This dissertation has been microfilmed exactly as received

69-1980

CARMICHAEL, Warren Clifton, 1926-AN INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS TOWARD HUMAN RELATION ISSUES.

The University of Oklahoma, Ed.D., 1968 Education, general

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

MARREN CLIFTON CARMICHAEL 1969

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

THE UNIVERSITY OF OKLAHOMA GRADUATE COLLEGE

AN INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS TOWARD HUMAN RELATION ISSUES

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE FACULTY

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the

degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

WARREN C. CARMICHAEL
Norman, Oklahoma
1968

AN INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS TOWARD HUMAN RELATION ISSUES

APPROVED BY

DISSERTATION COMMITTEE

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. Glenn R. Snider, chairman of his doctoral committee, for his leadership and assistance in developing this investigation, and for his contributions to the field of human relations. Grateful appreciation is also extended to the other members of the committee: Dr. Henry Angelino, Dr. Robert Ohm, Dr. Omer Rupiper, and Dr. Fred Sloan.

A special expression of gratitude is extended to Dr. Omer Rupiper for his substantial assistance on statistical procedures.

Especially the writer wishes to express a most sincere gratitude to his wife and daughters for their patience and encouragement during this study. Without their understanding and support the study would have been impossible.

In addition, grateful acknowledgment is extended to the individual members of the Jury of Judges for their invaluable assistance and the Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies for its cooperation toward completion of this investigation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
LIST OF	TABLES	v
Chapter		
I.	THE PROBLEM	1
	Introduction Need for the Study Statement of the Problem Delimitations Definition of Terms Procedure Organization of the Study	
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	115
	Q Methodology Other Related Literature Education of Minority Peoples in the American Culture	
III.	RESULTS OF THE JURY OF JUDGES	47
IV.	RESULTS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS	53
	Significance of Correlations Analysis of Statements Significance of the Distribution of Item Selections	
v.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	80
APPENDI	XES	89
	Appendix A Appendix B Appendix C	
BIBLIOG	RAPHY	105

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I.	Frequency of Item Selection by Jury of Judges on Original List of Statements	50
II.	Correlations and Transformed r to z' between First and Second Q Sorts	55
III.	School A. Individual Item Distribution Frequency for the First Sort	59
IV.	School B. Individual Item Distribution Frequency for the First Sort	61

v

AN INSTRUMENT TO MEASURE ATTITUDES AND OPINIONS TOWARD HUMAN RELATION ISSUES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Modern education, if it is to be its true self, must aim at the good life both socially and individually. It must also support and promote better human relations wherever these are now not satisfactory. I

Most human behavior is learned.² No child is born prejudiced. Children are taught adult prejudices. Prejudice has been with us a long time, and it is so intimately interwoven with our way of life that it becomes difficult not to transmit it to our children.

Alport³ gives two reasons why change in prejudiced attitudes of some people is not to be expected: For one

William H. Kilpatrick, Modern Education and Better Human Relations (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1957), p. 7.

²James Deese, <u>The Psychology of Learning</u> (New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1958), p. 1.

³Gordon W. Alport, <u>The Resolution of Intergroup</u>
<u>Tensions</u> (New York: The National Conference of Christians and Jews), p. 6.

thing the whole economy of their lives may be erected on the assumption that certain out-groups are inferior, threatening, or contemptible. A second obdurate fact is that prejudiced attitudes receive continual support from the social environment.

In <u>The Authoritarian Personality</u> the thinking of people with such prejudices are categorized: in-groups are good, out-groups bad; in-groups clean, out-groups dirty. It is not to be expected that such lives can be easily recentered. Prejudice has too profound a functional significance for such individuals to be changed by exhortation, by knowledge, or by argument. 2

There are reasons, however, why change in attitudes may be expected. Prejudiced attitudes have no hereditary basis. Not only is prejudice itself learned, but so are all of its ingredients. What is learned can, theoretically at least, be unlearned.

Another positive sign is the inexhaustible faith of Americans in environmentalism. We do not believe in the aristocratic ideals that caste and caste attitudes are imperishable. We believe in the efficacy of education.

¹T. W. Adorno, E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D. J. Levinson, and R. N. Sanford, <u>The Authoritarian Personality</u> (New York: Harper and Bros., 1950), p. 27.

²Alport, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 6.

³<u>Ibid</u>., p. 7.

Psychologists today are deeply concerned with "learning theory." In order to have a thorough understanding of almost any problem in psychology, we should know what effect learning and different learning experiences have upon the particular problem we are studying. 1

"Learning experiences" become vital essentials to the educational process. Noar² has emphasized that "information is not enough." There are many people, educators and laymen, who believe that the primary responsibility of the school is to give children information. These people would contend that the solution to human relation tensions lies in giving people information about religions, about the social class and caste structure of American society, and about distant lands and cultures.

Information and facts are important. Any school that fails to afford its pupils the opportunity to get facts is not meeting the demands of today's schools.

Nevertheless, current evidence in the field of education points to the fact that information is not enough--

to create people with generous outgoing personalities able to lead rich abundant lives;

to give people the courage needed to stand up and be counted in the fight against prejudice, discrimination and bigotry;

Deese, op. cit., p. 1.

York: The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1961), p. 5.

to enable adults of this generation to cure the human relations illnesses which beset our times: delinquency, crime and moral breakdown, divorce and the deterioration of family life, mental illness and emotionally caused illnesses, interracial and international strife.

If dispensing of information is not enough, what else is required of all American educational and social institutions? Noar has listed four paramount needs:

- . . . help the pupil to create a self-concept that permits him to like himself and, therefore to like others; one that enables him to move positively toward others who, in one way or another, are different from himself.
- . . . learn certain human relations skills.
- . . . good human relations requires the inculcation of positive attitudes towards others, towards differences, towards democracy, towards life itself.
- • responsibility for providing minority group children with status-building experiences.²

How may these concepts, skills, attitudes, and experiences be developed? How does the school, or any concerned agency, determine the areas in which it shall direct its attention? It may be assumed that maximal results can only be expected when the greatest efforts are aimed at the most persistent negative human relations attitudes.

The measurement of attitudes at best is a difficult task. Much work has been done in recent years on attitude and personality inventories. The <u>Sixth Mental Measurements</u>

¹<u>Ibid</u>., p. 5.

²<u>Ibid</u>., pp. 5-6.

Yearbook¹ gives a comprehensive listing of these tests. This source listed one hundred forty-six tests relative to the measurement of attitudes and personality. However, none of these tests was appropriate for measuring attitudes toward individuals of majority and/or minority groups, or toward basic issues and problems relevant to human relations.² Although much has been written in recent years concerning human relations, few have attempted to seriously attack the problem of measuring attitudes toward important human relations issues and problems facing this society. Remmers has contributed much to the area of attitude scale development and has edited three significant reviews of studies in attitudes.^{3,4,5}

The search for standardized tests in measuring attitudes proved to be unproductive. The response to a

¹⁰scar K. Buros (Editor), Sixth Mental Measure-ments Yearbook (Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965).

Hereafter the terms human relations, interpersonal relations, and intergroup relations will be used synonymously.

³H. H. Remmers, and Others, "Studies in Attitudes--A Contribution to Social-Psychological Research Methods," Studies in Higher Education XXVI. Bulletin of Purdue University, Vol. XXXV, No. 4, December, 1934.

⁴H. H. Remmers (Editor), "Further Studies in Attitudes, Series II," <u>Studies in Higher Education XXXI</u>, Purdue University, 1936.

⁵H. H. Remmers (Editor), <u>Anti-Democratic Attitudes</u> in <u>American Schools</u>. (Northwestern University Press, 1963).

letter of inquiry to the major testing companies produced a dismal return: "I'm sorry, we have done no work . . ."

Some suggestions of personality inventories were given, but nothing that related closely to the human relations dimension. A letter of reply from Mr. Phillip H. Webber, Coordinator of Professional Services for California Test Bureau, is representative of the replies: "It probably is not quite what you want, but may be as close as anything you can find."

Need for the Study

The Center for Continuing Education at the University of Oklahoma is doing much through its Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies in the resolution of problems and issues which provoke tension and conflict in many American communities. The work of the Center has been hampered in a degree due to the lack of an instrument for determining the attitudes of the participating school personnel when they arrive at the Center for human relations conferences.

This Center and others of its kind over the nation would without doubt function more effectively in the future if it were able to utilize an effective instrument for the determination of attitudes and opinions relating to the crucial problems and issues normally a part of the human relations dimension. The coming years will bring thousands of efforts over the country through in-service programs of

school faculties in this neglected area of human relations. This task will undoubtedly be forwarded by the availability of an adequate instrument for the determination of attitudes held by teachers and school administrators.

Statement of the Problem

The basic problem of this study was to develop and validate an instrument which would identify attitudes and opinions of an individual or group toward other individuals and/or groups in areas where conflict, misunderstanding, and tension often appear.

Delimitations

- (1) That attitudes toward individuals and/or groups and human relation issues and problems can be measured.
- (2) That an easily administered instrument which will identify attitudes in the area of human relations will appreciably aid and contribute to the effectiveness of institutions engaging in the education of school personnel.
- (3) The instrument is limited to determining attitudes and opinions of individuals concerning the identified issues and problems relevant to the human relations dimension.
- (4) The instrument may be used to identify negative human relation attitudes and opinions; not to develop procedures designed to change these attitudes and opinions.

<u>Definitions</u>

Interpersonal Relations:

Any social interaction or behavior involving two or more persons.

Intergroup Relations:

Any social interaction or behavior between individuals within a group or between members of different groups.

Human Relations:

Those ways of mutual behavior which by common consent are recognized as essential to promoting and safeguarding the desired quality of human living in a democratic society. 1

Attitude:

The sum-total of man's inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specific topic.

Opinion:

A verbal expression of attitude. Commonly used as a means of measuring attitudes. It must be recognized that there is a discrepancy, some error of measurement as it were, between the opinion or overt action that we use as an index and the attitude that we infer from such action.³

Q Methodology:

Also called Q Technique or Q Sort. Q Technique centers particularly in the sorting of cards and in the correlations among the responses of different individuals to the Q sorts. Q Technique is mainly a sophisticated form of rank-ordering a set of objects--colors, verbal statements, single words, phrases, pictures--given to an individual to sort into a set of piles according to some criteria.

Unstructured Q Sort:

An unstructured Q sort is a set of items assembled without specific regard to the variables or factors

¹William H. Kilpatrick, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 7.

²L. L. Thurstone, <u>The Measurement of Attitude</u> (University of Chicago Press, 1929), p. 6.

³Ib<u>id</u>., p. 8.

underlying the items. The items of an unstructured Q sort are like the items of a personality or attitude scale: they are selected to measure one broad variable--in this case the human relations dimension.

Procedure

An unstructured Q sort distribution of eighty items was used. Items were developed for each of the following areas: Racial, Religious, Socio-Economic, Education, Judicial, and Governmental. The Racial area was divided into three categories--Negro, Indian, and Other minority groups--with ten items in each of these three categories. The other five major areas also had ten items in each of the areas.

Theoretically, any sample of homogeneous items can be used in an unstructured Q sort. The items of an unstructured Q sort are like the items of a personality or attitude scale: They are selected and used because they presumably measure one broad variable. In this study the "broad variable" was a set of attitudes about the problems and issues relevant to the various human relations dimensions. Each item of the scale was directed toward one of the specific human relations areas previously listed.

A jury of eleven judges was selected from recognized leaders in the field of human relations. A list of thirty items in each of the eight selected areas was constructed from statements selected from current literature,

books, newspapers, periodicals, and other sources. Each judge chose the fifteen items he thought to be most significant for identifying both positive and negative attitudes from the list of thirty items for each of the eight selected areas, with the opportunity of changing the construction of the items if he so desired. The results of the evaluations made by each judge were tallied. The final list of eighty items, ten from each area, included those items most frequently chosen by the jury of judges.

