conduct a follow-up evaluation to determine the retention of the skills learned. Longer training sessions could be used which included an additional training period and a third videotaping. This would probably result in even greater positive change in communication effectiveness. Eventually, plans for generalization and continuation of learned behavior need to be made or the learnings in this brief laboratory training will be lost.

It is clear that a need exists for improved communication and understanding between black and white persons in this country. Better communication and understanding
can be achieved when people are able to listen to each other and understand the experience of one another. The experiencing concept, when used with a systematic training model, was effective in helping individuals to get in touch with their feelings, to learn to verbalize these feelings to others, and have these feelings understood.
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TABLE 1
Design of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Black and White Females</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Five minute videotaped conversation between same sex dyads.</th>
<th>Rating CES and UES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Presentation of training manual. Viewing of initial conversation. Demonstration and modeling of skills. Practice of skills by dyads.</td>
<td>Black and White Males</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>Second five minute videotaped conversation</td>
<td>Rating of CES and UES. Viewing of second videotaped conversation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 2

**PRETEST INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR NINE VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eye Contact</th>
<th>Body Language</th>
<th>Self-disclosure</th>
<th>Mutuality</th>
<th>Depth of interpersonal exploration</th>
<th>Understanding and Experiencing Scale</th>
<th>Communication Effectiveness Scale</th>
<th>Raters UES</th>
<th>Raters CES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body language</td>
<td>.790**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disclosure</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.409*</td>
<td>.562**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.789**</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>.264</td>
<td>.366*</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.471**</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and Experiencing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.713**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effectiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raters UES</td>
<td>.578**</td>
<td>.626**</td>
<td>.405*</td>
<td>.659**</td>
<td>.369*</td>
<td>.319</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raters CES</td>
<td>.700**</td>
<td>.722**</td>
<td>.346</td>
<td>.571**</td>
<td>.316</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>.840**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance at .01 level**

* Significance at .05 level
### TABLE 3
ANALYSIS FOR VARIANCE FOR CES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1024.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1024.00</td>
<td>6.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>110.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>110.25</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>4146.12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>148.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>1870.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1870.56</td>
<td>22.68**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES X S</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES X R</td>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.06</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES X S X R</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>2309.13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>43.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Males</td>
<td>44.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Females</td>
<td>54.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Females</td>
<td>65.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F value at .01 level of significance for 1, 28 d.f. = 7.64*

**F value at .05 level of significance for 1, 28 d.f. = 4.20**

### TABLE 4
ANALYSIS FOR VARIANCE FOR UES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>770.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>770.06</td>
<td>6.60*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81.00</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>68.06</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>3267.63</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>116.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UES</td>
<td>2575.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2575.56</td>
<td>51.07**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UES X S</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.00</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UES X R</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UES X S X R</td>
<td>72.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.25</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>1412.13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50.43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>40.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Males</td>
<td>39.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Females</td>
<td>49.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Females</td>
<td>58.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*F value at .01 level of significance for 1, 28 d.f. = 7.64*

**F value at .05 level of significance for 1, 28 d.f. = 4.20**
### TABLE 5
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EYE CONTACT RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>40.97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye contact</td>
<td>58.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58.14</td>
<td>143.51**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC X S</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC X R</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC X S X R</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F Value at .01 level of significance for 1, 28 d.f. = 7.64**

### TABLE 6
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR BODY LANGUAGE RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>41.80</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body language</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38.29</td>
<td>82.56**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL X S</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL X R</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL X S X R</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>12.98</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell Means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Males</th>
<th>Black Males</th>
<th>White Females</th>
<th>Black Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F Value at .01 level of significance for 1, 28 d.f. = 7.64**
### TABLE 7
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SELF-DISCLOSURE RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>26.38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disclosure</td>
<td>31.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.64</td>
<td>97.76**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD X S</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD X R</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD X S X R</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Males</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** F Value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64
* F Value at .05 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 4.20

### TABLE 8
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR MUTUALITY RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>4.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>19.11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mutuality</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.97</td>
<td>82.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M X S</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M X R</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M X S X R</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell Means</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Males</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Males</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** F value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64
* F value at .05 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 4.20
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth of Inter-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal Exploration</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26.91</td>
<td>87.52**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth X S</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth X R</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth X S X R</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F Value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64**