The examinee was instructed to distribute the eighty item Q sort into eleven piles along a continuum from "most approve" to "least approve":

	Most A	Appro	ve						Leas	st A _I	prov	rе
Score	11	10	_9_	_8	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
Pile	Ā	В	С	D	E	F	G	H	Ī	J	K	_

The examinee was instructed to complete the sort in three steps. The first step of the sorting process was the sorting of the eighty items into three piles as they were read:

Approve -- Disapprove -- Neutral

The next step was that of re-reading the items in each of the three piles and making further distinctions by placing each card along the continuum, A through K, according to the degree of approval or disapproval of the item on each card. The piles toward the middle from either extreme indicated a more neutral attitude about the item being considered.

After the examinee had placed all eighty items along the continuum, he was to begin at either of the extremes and work alternately from one end back to the other until the middle pile was reached. He was to read each item in each pile and make final selections of all items so that eventually all of the items had been placed in the eleven piles in accordance with the number of cards permitted in each pile. The final number of items permitted in each of the eleven piles was as follows:

	${ t Most}$	Appr	rove						Leas	Least Approve		
Pile	A	В	С	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	
Number of Items	2	4	6	9	12	14	12	9	6	4	2	_

There were no right or wrong selections in this exercise. Each person was to place each individual item into a pile according to his own likes and desires. These cards did not need to be ranked within the pile; all had the same value. The examinee could shift any card from one pile to another pile at any time during the sorting process, the only restriction being that the final distribution must have the pre-determined number of cards in each of the eleven piles.

Once the examinee had completed the sorting process to his satisfaction, he was to transfer the identification number found on each card to the answer sheet in the following manner: Each pile on the score sheet was to have the required number of blank spaces above the letter pile.

Place the identification number found on the cards in the spaces provided above each letter pile.

				TA	LLY S	HEET					
			i								
			1								
											•
											
								•			
			•								
									_		
	_										

-	 										
D: 10	 Α	Т		<u> </u>	Tr)	E .		TT	_		v
Pi <u>le</u> Num-	 <u>A</u>	B 4	<u>c</u>	D 9	E 12	F 14	G 12	<u>н</u> 9	6	J 4	<u>K</u> 2
ber of	-	-	J						ŭ	•	-
Items											

Thus, pile A had two numbers; pile B, four numbers; pile C, six numbers; etc.

Item validity of the instrument was obtained from having authorities in the field of human relations make selection of those items each believe to be most relative for identifying positive and negative attitudes in the

human relations dimension.

Questions concerning difficulty in following sorting procedure or ambiguous items were noted during the administration of the instrument on a sample of twenty randomly selected high school students. Any changes or alterations needed to clarify these difficulties were made before the instrument was administered to the sample groups.

The instrument was checked for examinee reliability through the test-retest procedure. Twenty randomly selected members of the Cleveland High School faculty, an all white group, and twenty randomly selected members of a minority group school faculty, Booker T. Washington of Tulsa, comprised the sample groups. (It should be remembered that Q sort is not concerned with large sample size, but with large numbers of items for which each individual must make a distinction.) The test was administered individually with a minimum of one week waiting period between the first and second testing.

Organization of the Study

Chapter I was concerned with the background and need for the study, the statement, delimitations, and the procedure for developing the instrument.

Chapter II reports a review of related literature.

The total population of items with the results of the jury of judges is presented in Chapter III. Chapter IV reports

the results of the group selected to validate the instrument.

Chapter V presents the final form of the instrument, test manual, and provisions for its use. This chapter also presents the summary, conclusions, and recommendations of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This study was the result of an interest on the part of the writer to conduct a semester seminar in human relations problems and issues confronting a group of high school seniors. The first concern in organizing the program was that of procuring an adequate measuring instrument. The Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies, located at the University of Oklahoma, did not have an adequate instrument for measuring the attitudes of the group before starting the seminar. Reference to the Sixth Mental Measurement Yearbook produced a list of one hundred forty-six personality and attitude scales. An examination of a critique on each of these listings revealed that none of the scales seemed to be directly applicable to the human relations dimension.

Some samples of the more promising scales were obtained for closer scrutiny. A few of those examined proved worthy of consideration. The California Test of Personality was rejected because the stated purpose of

¹Ernest W. Tiegs, Willis W. Clark, and Louis P. Thorpe, The California Test of Personality (Monterey, California: California Test Bureau, 1953).

the scale did not meet the needs of the desired instrument.

A more promising scale as a possible instrument was the Syracuse Scales of Social Relations, and objective measure of social interaction. This instrument was the product of five years of study and research in the field of human relations and morale in small groups. The Syracuse Scales furnished a substantially reliable index of the way an individual pupil evaluated each member of his class, and how he in turn was evaluated by his classmates. The successful completion of this scale was dependent upon a prior knowledge of the examinee's classmates and "his perception of their ability to meet a particular need for him." Since many of the persons taking the test would not have prior knowledge of his group, it was rejected as an unsatisfactory instrument for the purposes of the study.

The Study of Values, 2 a scale that has been found serviceable in many areas, was considered because of the many uses for which the scale had been employed. This scale attempted to measure the relative prominence of six basic interests or motives in personality: the theoretical, economic, aesthetic, social, political, and religious. These six classifications were based directly upon

Eric F. Gardner and George G. Thompson, Syracuse Scales of Social Relations (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1959).

²Gordon W. Allport, Philip E. Vernon, and Gardner Lindzey, Study of Values (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1960).

Spranger's <u>Types of Men</u>, a notable work which defends the view that the personalities of men are best known through a study of their values or evaluative attitudes. Although the scale offered definite advantages, i.e., established validity and reliability, it also was rejected as the desired instrument because the scale was designed "primarily for use with college students," and it should be used only when there is supervision and guidance in the interpretation of the results by individuals "who have had considerable experience in psychological testing and personality theory."

The final scale with established norms to be considered was the <u>Master Attitude Scales</u>, ² (Level A), as developed by H. H. Remmers and the Purdue Research Foundation. The fact that the scales were untimed and usable with subjects from the junior high school level to literate adults made the scales highly acceptable as the desired instrument. The design of this series of scales was such that each scale intended to measure "one attitude." It was believed that none of the scales would meet the demands of overall human relations dimension with which this investigation was concerned. Consequently, the Master

Leduard Spranger, Types of Men (Translated from 5th German edition of Lebensformen by Paul J. W. Pigors. Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1928).

²H. H. Remmers, ed., <u>Master Attitude Scales</u>, (Level A) (West Lafayette: Purdue Research Foundation, 1960).

Attitude Scales was determined to be unsatisfactory as the desired instrument in the study.

A letter of inquiry to the major testing companies produced a negative response. Their only help was to suggest personality inventories and scales of the type previously examined by the writer.

The search of the literature revealed the contributions of Stephenson's Q technique. A thorough examination of the possible application of Q technique to the evaluation of human relations attitude appeared to present definite possibilities for developing the desired instrument.

Q Methodology

Q methodology is a general name used by William Stephenson to express a group of psychometric and statistical procedures he developed. Q methodology centers particularly in the sorting of decks of cards, called Q sorts, and in the correlations among the responses of different individuals to the Q sorts. Q technique is mainly a sophisticated form of rank-ordering objects and then assigning numerals to subsets of the objects for statistical purposes.

Most published Q studies have used unstructured

William Stephenson, The Study of Behavior (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953).

Q sorts. An unstructured Q sort is a set of items assembled without specific regard to the variables or factors underlying the items. Theoretically, any sample of homogeneous items can be used in an unstructured Q sort.

Perhaps the most extensive use of unstructured Q sorts was done by Rogers and his colleagues and students. The concept is simple. A large number of statements were taken from various statement sources—personality inventories, newspapers, speeches, items specifically constructed by the researcher—and put together to comprise the Q sort. The items of an unstructured Q sort are like the items of a personality or attitude scale; they are selected and used because they presumably measure one broad variable, like attitudes toward Negroes, adjustment, the government, or school.

The theoretical principle behind the unstructured Q sort calls for a random sample of items from a population of such items. There is a theoretical infinite population of items, and the hope is that the set of items used by the investigator in his Q sort is a random, and thus representative, sample of this item population.

Some have adversely criticized Q sorts on

Pred Kerlinger, Foundations of Behavioral Research (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964), p. 586.

²Carl Rogers and Rosalind Dymond, eds., <u>Psychotherapy</u> and <u>Personality Change</u> (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954).

statistical grounds. Much of this criticism of Q technique has focused on the forced-choice feature of Q sorting. It has been said that the forced procedure is unnatural, that it required the subject to conform to an unreasonable requirement. Some subjects, too, complained about the forced-choice constraint of Q sorts.

On the constraint argument, all psychometric procedures are constraints on the individual. Kerlinger stated that such inferences are probably made by "critics who think forced procedures constrain the individual." His experience has been that very few individuals complained about the procedure. On the contrary, most of them seemed to enjoy it. Livson and Nichols concluded that the Q sorter is his own worst critic and that researchers should not be unduly alarmed by adverse sorter criticisms of the method. They recommended use of the forced procedure after a careful study of alternatives.

Evidence on the relative virtues of forced and unforced Q sorts is mixed. Block found forced sorting

Donald Sundland, "The Construction of Q Sorts: A Criticism," <u>Psychological Review</u>, LXIX (1962), pp. 62-64.

²Fred Kerlinger, op. cit., p. 595.

Norman H. Livson and Thomas F. Nichols, "Discrimination and Reliability in Q-Sort Personality Descriptions," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, LII (1956), pp. 159-165.

equal or superior to unforced procedures. On the other hand, Jones found the forced procedure wanting. Cronbach and Gleser conceded that a near-normal distribution can be obtained, but thought this forcing was of "dubious value."

One virtue apparent in forced-choice is that it assures variance in the responses and eliminates response sets. However, Cronbach and Jones believed it discards possibly important information about differences in scatter, and gave data to which analysis of variance could not properly be applied. Livson stated, "Pitted against this possible disadvantage is the fact that the forced sort insures statistical intersorter comparability of data (since all sortings conform to the same distribution and thus have the same mean and the same variance) as well as thereby facilitating usual computational operations."

Another criticism, perhaps more serious to the

¹Jack Block, "A Comparison of Forced and Unforced Q-Sorting Methodology," <u>Educational and Psychological</u> <u>Measurement</u>, XVI (1956), pp. 481-493.

Austin Jones, "Distribution of Traits in Current Q-Sorting Methodology," <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, LIII (1956), pp. 90-95.

Jee Cronbach and Goldine Gleser, "William Stephenson. The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and Its Methodology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953"

Psychometrika, XIX (1954), pp. 327-330.

⁴Ibid.

⁵Austin Jones, <u>op. cit</u>.

Norman Livson and Thomas Nichols, op. cit., p. 159.

traditional researcher in psychology, was the "loss of information" in Q sorting through lack of elevation and scatter. Stephenson answered the charge of "loss of information" philosophically by declaring that "the forced-choice procedure is still of paramount significance: but it is not because standardization "is often undesirable" that one uses it--for subjective operations no other rationale seems possible."

A criticism pertaining to the rationale for item selection was also raised by Cronbach and Glesser. It is one thing to try to randomize statements, and another to seek for conditions under which an operator's acts of judgement may be regarded as randomly given. Stephenson believed the latter condition more important. He stated, "What is at issue, . . . , is an operator's acts of judgment, or decisions, made about the statements. These acts should be made randomly."

Q methodology, like factor analysis which it uses liberally, is controversial within itself--some have highly praised, some have harshly criticized. The truth of the

Lee Cronbach and Goldine Glesser, "Assessing Similarity Between Profiles," <u>Psychological Bulletin</u>, L (1953), p. 456-473.

²William Stephenson, op. cit., p. 331.

³Cronbach and Gleser, Psychometrika, op. cit., pp. 327-330.

⁴Stephenson, op. cit., p. 112.

critical matter is probably that the method is not as powerful and all-embracing as Stephenson has claimed it to be, nor is it as poor and defective as some critics have said it is. It is probably safe to say that Q is a flexible and useful tool in the armamentarium of the psychological and educational investigator. Kerlinger supported this statement with a discussion of the strengths and weaknesses of Q methodology which contributes much to the understanding of Q.