**F Value at .05 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 4.20**
### TABLE 10
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATERS SCORING OF CES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>1097.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1097.27</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>189.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189.06</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>8553.84</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>305.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raters CES</td>
<td>3937.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3937.56</td>
<td>110.74**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raters CES X S</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>85.56</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raters CES X R</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.02</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCES X S X R</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>995.59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>35.56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell Means**

- White Males: 37.38
- Black Males: 41.00
- White Females: 42.56
- Black Females: 47.75

**Pretest**

- White: 37.38
- Black: 41.00
- Females: 42.56
- Males: 47.75

**Posttest**

- White: 52.25
- Black: 52.88
- Females: 61.00
- Males: 65.31

**F** value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64

### TABLE 11
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR RATERS SCORING OF UES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>976.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>976.56</td>
<td>3.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22.56</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex X Race</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (a)</td>
<td>9038.31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>322.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raters UES</td>
<td>5833.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5833.14</td>
<td>155.80**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R UES X S</td>
<td>135.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135.14</td>
<td>3.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R UES X R</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R UES X S X R</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error (b)</td>
<td>1048.31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>37.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cell Means**

- White Males: 29.75
- Black Males: 32.44
- White Females: 35.28
- Black Females: 36.63

**Pretest**

- White: 29.75
- Black: 32.44
- Females: 35.28
- Males: 36.63

**Posttest**

- White: 48.06
- Black: 46.50
- Females: 56.81
- Males: 59.19

**F** value at .01 level of significance for 1,28 d.f. = 7.64
### TABLE 12

**POSTTEST INTERCORRELATION MATRIX FOR NINE VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eye Contact</th>
<th>Body Language</th>
<th>Self-disclosure</th>
<th>Mutuality</th>
<th>Depth of interpersonal exploration</th>
<th>Understanding and Experiencing Scale</th>
<th>Communication Effectiveness Scale</th>
<th>Raters UES</th>
<th>Raters CES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eye contact</strong></td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Body language</strong></td>
<td>0.897**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-disclosure</strong></td>
<td>0.581**</td>
<td>0.688**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mutuality</strong></td>
<td>0.724**</td>
<td>0.812**</td>
<td>0.767**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Depth of</strong></td>
<td>0.670**</td>
<td>0.748**</td>
<td>0.915**</td>
<td>0.815**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>interpersonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>exploration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Understanding and</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experiencing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Communication</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Effectiveness</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raters</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UES</strong></td>
<td>0.735**</td>
<td>0.820**</td>
<td>0.614**</td>
<td>0.715**</td>
<td>0.645**</td>
<td>0.640**</td>
<td>0.587**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Raters CES</strong></td>
<td>0.787**</td>
<td>0.855**</td>
<td>0.640**</td>
<td>0.781**</td>
<td>0.706**</td>
<td>0.550**</td>
<td>0.456**</td>
<td>0.945**</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significance**

**Significance at .01 level**  
**Significance at .05 level**
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APPENDIX I

Letter to Parents or Guardian of Participants

and

Parental Permission Sheet
October 1, 1975

Dear Parent,

Your son/daughter has been selected to take part in a research study focusing on communication between black and white high school students. The study will involve a one hour session and will be scheduled to minimize class conflicts. It is also possible to schedule these sessions after regular class hours if you and/or your son/daughter would prefer. The study is begin undertaken as a doctoral research project under the direction of Dr. Allen Ivey, School of Education, University of Massachusetts.

Approximately fifteen minutes of the sessions will be videotaped and scored later for data collection by specially trained raters. All videotapes will be held confidential and will not be seen by anyone except the rater and me, director of the sessions. After data collection is completed, the tapes will be erased.

This study will begin early in October and should be completed within six weeks. The project is aimed toward more effective black/white communication and should be enjoyable as well as beneficial. If you have any questions or would like more information please feel free to contact me at 256-0306 or Dr. Ivey at 545-3629.

In order for you son/daughter to participate in this study his/her parent or guardian must sign the attached permission form and return it to the Principal's Office by October 8, 1975.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Winifred S. Noel
Doctoral Student
University of Massachusetts

Students who participate in this project will receive a $2.00 honorarium.
TO: Principal's Office
   Amherst Regional High School

Permission is given for my son/daughter ___________________________

name of student

to participate in the study as described in Ms. Noel's letter.