Definitive evidence is still needed to differentiate and substantiate the arguments pro and con. So it is that opinion must rule. It was this writer's belief that Q methodology, with forced-choice, was the most useful procedure for this study. Block's criteria are presented as supportive reasoning:

- (1) The forced-sorting technique enables comparison between judges to be made straight forwardly without distortions due to "response sets."
- (2) From a computational standpoint, forced-data are extremely convenient.
- (3) Most important, the procedure provides a set of operations readily linked to clinical and personality concepts.²

The important thing for this instrument was to force the individual to make discriminations that he often will not make unless required to do so.

¹ Fred Kerlinger, op. cit., p. 592.

²Jack Block, op. cit., p. 481.

Other Related Literature

Just as physical differences cannot hide the homogeneous physical nature of the human race, so social divergencies cannot disguise the basic unity of human traditions and customs. This being the fact, man in his interpersonal relations still experiences tension and conflict. Underlying this "basic unity" is the striking analogy between the things different peoples regard as right and wrong. Anthropologists and sociologists tell us if we are to understand our differences, we must know our culture.

Landes stressed the importance of this concept in Culture in American Education.

Anthropologists regard culture as the universal condition of human beings living in society. Men's minds, meeting socially, cooperate to create culture, inventing and changing it, and teaching it to new generations. A man is always born into the environment of culture and placed, even before actual birth, into the accustomed relationships of the local civilization . . . if American white, he has been directed to control Negroes; if American black, he has been

There are famous definitions of culture. See E. B. Tylor, <u>Primitive Culture</u> (London: John Murray, 1871, Two Vols.; seventh edition, New York, 1924) p. 1: "Culture or civilization. . . is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society."

Also, see Franz Boas, "Anthropology." in Edwin R. A. Seligman and Alvin Johnson (eds.), Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences (New York: Macmillan Company, 1937), Vol. II, p. 79: "Culture embraces all the manifestations of social habits of a community, the reactions of the individual as affected by the habits of the group in which he lives, and the products of human activities as determined by these habits."

taught to submit to whites. People are taught carefully how and what to hate and love in heaven and on earth. The culture of a group is its standardized behavior, values, and products. These have evolved through time and have been sanctified as whether pulse rate, styles of war and burial, alimentary disease, inventions, poetry, marriage rites, divine worship are shaped by culture.

Versions of culture vary enormously among civilizations. Human beings live in organized groups, which we call society. Their mental and social maturation flower best in company. The so-called backward or primitive cultures and the under-developed countries and societies of today have often lain off the main highways of cultural contracts and exchanges. The potentialities of man, as an individual or collectively as a society, are bound to opportunities and limitations of the social culture. A case in point is the U. S. Supreme Court ruling of 1954 when it ordered the end of segregation in public schools to assure children an equal opportunity to realize their potentials. Gittler wrote concerning this decision:

. . . historically important not because it was widely and enthusiastically acclaimed, which was not the case, but because the highest court in the land implicitly announced that it was now possible to make a radical

Ruth Landes, <u>Culture in American Education</u>. (John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York: 1965), p. 37.

²Alfred L. Kroeber presents a full discussion of this subject in <u>Configurations of Culture Growth</u> (Berkley: University of California, 1944).

declaration of a legal principle without plunging American society into civil strife. $^{\text{l}}$

Does the 1954 Supreme Court ruling assure children "equal opportunity?" A look at the controversial Coleman Report, which "stands majestically as a seminal document in the history of American education, of for ample information to explode the myth that equal educational opportunity does exist in this society.

Anthropologists believe that adults teach and pupils learn in keeping with habits absorbed from their cultural backgrounds. Hence, apparently "stupid behavior may actually reflect irreconcilable culture differences felt by the 'stupid' person, whereas success may testify to cultural harmony between a person and his environment." It would seem apparent that persons interested in group dynamics can be trained to apply these anthropologicals methods and concepts to their work and personal conduct.

Kahl emphasized that "men evaluate one another in terms of group values; individuals are considered worthy of difference if their behavior exemplifies the ideals of

¹Joseph B. Gittler, ed. <u>Understanding Minority</u> <u>Groups</u> (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956), p. xii.

²James S. Coleman, et al., <u>Equality of Education</u>
<u>Opportunity</u> (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966).

James K. Kent, "The Coleman Report: Opening Pandora's Box," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (January, 1968), pp. 242-245.

⁴<u>Ibid</u>., p. 18.

their culture. 1 It is obvious that American children are not equal and that they occupy different and unequal statuses. 2 All societies everywhere, no matter how primitive or modern, whether democratic or communistic, have recognized methods for distributing power, prestige, and status among their members. As each succeeding generation grows up it must learn how to behave, and learning how to behave means acquiring the proper responses to the batteries of social stimuli which compose our social order. The accomplishments of any single culture are based on universal human awareness, effort, and discovery.

Societies develop or remain undeveloped according to the dynamics of their needs, their wishes, their surroundings, and their dreams. All societies build their institutions and their way of life out of the common materials of the earth and their common human impulses. The "superior" civilizations of history have had a way of fading into obscurity, and the "backward" people of one century have come to be the leaders in another.

Between one group of people and another, regardless of their particular solutions of the problems of living, it is impossible to distinguish varying degrees of

Joseph A. Kahl, <u>The American Class Structure</u> (New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1957), p. 221.

²W. Lloyd Warner, Robert J. Havighurst, Martin B. Loeb, Who Shall Be Educated (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1944), p. 16.

human nature. Just below the surface of manners and customs lies our common identity.

Understandably a better knowledge of the American culture with its complexities must be attained if one is to approach the human relations problem with any hope of improvement. The American status system is not one but a variety of hierarchies. They include caste, class, hierarchies, and unequal ranked ethnic and minority groups.

An important factor in the American cultural pattern was identified by Kahl. "Acceptance cannot be earned if the superior group withholds it." And, generally speaking, the superior group tries to do this in order to keep their own symbols of prestige purer, scarcer, and thus more valuable. Given our system, they cannot prevent a man from making money, but they can keep him out of clubs and organizations that wield community power, and they can keep him outside the range of intimate associations.

The progression of acculturation and assimulation of minority groups have been similar, although the Negro's progression has been much slower: "first on the streets as laborers, then into the factories as operatives, then

Warner presents a full discussion of this topic in Who Shall Be Educated, pp. 18-19.

²Joseph A. Kahl, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 232.

into the crafts and professions. "1

Unlike many minority groups the Negro proprietors mostly serve their own people in residentially segregated They have not been able to become sections of the cities. storekeepers to the community at large, nor have they become manufacturers. Similarly, the Negro professionals have mainly a Negro clientele. As long as these barriers exist, there will be a cloak to Negro advancement qualitatively different from that which faces other ethnic Regardless of antidiscrimination legislation or Supreme Court decisions, a prejudiced public cannot be forced to patronize Negro storekeepers or physicians. sequently, the Negroes' best chances of climbing into the top occupations occur within large bureaucratic structures that have adopted policies against discrimination -- the federal government and some corporations and universities.

A recent interpretation of "local cultures" was recently given by Dan Dodson in answer to the question: What is the definition of "neighborhood," given today's socially changing conditions?

Neighborhood to me means something in the sense of 'nigh dweller.' In the early days, this meant community, because we were dependent upon each other. Today it may only mean that we have apartments in the same building or that we live in the same little section of town and have nothing more in common. Neighborhood is growing weaker except when whites are threatened by

Process of the secretary and a

¹<u>Ibid</u>., p. 235.

the coming of Negroes. The nearer Negroes get the more sacred it becomes. 1

In essence the American society with its 'system' of rank! has literally developed 'islands of ghettoes.' A ghetto, whether majority or minority inspired, black or white, is a tragic rejection of the democratic principles of equality and, more especially, equal opportunity. it is a black ghetto, imposed and maintained by white and/ or black landlords who make it virtually impossible to escape, it is a mockery of every basic principle to which this country is supposed to be committed. If it is a white ghetto in the form of an isolated, exclusive suburb to which whites have fled to escape the presence of minority peoples, it is a tragic and futile effort to create a homogenous social order that was never intended in this country and at this late date, never can be. Ghettoes. regardless of race or ethnic origin, make impossible the elimination of inequality and create a climate in Which equal opportunity in facilities, employment, citizenship, and privileges become impossible.

The problem of achieving equal rights and harmonious intergroup relations in our nation is the problem of prejudice. This formulation can be highly misleading.
"Intergroup relations problems can and do exist without

Dan W. Dodson, "Conference Summary," <u>Conference</u>
Report 1965. Commission of Equal Opportunities in Education, California State Department of Education, p. 31.

any dimension that can sensibly be defined as prejudice. Plany group with significant cultural and educational differences can obviously pose an intergroup relations problem. The general assumption is that many of these problems will diminish as the differences themselves diminish or are adjusted. It is only where the normal adjustment of these differences is persistently obstructed or resisted by the dominant group that the element of prejudice enters. To the extent that such normal adjustment has been obstructed, it is certainly true that some of our most abiding intergroup relations problems are currently or historically problems of prejudice.

An equally misleading concept, according to Raab and Lipset, is evidenced if prejudice is taken to mean 'prejudiced attitudes.' Prejudiced attitudes do not form the substance of our national problems of prejudice. The primary source of our problem is "prejudiced behavior, which can be defined, without casual reference, as that behavior which irrelevantly denies or attempts to deny equality of opportunity or status."

Further development by Raab and Lipset suggest:

Prejudiced attitudes are not even the prime movers of such behavior; they do not necessarily, or even typically, cause such behavior. Prejudiced attitudes,

Earl Raab and Seymour M. Lipset, <u>Prejudice and Society</u> (New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1963), p. 3.

²<u>Ibid</u>., p. 3.

in fact, may not even accompany prejudiced behavior and when they do, they may often be a by-product of that behavior. In short, the relationship between prejudiced attitudes and prejudiced behavior--and, therefore, between prejudiced attitudes and the problem of intergroup relations--is a dubious and widely misread one. I

These conclusions are now supported by events that are taking place in our nation today. Melvin Tumin stated:

The single most important lesson we have learned from the reactions throughout the nation to the Supreme Court order concerning the desegregation of public schools is that it is possible to make significant changes in the behavior of men without first producing commensurate changes in their feelings. Schools have been desegregated, Negro and white children have gone to school together for the first time in their lives, white and Negro teachers have shared faculty status in the same schools for the first time in their lives; yet it is highly unlikely that the feelings which these people had for each other before the Supreme Court order have changed nearly as much as their behavior toward each other. In short, a good deal of discrimination has been eliminated without a matching reduction in the amount of prejudice.²

Education of Minority Peoples in the American Culture

In our country many believe the solution to any or all social questions is more and better education. The American people for the most part believe that progress is inevitable; that their culture will be preserved with little change; that social problems will be solved; that higher social status will be attained; that democracy will function adequately; that the fit shall lead; that

¹ Ibid.

²Melvin Tumin, "Sociological Aspects of Desegregation," <u>The American Journal of Orthopsychiatry</u>, Vol. XXIX (January, 1958), pp. 180-185.

freedom will survive; in short, that anything aspired to will be accomplished.

The American faith in education is a dominant trait, the ethos, which provided "a kind of over-all grand formula by which we hope to perpetuate and perfect our culture."

In spite of, or because of this, we take education for granted and assume it to be an integral aspect of American culture.

In the United States education usually refers to the formalized patterns which occurs in schools. In the past, however, the common interactive processes through which the child becomes a part of the society are rarely described as education. George H. Mead, more than forty years ago, described this division by pointing out that "the business of storing the mind with ideas . . . has been assigned to the school. The task of organizing and socializing the self to which these ideas belong is left to the home, to the playground, the streets, and society in general."²

The emphasis on formal mental training has been characteristic of American education. Under this system the mind of the child is something to be developed by the

Clark Wissler, Man and Culture (New York: Thomas Crowell Co., 1923), p. 10.

²George H. Mead, "Psychology of Social Consciousness Implied in Instruction," <u>Science</u>, Vol. XXXI, p. 689.

presentation of ideas, old or new, which those in power consider necessary and acceptable for the maintenance of society. The teacher is the liaison official between the sources of social control and the children who are to be initiated into the culture. In our society most schools are based on a highly formal pattern of relations between the teachers and the community. Traditionally, the teacher dominates the learning activity and attempts to control the response of the pupils in accordance with the wishes of those who control their behavior. We might characterize this pattern of education as "the forced-formal system, in which society attempts to teach the children, under pressure, that which it believes they will find useful."