Check one:

______ My son/daughter may remain after school hours for
      the sessions.

______ My son/daughter may not remain after school hours
      for the sessions.

_____________________________   ___________________________
Date                                           Signature of Parent or Guardian
APPENDIX II

EXPERIENCING MANUAL
SYSTEMATIC TRAINING IN EXPERIENCING BETWEEN BLACKS AND WHITES

You will be working in a program designed to increase communication between black and white people. Emphasis in this program is on becoming aware of your moment to moment experiencing AND THE EXPERIENCING OF YOUR PARTNER. During the first videotaped conversation I would like you to try to talk about your feelings as a black or white person in Amherst Regional High School.
The purpose of this training is to improve communication by trying to understand the feelings and moment to moment experiencing of yourself and your partner. By trying a new way of talking to another person you will get to know and understand him/her better. Good communication means having respect for the other person and believing in the right of people to differ and be different from you. Rather than "sell you point of view," hear the other individual accurately and actively support differences of opinion and belief. The "put down" or the specific belittling of an individual and his/her ideas and opinions can be considered the opposite of showing respect.

WHAT DOES EXPERIENCING MEAN?

EXPERIENCING IS THE MOMENT TO MOMENT FEELINGS THAT EACH OF US HAVE AS WE GO ABOUT OUR DAILY LIVES. IT IS THE CONTINUOUS FLOW OF FEELING WHICH IS WITH EACH PERSON AT EVERY MOMENT. EXPERIENCING IS AN ASPECT OF HUMAN LIFE THAT IS ALWAYS PRESENT AND UNDERLIES EVERY INSTANCE OF BEHAVIOR AND THOUGHT.

HERE ARE SOME EXAMPLES OF WHAT EXPERIENCING IS AND IS NOT.

Experiencing is: Trying as much as possible to understand what your partner means by what he/she is saying.

Experiencing is not: Knowing that you do not understand what your partner is saying and not saying that you do not understand.
Experiencing is: Accepting your partner as a fellow human being and acknowledging this acceptance.

Experiencing is not: Determining whether or not you accept partner on the basis of how he/she is dressed, or by a stereotypic view of the other person.

Experiencing is: Talking about yourself and your partner and how you feel about the relationship now.

Experiencing is not: Talking about other people who are not present.

Experiencing is: Talking in the present tense about present feelings.

Experiencing is not: Talking in the past tense about past events.

Experiencing is: Allowing your partner time to talk about his/her reactions to your experiences.

Experiencing is not: Talking continuously without asking for your partner's reaction to what you are saying.

THIS TRAINING SEEKS TO HAVE THE TWO OF YOU SHARE YOUR HERE AND NOW MOMENT TO MOMENT EXPERIENCING WITH EACH OTHER.

TO DO THIS HERE ARE SOME HELPFUL SKILLS:

1. Look at your partner and listen carefully to what he/she is saying. Make sure you have heard what your partner has said by paraphrasing or summarizing what he/she said. You may say, "I hear you saying. . . ." If you don't understand what your partner has said ask him/her to clarify his meaning. You may say, "I don't understand what you mean." Or "What do you mean by that?"
2. **Express your reactions to your partner about what he/she has just said.** You can respond by expressing your feelings and thoughts to your partner, and you may add new information from your own experience.

3. **Get your partner's reaction to what you have said.** Check out with your partner how your comment was received. You may ask, "How do you react to what I have just said?"

4. **Use your partner's name or use personal pronouns (I, we, me, my) when you respond to him/her.**

5. **Always talk in the present tense.**
APPENDIX III

Communication Effectiveness Scale
COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS SCALE

Place a check mark in the space that best describes your feeling about your partner in the conversation you have just completed. EXAMPLE: Good : X : Bad

sensitive ___:___:___:___:___:___ insensitive
nervous ___:___:___:___:___:___ calm
confident ___:___:___:___:___:___ hesitant
skilled ___:___:___:___:___:___ unskilled
attentive ___:___:___:___:___:___ unattentive
comfortable ___:___:___:___:___:___ uncomfortable
interesting ___:___:___:___:___:___ dull
confused ___:___:___:___:___:___ sensible
tense ___:___:___:___:___:___ relaxed
polite ___:___:___:___:___:___ rude
APPENDIX IV

Understanding and Experiencing Scale
# UNDERSTANDING AND EXPERIENCING SCALE

Place a check mark in the space above the number which you feel best describes your feelings about the conversation you have just completed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Feel personal involvement with my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Perceive signs of understanding from my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Don't know how I feel about this relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My partner co-experiences what things mean to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Able to communicate to my partner what my feelings are.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I feel a lack of acceptance from my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I feel satisfied with this conversation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I do not feel safe in this relationship.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I feel uptight and distant.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I feel safe in sharing an experience with my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feel uninvolved with my partner.
See no signs that my partner understands me.
Able to define my feelings about this relationship.
My partner fails to see the world as I see it.
Cannot communicate my feelings to my partner.
I feel that my partner accepts me.
I feel no satisfaction from this conversation.
I feel safe in the relationship with my partner.
I feel initial relief from being alone.
I cannot share my experience with my partner.
APPENDIX V

Rules for Rating Videotapes
RULES FOR RATING VIDEOTAPES

Each partner of the dyad will be rated separately. Raters will rate each person on five dimensions: eye contact, body language, self-disclosure, mutuality and depth of interpersonal exploration. A five point scale is given for each dimension. Each point on the scale carries a numerical value of 1 to 5 (1 being low—5 being high). Anchor statements are provided for each point on the scale regarding the type of behavior or expression which would receive that numerical value. When viewing the tape, watch one person at a time, (Person A--Person B). Rate Person A on all dimensions, rewind the tape and rate Person B. Each rater will then complete the CES and UES for each person.

Anchor statements for each dimension follow:

I. Eye Contact

1. Person avoids eye contact, keeps head lowered or looks away.

2. Person is uncertain and hesitates to maintain eye contact. Person makes few eye contacts with partner.

3. Person is somewhat attentive, looks at partner and makes eye contact most of the time, may look away, or stare inappropriately at times.

4. Person is attentive, varies eye contact, person is able to maintain good eye contact most of the time.

5. Observes closely, very attentive, good use of varied eye contact, few eye contact breaks, appropriate if they occur, sensitive to other person.

II. Body Language

1. Person is rigid, appears uncomfortable, body is turned away from partner, head lowered.

2. Person changes body position often, body appears closed (arms folded).

3. Body is relaxed, slight movement, body appears more open, arms unfolded.
4. Body movement is appropriate, use of hand and arms in animated speech.

5. Body appears completely comfortable, slight trunk lean toward partner. Body seems to be in synchrony with partner.

III. Self-disclosure

1. Person does not disclose any of his/her own feelings to the partner, talks only about other persons or things, not about self (they, it, he, she).

2. Person seldom volunteers information about own feelings. May answer questions about self in vague manner. Person talks about other persons and things, with occasional reference to self.

3. Person communicates openness to partner about self, talks about other people and things in relation to self.

4. Person freely gives information about personal ideas, attitudes, and experience, talks about self and personal feelings most of the time, referring to others and things some of the time.

5. Person expresses intimate feelings about self to partner, talks exclusively about self and personal feelings, attitudes and experiences (I, me, my).

IV. Mutuality

1. Person is unable to follow what partner is saying and moves to another topic.

2. Person is able to follow topic.

3. Person begins to share some personal feelings and relate to partner, some sharing of own feelings.

4. Person shows understanding of partner's feelings and thoughts and communicates this understanding. May share own feelings.

5. Person is able to understand the feelings of partner and share own personal feelings in depth.
V. Depth of Interpersonal Exploration

1. Person talks in the past tense about other persons and things.

2. Person talks in the present tense about other persons and things, may talk about self in the past.

3. Able to communicate in present tense some of the time, some reference to self and present feelings.

4. Person talks in present tense, may talk about self in depth.

5. Person talks about present feelings and explores the feelings of each other in depth.
APPENDIX VI

Score Sheet for Rating Videotapes
SCORING SHEET FOR RATING VIDEOTAPES

Read the rules for rating videotapes as you watch the tape. Place a numerical value for Person A in the space provided for each dimension. Rewind the tape and rater Person B, placing a numerical value in the space which you feel best describes that person's behavior on each dimension.

Tape Number_________________ Rater Number_________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Eye Contact</th>
<th>Body Language</th>
<th>Self-disclosure</th>
<th>Mutuality</th>
<th>Depth of interpersonal Exploration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>