A more recent evaluation of the function of education, and one which is widely accepted by leading educators, is stated by Spindler: "Cultural transmission and personality formation are perhaps the two most important functions of the school." Not all people believe the school is meeting this obligation. Harold Benjamin showed the tendency of schools to perpetuate outmoded content and experiences in his satire, The Saber-Tooth Curriculum.

¹Wilbur B. Brookover, A Sociology of Education (New York: American Book Co., 1955), p. 38.

²George D. Spindler, <u>Education and Culture</u> (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1963), p. 50.

Educators need help to develop more effective techniques for the study of peoples' living in other cultures. In many instances comparative culture studies in the school tend to reinforce prejudice rather than to increase understanding and appreciation. It is therefore appropriate to examine the educational activities designed to modify intergroup relations and to note the changes resulting from such programs.

Brookover suggests three possible ways that education may be applied to the problem of intergroup relations in America. The prevalent thesis in the late

Nineteenth and early Twentieth Centuries was that education could best be used for 'acculturation' of minorities.

The melting pot theory proposed that all nationality groups should be Americanized. While it did not apply to all minority groups, this concept had great influence on the educational system. The highly visible minorities of the period were the multitudes of foreign-born immigrants. The movement to Americanize these people became particularly vigorous when the South European immigrants replaced the less diverse North European group. The strong prejudice against these groups culminated in the restrictive immigration acts of the 1920's.

Relative to these acts the late President John F. Kennedy has written:

¹Brookover, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 122-123.

This system is based upon the assumption that there is some reason for keeping the origins of cur population in exactly the same proportions as they existed in 1920. The idea is at complete variance with the American traditions and principles that the qualifications of an immigrant do not depend upon his country of birth, and violates the spirit expressed in the Declaration of Independence that "all men are created equal."

The possibility of people of varying cultures living side-by-side in harmony was not widely accepted. Rather, it was thought necessary for the foreigner to become American. This program of assimilation was not readily applicable to the Oriental and Negro groups, which had distinguishable biological traits even when they were fully acculturated. Since there was strong prejudice against racial mixture, the 'melting-pot' program of assimilation never included such groups. It was not a program of intergroup education, but rather one designed to eliminate certain minority groups through absorption into the dominant group.

The second approach was designed neither to result in complete assimilation nor to provide for harmonious relations on a basis of equality. Some minority groups such as Negroes, Indians, and sometimes Mexicans were expected to remain separate. Their education was designed to prepare them for useful roles in 'their place,' and to perpetuate rather than to eliminate the cultural differences.

lone F. Kennedy, A Nation of Immigrants (New York: One Nation Library, 1963), p. 32.

The third approach presented by Brookover to intergroup education is aimed at relieving tension and reducing the hostility found in both groups. The main emphasis is placed on changes in the attitude and conduct of the dominant group. Since this group possesses the power, it is expected to assume the responsibility for modification of intergroup relations. This supposes at the same time both a degree of cultural pluralism, with racial and other minority groups remaining separate, and equalization of the opportunities of members of these distinct parts of the community.

Brookover has used two terms, almost interchange-ably, which needs further clarification. 'Assimilation' is the partial or total absorption of a minority person or group into the dominant group. Assimilation, then, is usually a one-way proposition, with very little reciporcity or exchange of values, traditions, or customs. The minority group discards its peculiar and foreign ways as the price of complete merger with and disappearance into the dominant social structure.

'Acculturation' is a related but somewhat different social process. There is an exchange of cultural artifacts--of food, words, music and perhaps, of ideas, values, and customs relating to ceremonies. Acculturation

Raymond W. Mack and Troy S. Duster, <u>Patterns of Minority Relations</u>. Freedom Pamphlets, Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, New York: 1964, p. 51.

has been defined as "subsuming those processes that occur as a society (or group of people), with a distinctive culture, adapts to changes in the conditions of life brought about by the impact of another population and its culture."

There are occasions when assimilation and acculturation go hand-in-hand. An example would be the Italian immigrant to our country. His native dishes--pizza, spaghetti--are now such a common part of the American cuisine that they can be found in almost every community. Yet the Italian-American has also assimilated. He is invisibly American, and retains few distinctive features which make him stand out in the society.

But assimilation and acculturation have no necessary association. It is not just that societies and subcultures and minority groups acculturate and assimulate, individuals do, too. The individual who acculturates without assimulating is subject to much intergroup antagonism. Mack and Duster call him a "prime candidate for the status of marginal man." The "marginal man" is on the periphery of two different cultures, but neither integrated into nor accepted by either culture. His own inhabitants see him as drifting away from the customs and traditions which they cherish while at school or work peers consider odd his foreign ways.

Spindler, op. cit., p. 60.

²Mack and Duster, op. cit., p. 51.

Throughout this process of assimilation and acculturation there was active demand for the schools to teach both the parents and children the fundamentals of American culture. Americans have generally advocated formal schooling for minority groups. For the most part foreign-born, religious, and other minority elements, this has meant education similar to that provided for the majority. However, Negroes, and in many cases Indians, have usually been treated as unable to profit by the same training, or training in the same schools. As a result, there have been differences of opinion as to the best training for them.

In the South, Negro education has been traditionally based on the theory that the Negro is incapable of training in the academic subjects, and should therefore be equipped with manual skills. Leaders of Negro opinion have differed on this issue. Booker T. Washington was an early proponent of the program of industrial education, accepting, to a considerable extent, the white man's definition of the Negro's role. He advocated educating colored people for the jobs which were open to them. The opposition to this view was most vigorously stated by DuBois, who maintained that such an educational program

¹Booker T. Washington, <u>Up From Slavery</u> (New York: Doubleday, 1901).

²W. E. B. DuBois, <u>Souls of Black Folk</u> (Chicago: McClurg, 16th edition, 1928).

was discriminatory. DuBois and his associates demanded equality of opportunity for education at the higher levels as well as in elementary and vocational training. They felt that leadership in the struggle for equality must come through higher education, not through training for inferior positions.

American Indian education has been complicated by segregation on reservations. Education of other groups is a function of the state and local governments. The education of the American Indian has been administered mainly by the U. S. Bureau of Indian Affairs although a majority of Indian pupils are now enrolled in predominantly white public schools.

Recent data indicated about eight per cent of the Indians attended mission or parochial schools while more than forty per cent attended the public schools. Other Indian children receive their formal education in government schools. The mission schools generally emphasize religious instruction and some type of liberal arts program. The Bureau operated schools (even though the educational policies of the Bureau of Indian Affairs have varied from time to time) have provided a predominantly vocational or practical arts curriculum.

The Indian youth attending public schools generally receives the same instruction as other students.

¹Brookover, <u>op. cit</u>., pp. 127-128.

A larger proportion of Indian youth may be guided into vocational courses than into others, but they are not segregated from other students. This mingling with non-Indian students probably results in a greater degree of acculturation. Discrimination against Indian youth is no doubt common, but display of superior academic, athletic, or other abilities generally gains acceptance for them in the dominant group.

Most Indians want their youth to acquire a facility to use the tools of the dominant society, but they also want them to retain the native culture. White teachers frequently have ambivalent feelings about the educational process also. Some of them want the Indians to reject the native culture and to become integrated in the dominant society. These contradictory expectations among both parents and teachers leave the youth in a difficult situation. He is expected to learn the new and to reject the old, but he must retain the old to maintain the approval of his native group.

The challenge for education in human relations seems to be apparent. Education should provide "a basis for mutual sympathy and understanding necessary to adequate social solidarity." And, it might be added, that it is necessary in the solution of problems of modern

Paul F. Voelker, <u>The Function of Ideals and Attitudes in Social Education</u> (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1921), p. 44.

civilization. Social education will foster the dissemination of knowledge. Mere knowledge does not guarantee citizenship. Ideas about morality do not transform themselves automatically into good character or conduct.

There is at present no generally accepted theory of the development of prejudicial behavior. A variety of hypotheses are constantly being tested. One theory is the "personality needs" concept. In this theory, prejudice is seen as an attempt to adjust to disturbing frustrations, guilt feelings, or other personality needs. is illustrated by the work previously mentioned on the "authoritarian personality." The authoritarian person's behavior is primarily the result of adjustment of deepseated personality needs. The "frustration-aggression" hypothesis is similar to this in many ways and can be included in this category. Here the hostility toward the minority is seen as displaced aggression toward the frustrating object -- a dominating father, a boss who fails to promote the individual, or a combination of forces that prevent the person from reaching his goals.

A second type of prejudice theory may be identified as the "cultural theory." This supposes that prejudice is a part of the culture and is learned like any folkway, sentiment, or belief. The sterotypes of minority

¹<u>Ibid</u>., p. 43.

Adorno, op. cit., p. 27.

groups and the definitions of proper behavior toward them in a variety of situations are acquired in the socialization process. Much of the research on social attitudes toward minority groups and the programs of education to change such behavior reflect this theoretical framework.

MacIver summarized this position succinctly:

In the primary processes of socialization the thought modes of the group are perpetuated, and for the majority . . . these thought modes are woven into the very fabric of personality. 1

Another type of prejudice theory may be called the "competitive" theory. According to this theory, prejudice results from the competition between groups for material goods and desired positions in society. MacWilliams, studies of intergroup relations are based on this position. He maintained that the motivation for forcing the Japanese-Americans from the west coast or discriminating against Jews in jobs or clubs arose from the desire to reduce the competition for wealth, power, or status.

Still another concept, closely akin to the "cultural theory," concerning general education and intergroup relations holds that the more formal education one has, the less prejudiced one will be. There is evidence that persons with formal education expressed more tolerant

¹R. M. MacIver, The More Perfect Union (New York: Macmillan, 1948), p. 196.

²Carey McWilliams, <u>Prejudice: Japanese-Americans</u> (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1944). And, <u>Mask for Privilege</u> (Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1948).

attitudes toward minority groups. Many will agree that an increase in the general level of formal education is the solution to the problems of intergroup relations. However, Brookover suggested some reasons why this is probably not true:

First there is little likelihood of everyone receiving a college education. More important than this, the significant factor in the differences between these groups may not be the educational level. The differences in education may only be correlated with simple increase in the level of education—regardless of its character—is not the total solution for the problem.²

In recent years numerous agencies have directed their attention to the improvement of intergroup relations. Many educators have reorganized their curricula, initiated special courses, and arranged many other activities which they hoped would modify the behavior of the youth toward out-groups. The variety of these activities makes them difficult to classify, and in many cases the theoretical positions on which they are based are not clearly identified. There is little basis for determining the most effective methods, but educators concerned with the problem have hastened to initiate some kind of action program. The effectiveness of these programs remain to be proven as attested by the Coleman Report.

¹Babette Samelson, "Does Education Diminish Prejudice" <u>Journal of Social Issues</u>, Vol. I, 1945, pp. 11-13.

²Brookover, <u>op. cit</u>., p. 131.

In spite of these difficulties, Williams has classified the techniques used for controlling intergroup relations into two broad categories. The first is through a modification of the situation for the individual without changing it overtly.

The second approach is much more important for the school. It is a direct appeal to the values and attitudes of individuals, without necessarily changing the actual or potential situation for action in other respects. This includes all the propaganda techniques, as well as the acceptable educational devices for changing attitudes through information, contact, group discussion, and related methods.

What may well be called the problems confronting the citizen--questions and issues of economic, political, ethnical, municipal, national, financial, and sociological--are increasingly of a kind that cannot be resolved by well intentioned compliance and kindly initiative alone. Social institutions must direct their efforts toward improved interpersonal relations through recognition of the various areas of negative human relation attitudes.

The researcher must continue to investigate, to move from the known to the unknown. The basic difficulty is that, to be in anyway satisfactory, a criterion or

Robin M. Williams, Jr., <u>The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions</u>: A Survey of Research on Problems of Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Group Relations. (New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin No. 57, 1942), pp. 17-25.

hypothesis must have a solid, known meaning which is acceptable to all. But psychology does not know enough as yet to provide any such definition. Rogers contended that "our science lacks an incontestable body of knowledge about personality and that there is no general agreement about the precise nature of adjustment and maladjustment."

Murry challenged, "If the psychology of personality had to limit his discourse to theories that were securely proved, he would have nothing to recount. In this realm there are no certainties."

This study was an effort to pursue the human relations endeavor as categorized by Williams' second approachadirect appeal to the values and attitudes of individuals, without necessarily changing the actual situation for action in other respects.

¹Carl R. Rogers and Rosalind F. Dymond, <u>op. cit.</u>, p. 28.

Henry A. Murry, et al., Explorations in Personality (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1938), p. xii.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS OF THE JURY OF JUDGES

A commonly accepted method of validating items of a questionnaire and other measuring devices is that of using a jury of qualified judges to evaluate the items. It was decided that current leaders in the field of human relations could best determine the kinds of statements to include in the instrument to be used in this study. Statements selected by recognized leaders in the field of human relations from a large population of pertinent items should assure statement validity for the eighty item Q sort instrument and this approach was, therefore, used.

The eleven member jury of judges for this study was composed of recognized leaders in the field of human relations. Each juror was selected because of his position, knowledge, active participation, and interest in the field of human relations. The consultative services of the Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies at the University of Oklahoma aided greatly in the search for qualified jurors. (Appendix A)

Instructions to the Jury of Judges (Appendix B) included a brief explanation of Q sort technique for those jurors who might not have been familiar with this process. Also included in these instructions was a statement about the purpose of the instrument.

The original list of statements sent to each juror was divided into eight areas within the broad spectrum of human relations: Racial (subdivided into Negro, Indian, and other minority groups), religious, socioeconomic, education, judicial, and governmental. Thirty statements were included under each category. These statements were selected and developed from current literature, periodicals, speeches, newspapers, and other communication media.

The criteria for the statements of opinion to be used in this instrument were taken from Thurstone:

- (1) Should be brief.
- (2) Can be indorsed or rejected in accordance with their agreement or disagreement.
- (3) Statements does indicate something of reader's attitude about issue in question.
- (4) Doubled-barreled statements should be avoided accept possibly as examples of neutrality.
- (5) One must insure that at least a fair majority of the statements really belong on the attitude variable that is to be measured.

Jurors were instructed to select only the fifteen statements in each area which they believed to be the most relevant statements for identifying both positive and

¹L. L. Thurstone, op. cit., pp. 22-23.

negative attitudes in each area. These fifteen choices were to be made without regard to the juror's own personal degree of agreement or disagreement. The juror was advised that the sorter making the Q sort would be required to make a choice as to his own degree of approval or disapproval with each item of the Q sort.

The only criterion concerning the juror for statement inclusion was its relevancy for determining positive
or negative attitudes in the area under which the statement
was included. As a judge, each juror was permitted to
change the wording of any statement for clarity. A final
caution was given that only fifteen statements should be
selected from each of the eight categories.

Table I shows the summary of the judgment of the jurors for all thirty items found in each of the eight categories. The left column lists the item number, thirty for each category. The eight general areas were listed across the top of the table. The numbers found in each column below the eight areas indicates the number of affirmative votes each item received for inclusion in the final Q sort instrument.

The totals at the bottom of the table gave the number of votes cast by all eleven jurors in each area for all thirty items. The possible number of votes that could be cast in each area was one hundred sixty-five.

Only the ten most frequently selected items of the

TABLE I
FREQUENCY OF ITEM SELECTION BY JURY OF JUDGES
ON ORIGINAL LIST OF STATEMENTS

	A R-E A S											
Item	Negro	Indian	Other Minority Groups	Reli- gious	Socio- Economic	Educa- tion	Judicial	Govern- mental				
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4 1 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 1 4 1 5 6 1 7 8 9 0 2 1 2 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 0 1 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 1 2 3 4	998782887401354249385817535543	757746775275445994323415527247	747787854742744724423633331472 * * * * * *	487537572532374744515147374747 ** * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	599558854284029731937198362434 1029731937198362434	797504875137453345523951343773	678483474353780593420279572135	782557587672134027584132353227				
	165	149	139	142	163	149	141	141				

^{*} Indicates items comprising the final Q-sort instrument.

original thirty statements in each area comprised the final Q sort. There were a few suggested alterations in the wording of statements as originally sent to the jurors. These changes, while often minor in nature, were of significant help. These suggestions improved clarity and conciseness in some instances. In none of the returns were the statements altered as to meaning or intent.

Some helpful comments on various items were included in the returns. These comments usually pointed up negative aspects for not including a specific item in the instrument. The following examples illustrated the helpfulness of these comments: "Does a question like number seven have to do with factual information rather than attitudes?" "Ambiguous." "Reflects ignorance of fact rather than attitude."

Additional help was rendered toward strengthening the Q sort with these kinds of comments: "If you use number four, include number eleven; if number five is used, pair it with number twelve." "Beware of making the instrument too long."

It was interesting to note that in not one single case where a statement was recommended as not suitable by one juror did that statement receive enough approval by the other jurors to be included in the final Q sort.

Another observation worthy of note was the fact that only two statements failed to receive even one single

vote for inclusion. (Item fifteen and item twenty-one under area six--Judicial.) On the other hand, no statement received unanimous approval for inclusion. Four statements did receive near unanimous approval--item eleven under Negro, item thirteen under Socio-Economic, item five under Education, and item sixteen under Governmental.

Each of these four statements received ten votes of the possible eleven for inclusion.

All items included in the final Q sort received a minimum of seven affirmative votes for inclusion. Some jurors did not select the total fifteen items in each area. Therefore, the grand total of responses in each area varied with the exception of the judicial and governmental areas, each of which tallied a total of one hundred forty-one responses.

Only one area received the possible 165 affirmative tallies for inclusion. This was area number one--Negro.

A possible reason for this could be the fact that it was the first area and the jurors were more exact in indicating their choices.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS OF THE EXPERIMENTAL GROUPS

Two Oklahoma public school faculties were chosen as the experimental groups. One school represented an all white faculty of forty members with only one minority group person on the staff. This one minority group person was an Indian. The other faculty represented a predominately Negro school. Only seven persons of Caucasian origin were on the staff of seventy-five persons in the latter school.

Twenty teachers were randomly selected from each faculty. The only factor limiting the selections was the elimination of the white members on the predominately Negro faculty. It was desired to obtain results from two entirely different racial groups.

Verbal instructions were kept to a minimum. Each teacher was told the Q sort was a part of a study to develop an instrument in the field of human relations. The packet they would receive contained the Q sort cards, a sheet of written instructions which would be self explanatory, and a tally sheet to record their selections once the sorting process was completed.

Each teacher was given a packet to either take home for sorting or to sort during his planning period.

The packet was to be turned in the next day with the tally sheet filled out according to his choices.

A minimum of one week was allowed to pass before the second Q sort packet with a new tally sheet was handed to the teacher. The second packet was to be returned the next day with the completed tally sheet.

The results of the first and second sorts were then correlated using the following formula:

$$\mathbf{r} = \frac{\mathbf{\xi}^{xy}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{\xi}^2 \mathbf{\xi}^2}}$$

Table II shows the correlated results of school A and school B between the first and second Q sorts of each selected faculty member. This table also gives the corresponding z' value of each correlation using Fisher's z Transformation.

Significance of Correlations

The significance of the correlations shown in Table II was then considered. $Cornell^2$ presents a table

Frances G. Cornell, The Essentials of Education Statistics (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1956), p. 180.

²Ibid., p. 179.

TABLE II

CORRELATIONS AND TRANSFORMED r TO z'
BETWEEN FIRST AND SECOND Q SORTS

Teacher	Scho	ol A	School B				
	r	z'	r	z '			
1	. 988	2.567	.894	1.442			
2	, 958	1.922	.866	1.317			
3	. 958	1.922	.850	1.256			
4	• 907	1.511	.845	1.238			
5	.872	1.341	.845	1.238			
6	.858	1.284	.836	1.208			
7	.840	1.221	.831	1.191			
8	.819	1.154	.822	1.163			
9	•793	1.079	.819	1.154			
10	.750	• 973	.778	1.039			
11	.731	•931	• 757	. 989			
12	.722	.912	.734	• 937			
13	.712	.891	.662	-797			
14	•700	.867	.660	•793			
15	•685°	.838	.627	•735			
16	.682	.832	.623	.730			
17	.682	.832	.600	.693			
18	.678	.825	.542	.607			
19	.655	.802	.514	.569			
20	.646	.768	.424	453			

indicating the one percent and five percent levels of significance for correlation coefficients without reference to the sign of r for two-tailed significance levels. The lowest limit for significant correlations with eighteen d.f. is .561 for the one percent level of significance. Therefore, it may be seen that the three lowest correlations for School B are below this lowest limit while none of the correlations from School A fall below this limit.

Table II shows some apparent differences in the test-retest correlations of the individual members of the two faculties. School A, the majority group school, produced the higher correlations overall with the least range. School B, the minority group school, did have higher correlations from individuals at positions eight, nine, ten, eleven, and twelve.

Some differences were indicated from the results of the two sample groups which represented two well defined racial groups. Could it be reasonably assumed there is no significant difference between the correlations of the two sample groups?

A check into the significance of the difference between the averages of the transformed correlations on the Test-Retest of the two independent samples according to Cornell¹ showed the following:

¹Ibid., p. 243.

School A School B

$$z' = 23.472$$
 $z' = 19.549$
 $z' = 1.1736$ $z' = .9774$

To test the hypothesis H: $p_1 = p_2$, that there is no significant difference in the correlation in the two populations, we use Cornell's formula:

$$z = \frac{z_{1}^{1} - z_{2}^{1}}{\sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{1}-3} + \frac{1}{N_{2}-3}}}$$

We find that

$$z = .1962/\sqrt{.11764} = .1962/.343 = .5720$$

The one percent level of significance with thirty-four d.f. is 2.73. Since the observed result falls short of significance, the hypothesis that the samples are from a population with common p was tenable.

Analysis of Statements

The distribution of the items as sorted by each individual on the first sorting process was next considered. Since the selected schools represented two basic racial groups, could the distribution of their item selections be expected to differ significantly?

Tables III and IV present the total frequency distributions for each of the eighty items as selected on

the first sort by the individual members of each sample group. Each pile was given a numerical score--one through eleven. The total number of times each item was placed in a particular pile was shown in the horizontal row to the right of the item number. The total score, found in the extreme right hand column, was obtained by summing the product of the score assigned to each pile times the frequency the item was placed in each pile. Example: Item One.

Pile Score	A 11	В 10	С 9	D 8	E 7	F 6	G 5	H 4	I 3	J 2	K 1		
Item				Frequency									Score Total
1	11x7	+10x1	+9x4	+8 x 4	+7x1	+6x1	+5 x 2	+	+	+	+	=	178

The totals at the end of the tables for each column, A through K, equalled the total number of selections required by the forced choice method with twenty subjects sorting. The group score used in making computations was found by summing the "Score Total" column.

Since the basic purpose of this instrument was to identify positive and negative human relations attitudes, it was decided to not get deeply involved in a discussion of comparing group reactions to each item but to direct the discussion primarily to those items which indicated negative attitudes on the part of individuals.

It has been shown that the two school faculties comprising this study could well have been samples drawn

TABLE III

SCHOOL A. INDIVIDUAL ITEM DISTRIBUTION FREQUENCY FOR THE FIRST SORT

	Pile Score	A 11	B 10	С 9	D 8	E 7	F	G 5	H 4	I 3	J 2	K	
T ±					*****	· · · ·							Score
Item					Т	red	uenc	У				·	<u>Total</u>
1		7	1	4	4	1	1	2					178
2			1	3	3	4	1.	2 4	2	1	1		. 128
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9					1	1	7	3	4	1	2	1	96
4			4	1	4	6	1		2	1	1		142
5		2	4	4	5 3 5 5	4	1 3						152
6		1		_	3	4	3	4	2	3			117
7		1	5 1	3 6	5	4	_		2				146
8 -		1.	1	6	5	5 1	2 4 8		_	1.		_	142
9						1	4	4	6	4	-	1	88
10				~	_	357285	. 8	6	2	1	1		106
11				2	2	ク	4	5 4 4	-		2	-	122
12			-		5 3 3	7	2 3 2 6 3	4	1	-	2	1	126
13			1.	0	٥	2	ز.	2	3 1	1	3 1		107
14				3	3	0	2	4	Ŧ	0	Т.		135
15 16					3	٦	9	4 2	4	2 10	1		121
7.Q		2	4	4	E.	2	ر	2	4	10	Т		76 169
17 18		4	4:	4	5 2	3 6	4	2	0	4			112
19				1	2	3	4	2	2	2			113
20				т.	4) 2	6 1	2 4	3 6 1 5 4	3 2	3	2	72
21		1			6	2	<u> </u>	3 <u>*</u>	1	2	٠,		78 128
22		ماد.			U	~	フ 3	3 1	<u> </u>	5	3	2	70
23							5 3 1	2	L	5 2	3 7	4	76 56
23 24			1	1	2	5	6	2	2	ī	•	•	127
25			 .		-	í	2	ā	3	$\frac{1}{4}$	1		90
25 26				2	2	$\overline{2}$	2 8	9 1	3 3	ī	ī		90 118
27			1	ī	2	3	11	ī		_	ī		129
28			_	_	ī	í	2	8	1	3	4		129 88
29							2	8 8	3	3 3	1		96
3Ó			2	2	2	· 3	4	3	•			1	96 136
31		1	2 4	2 3 1	2 3 3	5	2	1	1				158
32			2	1	3	5 4	4	4		2			136
33			_					2	5	1	6	4	61
3 4		2	1.	4	1	2	2	4	5 3 7		1		136
35						2 1	4	2	7	1	5		136 61 136 80 63
36					1	1 4	1	3		4	5	5	63
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39						4	2 4 1 6 3	2 4 2 3 2 4	3 3	1 4 3 3	6 1 5 5 2 3		99
38				_		2	3	4	3	3	3	2	81
39		4	5	6	3	1	1						185
40				_	3 1 7		1 1	2	3 1	4	5	4	99 81 185 62 138
41			1.	2	7	4	1	2	1	2			138

TABLE III (Cont.)

SCHOOL A. INDIVIDUAL ITEM DISTRIBUTION FREQUENCY FOR THE FIRST SORT

	Pile Score	A 11	В 10	с 9	D 8	E 7	F 6	G 5	H 4	I 3	J 2	К 1	
Item				Fr	- A CI ST	enc	37						Score <u>Total</u>
			 										
42				1	2	4	7	2	3 6	1	14 1		120
43 44			1	2	-		4 4	3 2 1	0	2 1	5		79 140
44 45				4	5	5 1	٦. ت	7	6		1.	3	74
45 46		1	3	1	4		3 2 3 3 8	-1-	5	5 2	,J.)	134
47		-	3 4	2	5	2 5 6	3	1	,	. =			156
48			-	ī	5 4	6	3	3	2	1			127
49				_	1	4	8	3 4	2	1			115
5Ó						1	3	. 7	8		ı		$9\overline{4}$
51		1	1	2	5	1	3 2 2 1 4	7	2 8 1 3				137
51 52				1	5 1	3	2	6	3	3	1		103
53 54		8	5 1	4	1 5 1	1	l						195
54			1	5 1	5	1	4	4 6		•			146
55 56						2	8	6	1		1		115
56			1	2	7	6	2	1	1	_			147
57 58			_	2	2	2	7	1 4	4	2			117
50		1	2	2 5 8	<i>3</i>	3	ز 1	4	7				148 169
59 60		T	2 3 2	2	72345	1 2 6 2 3 2 4	7313563324	2	1	7			142
61			_	_)	T	ر 5	2	7	1 3 1	2	1	82
62				1		3	6	3	3	1	1	2	100
63					3	3 5 2 4	3	3 2 3 4	733334	1		ī	113
64					3 1	2	3	3	3	4	2		
65			1	2	í	4	2	3 6 1	3	1			99 121
61 62 63 64 65 66 67				2 4		2		1	4	3	1	1	107
67		1	2 1	5	3	5	3	1					158
68			1			2	3 4 4	2	4	2	2	3	87
69					1	2	4	2 5 4	6	2			101
70		1	_	1	2	2 5 2 2 8 2	2	4	1	1	_	_	131
71 72			1			2	5 3	5	3 4	1 4	2	1	99
72 72			1	1.	_	_	3	6	4	4	1		97
73		,	3	3	5	6	3	1.	•				157
74 75 76 77 78		1	1	3 2 3 2	2	うっ	2 9	4	3 1	7			上 54 120
75 76		1	1	2	<u> </u>	ر 4	S O	2 2 7	1	1 1			149 149
77 77		т.	1	ے	フ 1	٦ ع	6	7.	1	1			175
78		7	3	4	3	ر 1	7	7.		ī			172
79		,	3 1 8	i	5	ī	2 8 3 6 1 5	7					131
79 80		1	8	2	52251352	5343116	_	•				1	157 134 129 142 117 172 131 168

Totals

40 80 120 180 240 280 240 180 120 80 40

9594

TABLE IV

SCHOOL B. INDIVIDUAL ITEM DISTRIBUTION FREQUENCY FOR THE FIRST SORT

*****	Pile	A	В	С	Ď	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	
Colored transfer Claim	Score	1.1	10	9_	8	_7_	6	_5_	4_	_3_	2	1_	Score
Item				F	req	uen	су				·—··		Total
1.				6	6	6	2						156 189
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10		6	6	1	5	2							189
3								3 6	$\frac{1}{2}$	3	4	9	45
4		_			2	3 1	7	6	2				117 182
5		2	5	7	5	1		4		,	2	7	.182 80
6		8	7	4	5 1 1		2	4	5	5	4	1	202
ģ		O	1	4	, .L .		3	-7	4	4	2		85
9							,	-7 4 7	4 5 3		3	1	85 68
1ó					1.	1	1.	7	3	7 4	3 1	2	84
11			3	4	6	7		·	-				163
1.2				4 3	8	7 1	2						152
13 14 15 16					8 3 2 2 6	1	9 12 5 8 6 12	3	4				116
14					3	5 6	12	,		_			131
15					2	6	5	4 5	2	1 2		73	119
7.P			-3	4	2	7	6)	2	2		1	104 157
17 18			3	4	1	1 2	12	2	2		1		114
19					4.	5	12	_	-	3.	-4-		116
20					2	5 1	9	5	1	3 · 2			112
21			3	4	4	5	9 1 2 2	5 3 4 1					154
22			-				2	4	2 6	3	6	3 4	64
23 24							2	l	6		7	4	. 59
$2\frac{4}{4}$				6	7	7						_	159
25 26					_	_	3 5 2 11 8	3 6 5 2 5	5 3 5	4	4	1	74
26					1	3	5	6	3	1.	1 3	1 1	104 81
27 28						6	11	り	כ	4 1	ر	1	$\begin{array}{c} 11 \\ 121 \end{array}$
29					1	5	8	5	1	_			120
30		.1	2	10	6	5 1	Ū		_				176
31			_	3	6 8	7	2						152
31 32 33				_	1.	7	2 5 7	3	1	1	2		113
33					1.	ĺ		3 6	1 1		2 3	1	98
3 4				2	2	7	4	4	1 5				131
35						2	7	4	5	1.	1		101
36					•	7 2 8 6	7 9 4 12	2 5 3	73		1		122
37 28					3	b	10	2	1		1 1		$\begin{array}{c} 121 \\ 114 \end{array}$
ەر 20				10	6) 4	.1. 4	כ	Л.		-		166
34 35 36 37 38 39 40				0		3 4 7	6	5	2				113
						•	_	_					

TABLE IV (Cont.)

SCHOOL B. INDIVIDUAL ITEM DISTRIBUTION FREQUENCY FOR THE FIRST SORT

	Pile Score	A 1.1	B 10	C 9	D 8	E ;	F	G 5	H 4	I 3	Ј 2	K 1	
Item	<u> </u>		_1.0			requ						<u>±</u>	Score Total
								~~			-41		
41			1			5	3 2	5 5 4	2	2	1	1 2	105
42 42							4) -	7 5	3 3	1 8	4	78 6 5
43 44		3	8	5	2	.1.		ı)	ر	0		65 211
4.5		ر.	1)	3 2 1 4	.Д.		5	6	4	2		91
45 46			.1		ב ד		3	5 5 3 2 6	6 7 2 3 2 6	4	_		91
47		1.	3		4	2	3 5 6 8 2	3	2	-			140
47 48					-		6	2	3				121
49					1	ź	ě	6	2	1			111
50					1	3	2	1.	6	1 6	1		90
51		6	7	5		9 2 3 2					_		195
52			•	•		1	3	2	6	3	4	1	77
53		8	9	2		1				-			203
54		1	L _I	7	6	2							176
54 55 56 57			2	1	Л.		4	4	4	3		1	107
56			.1	5	6	6	1 8	1					156
5 7					2	3	8	1	3	2	1		110
58		2	3 6	9	3 2	3 2 3 6	1						177 169 146
59 60			6	7	2	3		1	1 1 5 4 4				169
60			1.	3	5	6	3 1 3 4	1	1	_			146
61						1	1.	4	5	3	3 2 2	3 2	71
62						1	3	6	4	2	. 2	2 1	83 88
63 64						2	4.	4/.	4	3 2 3 4	2	Т	
04 ∠∵					.1.	3	2	4. 4.	3 6	2	3 1		91
65 66					2 2	3 3 5 7	2 2 5 1 6 5 3 4 2	2	4	1	т	7	101 115
67				3	-7	ララ	ラ 1	4	I	т.	1	1 1	エルフ
67 68			Ĩ.	,	7	7	5	5			1	1.	$\begin{array}{c} 141 \\ 128 \end{array}$
69			-J.,		1.	1	5	5 6	5	2			101
70					. <u>r</u> .	.1 8	3	U	,	-			146
71					9 2	2	4	5	4	2	1		103
72					1	<u>-</u> 1.	2	5 6	5	$\bar{4}$	ī		91
73		2	3	4		6	_	•		_	_		170
74	•		•-		5 1 1	6 3		7	7	2			170 98 89
75					1	_	2	7	7 5 2 6	4	1		<u>8</u> 9
76						1.	3	7 6 4	2	4 5 6	2 2	1	83
77					1		1		6	6	2		83 80
78				3	10 1	4	2	1					152
72 73 74 75 76 77 78 79					2 3	1	3 1 2 3 2	9	2	2		1	101 142
80			<u> </u>	2	3	9	2	3					142

Totals 40 80 120 180 240 280 240 180 120 80 40 9627

from the same population. However, a quick survey of

Tables III and IV revealed that some basic differences in

individual attitudes toward various items were in evidence.

A close study of each statement with its distribution indicated that the instrument was able to elicit negative attitudes for the following items:

School A

(a) Rather strong negative attitudes.

Area one -- attitude toward Negroes.

- Item 2. Fifty percent believed the dignity of the Negro was not impaired by segregation.
- Item 6. Seven members (thirty-five percent) agreed somewhat that Negroes lower moral tone in a neighborhood while one person gave maximum agreement to lowered moral tone.
- Item 7. Equal opportunity had little to do with achievement as expressed by two members.
- Item 8. Ninety percent of the majority group members believed that the civil rights movement was allowing Negroes opportunities before they were ready to assume the responsibilities.

Area two--attitude toward Indians.

- Item 11. Two persons indicated a strong feeling that the white man had little to do with conditions of poverty found among Indians.
- Item 12. One-fourth of School A had some reservations about the willingness of members of the Indian race to improve themselves while one person indicated extreme disagreement with the willingness of the Indian to improve himself.
- Item 13. Prejudice toward a race was indicated by some who judged all Indians for a "lack of ambition" possibly by a few he has known.

Item 14. One member of this group strongly disagreed with the statement that tribal custom had contributed to the conditions Indian youth experiences today.

Area three--attitude toward other minority groups.

- Item 24. Two persons registered high disapproval and seven mild disapproval for young people of different races attending the same parties and dances.
- Item 28. Three people indicated that a new neighbor belonging to a minority group would be sufficient reason to consider moving.
- Item 30. Four members doubted strongly, and eight others to a lesser degree, the willingness of minority groups to support and make sacrifices for this nation.

Area four--attitude toward religion.

- Item 31. A strong majority indicated that all churches should permit Negroes to be members, however, two believed that membership should not be extended to Negroes.
- Item 36. Two people felt that membership of a Negro in their church would be sufficient grounds for them to seek another church.

Area five--attitude toward socio-economic factors.

- Item 42. "Lack of initiative" was recorded as one of the main reasons why minority group peoples have lower standards of living by seven persons. Only one of the seven placed this toward the extreme of the continuum.
- Item 44. Three members of School A indicated a desire to limit housing opportunities.

Area six--attitude toward education.

Item 52. One quarter of Group A indicated approval of this item. This statement implies opposition to school desegregation and a belief that Negroes are inferior.

Item 54. Twenty percent opposed integration of school faculties. These four thought that Negro teachers should not be integrated into all white faculties.

Area seven -- attitude toward judicial factors.

- Item 62. One person believed that miscegenation laws were necessary to prevent massive intermarriage between the races.
- Item 64. Five people indicated equality of opportunity was possible even when there was racial segregation.
- Item 68. One person had a strong conviction that the courts were so corrupt that one could not expect to receive justice.

 Two others agreed to a lesser degree.
- Item 70. While sixty percent of this group believed that justice for the individual appeared to be proportional to one's financial resources, only two indicated a strong negative feeling on the topic.

Area eight--attitude toward governmental factors.

Item 71. Sixty percent of School A indicated a belief that states rights were of a higher order than civil rights. Twenty percent of the group had very strong feelings on this item.

(b) Mild negative attitudes.

Area one--attitude toward Negroes.

- Item 9. Only one person was deeply concerned about employment of Negroes as supervisors over whites.
- Item 10. Exactly half of the group believed that the Negro had not gained enough equal rights through recent legislation.

 Eight persons were neutral on this item and three indicated mildly that the Negro had gained enough equal rights.

Area two--attitude toward Indians.

Item 20. You cannot trust an Indian's word. Two persons gave mild approval to this statement.

Area three--attitude toward other minority groups.

- Item 25. Only one person felt that minority groups should be satisfied with their present position in our society.
- Item 27. A few members of the majority group believed that minority groups were pushing too fast for equal status with Caucasians. One person revealed a fairly strong negative attitude on this item.
- Item 29. Three persons believed all immigration should be stopped.

Area four -- attitude toward religion.

- Item 35. One person indicated mild approval of placing the blame of persecution to the Jews upon the Jewish people themselves.
- Item 38. Very limited approval was given to exclusion of religions not of Western culture such as Islam, Hinduism, etc.

Area five -- attitude toward socio-economic factors.

- Item 45. A strong majority of School A believed that all persons in our society did not have equal job opportunity, but one person in this group did believe that equal job opportunity existed.
- Item 48. A majority, fifty-five percent, believed that television tended to "over play" the poverty conditions of the Negro.
 This belief was indicated by very mild approval.
- Item 50. The mildness of the negative attitude to the statement that white people should not be held responsible for the plight of minority groups was indicated not by the number of those approving the item, but by the mildness of the disapproval of the item.

Area six--attitude toward education.

Item 56. Again, the negative attitude was indicated not by disagreement, but for the lack of acknowledging defacto segregation in the north.

Area seven--attitude toward judicial factors.

Item 66. General belief that little or no difference existed between the approach of Martin Luther King and Stokely Carmichael was indicated by thirty percent of the majority group faculty.

Area eight--attitude toward governmental factors.

Item 72. Two persons agreed that the federal government should let each state determine its own laws regarding minority group peoples.

School B

(a) Rather strong negative attitudes.

Area one -- attitude toward Negroes.

No strong negative attitudes were revealed in this area.

Area two--attitude toward Indians.

- Item 11. All twenty members indicated that white people are responsible for the conditions of poverty found among Indians today.
- Item 16. Only two persons from School B, the minority group, indicated a belief that the innate ability of the Indian was inferior to that of other races, but a surprisingly large number (eight) took a neutral position on this item. (Refer to Item 52 above).
- Item 20. It was surprising to see three minority group people agree that you cannot trust an Indian's word, and nine persons indicated a neutral position.

Area three--attitude toward other minority groups.

- Item 28. If a member of a minority group such as a Negro, Mexican, Jew, etc., moved next door to me, I would consider moving. Six persons indicated approval of this item. A large number took a neutral position. The surprising thing on this item was the fact that more minority group people approved of this statement than did majority group persons. (Refer to Item 28 above).
- Item 29. Thirty percent of the group approved of rigidly restricting or completely stopping immigration of all foreigners.

Area four -- attitude toward religion.

- Item 33. Two members agreed that the death of many Jews in Germany during Hitler's reign was necessary.
- Item 35. Two persons indicated approval of this item charging the Jewish people as being responsible for the persecution brought upon their ethnic group. The rather large number (seven) who took a neutral attitude was unexpected.
- Item 38. Three persons agreed and twelve took neutral positions on forbidding the practice of religions not of Western culture.

Area five -- attitude toward socio-economic factors.

Item 50. Seventy percent of this group believed that the white people should be held responsible for the plight of minority groups.

Area six--attitude toward education.

Item 55. Four members believed that the 1954
Supreme Court ruling of "separate but
equal" was in violation of the Constitution.

Area seven--attitude toward judicial factors.

- Item 67. While a strong majority of the members of School B agreed with School A on the statement that the courts have become too lenient with law violators, two minority group members indicated extreme opposition to this statement.
- Item 68. Forty-five percent of the minority group believed the courts are so corrupt today that one could not expect justice. One person indicated an extreme belief on the degree of corruptness.

(b) Mild negative attitudes.

Area one -- attitude toward Negroes.

- Item 6. One person agreed that Negroes lowered the moral tone of a white residential area upon moving into the area.
- Item 10. Two persons indicated very mild agreement with the statement that Negroes had gained enough equal rights through recent civil rights legislation.

Area two--attitude toward Indians.

- Item 17. Six people took a neutral position concerning equal rights for a minority group other than Negroes.
- Item 18. Three people believed that the American Indian had been accorded full citizenship privileges and responsibilities.

Area six--attitude toward education.

- Item 52. One person agreed mildly with the statement that desegregation caused white children to learn below their potential.
- Item 56. Only one person believed that defacto segregation did not exist in the north. This belief was expressed very mildly.

Area seven -- attitude toward judicial factors.

Item 66. Twenty-five percent believed that very little difference existed in the

approach of Martin Luther King and Stokely Carmichael for solving civil rights issues.

Item 70. Eighty-five percent of this group believed that justice for the individual was proportional to one's financial resources, but none of the persons responded in an extreme manner. These seventeen persons placed the statements in the two piles indicating the mildest amount of approval.

Statements on this Q sort for the most part were directed toward attitudes and opinions about minority groups, such as Negroes. These statements would possibly elicit fewer negative attitudes and opinions from minority groups responding to the instrument than would be revealed if given to the majority group of Caucasians. An examination of the results of the two groups supported this theory. School A, the majority group, indicated a strong prejudice on twenty-two items and a mild prejudice on fourteen items while School B, the minority group, indicated strong prejudice on twelve items and mild prejudice on eight items.

Of the total thirty-six items for School A and twenty items for School B on which either a strong or mild prejudice was revealed, less than half (forty-eight percent) were held in common. A difference was clearly indicated by these results. However, a statistical test would need to be conducted to determine if the difference was significant.

Tables III and IV also revealed that several items

were mutually acceptable to both faculty groups. The degree of acceptance was noted by the balanced distribution and comparable total scores on the following items:

- Item 15. Many Indians do not desire modern standards of living.
- Item 18. The American Indian has been accepted with full citizenship privileges and opportunities.
- Item 19. Indians do not constitute a racial problem in our society.
- Item 22. Uneducated white people are superior to the uneducated people of minority races.
- Item 23. White people have every right to set themselves above and apart from people of other races.
- Item 48. Current television programing tends to "over play" the depressed, poverty stricken conditions of the Negro race in contrast to other minority groups.
- Item 49. Urban renewal and subsidized low rent housing places an unfair tax burden on the American people.
- Item 50. White people should not be held responsible for the plight of minority groups, because minority group peoples control their own destiny.
- Item 53. All children should be taught the basic principles of human relations so that they can develop appropriate attitudes toward all people.
- Item 57. Negro teachers will find it difficult to discipline white students because of their apprehension over contact with white parents, thus they tend to avoid such behavior.
- Item 59. Developing knowledge and understanding of human rights is often neglected by schools.

- Item 60. One of the major obstacles to improved human relations in education is teacher attitudes toward non-academic pupils and the non-conformist.
- Item 69. Negroes get preferred treatment in the courts today.
- Item 71. States rights are of a higher order than civil rights.
- Item 72. The federal government should let every state determine its own laws regarding minority group peoples.

The discussion above has generally considered individual differences. Some analogies of the two groups should be considered. Special attention was made to a few of the above items that had almost identical distribution—items 15, 59, 60, and 69. These four items revealed a very high correlation between the two groups. That is, the attitudes of both groups were almost the same on these four statements.

A close analysis of an apparent agreement was revealing. The results of two statements were considered—items 31 and 32. The responses from both groups to item 31 (All churches should permit Negroes to join their congregations) indicated close agreement. Nonetheless, the wide difference of the two groups in response to item 32 (Negroes will be happier in a church whose congregation is composed of their own kind.) did not support the positive position taken by some individuals from School A. Here was an attitude toward segregation concealed in such a way that it became shrouded in the language of the statement.

More will be said of "concealed principle" later.

Some items revealed basic differences in the attitudes of the two groups taken as a whole. These differences were discovered by a careful survey of Tables III and IV. The summary which follows reflects the group differences in six statements.

- Item 21. Laws forbidding marriage between the races are discriminatory.
- School A: 45% approved 25% neutral 30% disapproved School B: 80% approved 5% neutral 15% disapproved
 - Item 27. Minority groups are pushing too fast for equal status with caucasians.
- School A: 35% approved 55% neutral 10% disapproved School B: 0 10% neutral 90% disapproved
 - Item 32. Negroes will be happier in a church whose congregation is composed of their own kind.
- School A: 50% approved 20% neutral 30% disapproved School B: 40% approved 25% neutral 35% disapproved
 - Item 46. Adequate opportunity has always been available to anyone who is willing to work hard.
- School A: 55% approved 10% neutral 35% disapproved School B: 5% approved 15% neutral 40% disapproved
 - Item 74. Government should assert its power and authority and put an end to civil rights demonstrations and other minority group movements of this nature.
- School A: 55% approved 10% neutral 35% disapproved School B: 20% approved 0 80% disapproved
 - Item 75. The defeat of some civil rights legislation during the past session of Congress was good because the civil rights movement had gotten out of hand.
- School A: 40% approved 40% neutral 20% disapproved School B: 5% approved 10% neutral 85% disapproved

A neutral position on most statements did not reflect any indication of a prejudiced attitude. However, for some statements this did not remain the case. A neutral position on some statements possibly reflected a negative attitude. Some statements so considered were:

- Item 16. The innate ability of the Indian is inferior to that of other races.
- Item 20. You cannot trust an Indian's word.
- Item 33. The thousands of Jews who were killed by the Nazi during Hitler's reign was necessary to break the financial stranglehold the Jews had over Germany.
- Item 35. If Jews are persecuted or discriminated against, it is basically their own fault.
- Item 38. Religions such as Hinduism, Islam, etc., are not of Western culture and should not be practiced in our country.
- Item 52. Desegregation of schools tends to lower the academic standards of schools and causes white children to learn below their potential.

If a minority group person responded neutrally to item 28 (If a member of a minority group such as a Negro, Mexican, Jew, etc., moved next door to me, I would consider moving), it would possibly suggest a negative attitude.

The statement by statement examination focused attention on some other interesting analogies. Item 17 (We should be just as concerned about the equal rights of the Indian as we are the Negro even though the Indian race represents a much smaller percentage of our population)

received two negative responses from School A and six neutral responses from School B. The immediate question raised by these responses to the person concerned with interpersonal relationships was "Why shouldn't one be just as concerned about injustices to one minority group as to any other minority group?"

Also, consider the response from both groups to item 18 (The American Indian has been accepted with full citizenship privileges and opportunities), and item 19 (Indians do not constitute a racial problem in our society.) Both groups indicated a close agreement on these two items. The number of persons showing a positive approval to either of these two items would suggest that they lacked an understanding of the human relations concepts involved.

The positive response to item 39 by both faculties revealed an openness to religious tolerance within both groups. But, this same kind of positive agreement on item 59 presented a challenge for education to "develop knowledge and understanding of human rights" which both groups believed to be "often neglected by schools."

Some items were so constructed that even though the statement itself was not a negative statement, there was an underlying (concealed) principle which "gets at" negative attitudes. A high positive approval of item 26 (Minority groups are happier and have more freedom and initiative in their own separate communities.) implied

approval of segregation. The same was true of item 27 (Minority groups are pushing too fast for equal status with Caucasians), and was also true of item 32 as previously discussed.

Teacher prejudice toward some pupils was found in the responses to item 60 (One of the major obstacles to improved human relations in education is teacher attitudes toward non-academic pupils and the non-conformist.) The mild negative response by four School A and two School B members was a subtle indicator of prejudice.

It was difficult, if not impossible, to conjecture upon some Negroes' response to a few items. Some of these responses from School B are indicated without making an effort to interpret the recorded choice.

Item 6. Negroes moving into a predominately white residential area lower its moral tone and standard of living.

One person gave moderate positive approval to this item.

Item 10. The Negro has gained enough equal rights through recent civil rights legislation.

Two persons recorded mild positive approval, and one responded neutrally.

Item 11. The conditions of poverty found among many Indians are largely the result of white man's injustices.

All twenty members of the minority group gave fairly strong approval to this item while responses to other items relative to the Indian-13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, and 20-did not show equal concern to this minority group.

Item 26. Minority groups are happier and have more freedom and initiative in their own separate communities.

Four persons recorded mild approval to this item.

Item 37. Religious practices of Negroes reflect more emotionalism than devotion to God.

Ten persons indicated a mild positive approval to this statement.

Item 38. All persons, regardless of race, religion, or sex have equal job opportunities in our nation.

Three persons approved this statement; one of which recorded a high approval.

Item 48. Current television programing tends to "over play" the depressed, poverty stricken conditions of the Negro race in contrast to other minority groups.

A mild approval was given to this item by nine persons.

Item 63. Public laws supporting restricted housing should be permitted.

Two people agreed mildly that restricted housing should be permitted while five agreed mildly that "open housing" laws are unconstitutional. These people would probably be called prejudiced if they were of the white majority. What would they be called if they were of the black minority?

Significance of the Distribution of Item Selection

The analysis of Tables III and IV revealed some differences in the attitudes and opinions of the individuals comprising the two sample groups. The above discussion pointed out some of the items where differences existed among the individuals of the two groups. Some

The Control of the Co

differences were reasonably expected in the two sample groups which represented two distinct racial groups found in our society. Are these differences significant?

The hypothesis tested was: There is no significant difference between the means of the two groups on the first sort of the eighty item Q sort instrument.

Computing from Tables III and IV the following results were obtained:

School A	School B
$\overline{X} = 119.925$	$\overline{X} = 120.35$
$\mathbf{z}^2 = 75,767.55$	$\angle x^2 = 113,860.20$
$s^2 = 959.08$	$S^2 = 1,441.26$

The square root of the variance of the difference between means of the independent groups was

$$S_{\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2} = 30.004$$

and, by formula, 1 had a t value of -.014.

Using the one percent level for 158 d.f. it was found that t began at -2.58 and ended at +2.58. The observed t (-.014) was well within the acceptance range. The null hypothesis was accepted. The instrument did not discriminate between groups and, therefore, the validity of the instrument was not established.

The basic problem of this study was to develop and validate an instrument which would identify negative

¹Ibid., p. 230.

attitudes and opinions of individuals toward other individuals and/or groups in certain human relations areas where conflict, misunderstanding, and tension often appears. The eighty items of this Q sort instrument were validated by a jury of judges, eleven recognized authorities in the human relations field. Instrument reliability was achieved by the test-retest procedure.

The discussion above has pointed out some areas where negative attitudes were revealed by the Q sort technique. The Q sort instrument, as developed in this study, can probably be a useful tool to those working in the field of human relations.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The problem of this study was to develop and validate an instrument which would identify negative attitudes and opinions of individuals and/or groups in certain human relations areas where conflict, misunderstanding, and tension often appears. The Q sort methodology was used in the development of the instrument. Item validity was established by an eleven member Jury of Judges which was composed of nationally recognized leaders in the field of human relations. Instrument reliability was established through the test-retest procedure. Two Oklahoma school faculties comprised the experimental groups. One school represented a majority group faculty; the other school represented a minority group faculty.

The purpose of this chapter is to present the major findings, conclusions, and recommendations of this investigation.

Summary of the Findings

The search for an acceptable instrument to measure attitudes was unproductive. Inquiries to the major test publishers were returned with the common reply, "We have done no work . . ."

A review of the literature revealed that Stephenson, Rogers, and Dymond had experienced favorable success in determining attitudes through Q-Methodology. It was decided that this technique could be profitably used for this study.

A compiled list of two hundred and forty (240) statements were grouped into eight broad areas within the human relations dimension: Negro, Indian, Other minority groups, religious, socio-economic, education, judicial, and governmental. These statements were selected from current literature, books, newspapers, speeches, and other current sources. Each statement included in the total sample was selected on the assumption that it met Thurstone's criteria for the use of statements of opinion.

Each of the eight general areas had thirty statements in the original mailing to the jurors. Each juror was to select the fifteen statements in each category he believed to be most relevant to identifying both positive and negative attitudes in each area.

The return from each juror was tallied. Since the instrument required eighty statements, only the ten

statements from each category receiving the highest frequency for inclusion were selected for the final Q sort instrument. Each statement included in the final form received seven of the possible eleven affirmative votes for inclusion.

The twenty correlations between first and second sorting process of School A ranged from .988 to .646.

All of these correlations were found to be significant at the one percent level.

The twenty correlations between first and second sorting process of School B ranged from .894 to .424. It was determined that any correlation falling below .561 with eighteen d.f. at the one percent level would not be significant. The last three (3) correlations of School B fell below this lowest limit. These three correlations were: .542, .514, and .424.

A look into the significant difference between the averages of the transformed correlations of the two independent samples revealed that the observed z' value of .572 falls short of significance, thus we accept the H: $p_1 = p_2$. The two samples could reasonably be random samples from the same population.

A further examination into the distribution of the items as sorted by each individual on the first sorting process revealed no significant difference of the means for the two sample groups. The observed "t" value of -.014 fell within the acceptance range using the one percent level with one hundred fifty-eight (158) d.f.

The purpose for developing the instrument was to identify attitudes and opinions of an individual or group toward other individuals and/or groups in areas where conflict, misunderstanding, and tension often appears. The Q sort instrument identified no less than twenty-two items wherein a strong degree of negative attitudes and opinions were found within the individuals of School A, and twelve items indicating strong negative attitudes and opinions within individuals of School B. A milder degree of negative attitudes and opinions was also indicated on fourteen items in School A and eight items in School B.

A strong agreement between the two groups was indicated on fifteen items of the instrument. That is, the two groups responded in a like manner on several statements. In fact, almost identical distribution was recorded on four items.

Other item responses of the two groups indicated sharp opposing opinions. Six statements were indicative of this clear cut difference of opinion between the two groups.

Responses from the minority group school revealed a negative attitude not only toward the majority race, but toward other minority groups as well on some statements.

The instrument further revealed that not all persons in the two sample groups were as concerned about the injustices to one minority group as they were for another minority group.

A positive openness to religious tolerance was clearly indicated by both groups. The belief that all groups should have equal opportunity was implied by both groups. However, the openness to religious tolerance was more pronounced than the approval of equal opportunity.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were drawn from the data gathered by the instrument and presented in the tables. These conclusions pertain only to the sample groups and cannot be applied to the total population.

- 1. There is a lack of general understanding about the total human relations dimension among professional teachers.
- 2. Positive and negative attitudes are identifiable through the use of this Q sort instrument.
- 3. The degree of positive and negative attitudes of individuals were ascertainable in most cases.
- 4. Teachers participating in the sorting process did not feel uncomfortable as if they were being evaluated. In fact, they seemed to enjoy the experience.

- 5. The instrument appeared to be more successful in eliciting negative attitudes from members of the majority white group than from members of the minority Negro group.
- 6. This Q sort instrument, with its simplified scoring methods and calculations, is appropriate for use in measuring the attitudinal changes of an individual or group over a period of time.
- 7. Some seemingly negative attitudes as recorded by the instrument may be more from a lack of knowledge and information than an actual case of prejudiced attitudes.
- 8. There existed a wide divergence of opinion, even within a particular racial group, about problems and issues related to the improvement of human relations and the achievement of civil rights and liberties for all people.
- 9. The instrument did not discriminate between groups and, therefore, the validity of the instrument was not established.

Recommendations

1. The results of this study would indicate the need for a planned program of human relations education through well planned in-service programs. Teachers from both minority and majority groups need additional experiences in interpersonal relations between racial groups.

It is recommended that school systems be encouraged to institute human relations workshops and seminars designed to achieve this purpose.

- 2. Attitudes are constantly in the process of change. Information and fact-giving of itself is not "reaction agent" enough to guarantee attitudinal change. Individuals must have the opportunity to experience interpersonal relationships for themselves. It is recommended that faculty involvement in some form of action research accompany any in-service program or workshop instituted by the school. It is further recommended that any in-service program be of the continuing or long range nature.
- 3. A cooperative effort will be required if faculty members are to gain interpersonal experiences with minority groups. Local administrators must be willing to introduce new approaches to involvement of totally segregated or all white faculties in the problems and issues facing our nation in the areas of human relations. Experienced leaders and knowledgeable people in the field of human relations must be willing to share their experiences. Therefore, to assist the schools in their efforts to provide an effective in-service program, it is recommended that state colleges, universities, the Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Oklahoma Commission on Human Rights, the

State Department of Education, Anti-Defamation Leagues, the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and all other concerned governmental and civic agencies make qualified personnel available as consultants, and that local school systems utilize these people.

- 4. It is strongly recommended that the Consultative Center for School Desegregation and the Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies continue to conduct workshops and take a leadership role in working with public schools in this much neglected area of human relations.
- 5. The employment of minority group teachers by all school systems should be encouraged by the State

 Department of Education, and this same agency should provide leadership in affecting desegregation and integration of school enrollments and faculties.

Instrument Utilization

It is suggested that this instrument might be of much value if used on a pre-test/post-test basis in a long range in-service program to determine attitudinal changes. The lower the correlation on the pre-post sortings, the greater the change in attitude. A high correlation would indicate a lack of attitudinal change. The results of the pre-test could be used as a basis for directed emphasis toward changing negative attitudes.

Secondly, the instrument might be of significant

value at the beginning of a human relations workshop or seminar to determine the positive and negative attitudes of the participants. The leadership of the workshop could then direct its efforts toward the areas where negative attitudes and misunderstanding appear.

The instrument might then be readministered at the end of the workshop to determine the degree of attitudinal change. However, it is believed that very little change in attitude would be expected during a short workshop of one or two weeks duration. A greater change might be expected after the participants have experienced the opportunity to put into practice some of the ideals and concepts analyzed during the workshop. A follow-up study on the participants by the administration of the Q sort instrument at an interval of six months to a year after such a workshop or seminar might indicate the degree to which attitudinal change has occurred.

APPENDIX A

JURY OF HUMAN RELATIONS LEADERS

Bill Carmack, Asst. Commissioner Bureau of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

Father Maher, Dean College of Education St. Louis University

John OHara, Director Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies University of Oklahoma

Bruce Rosen, Professor College of Education Atlanta University

Senator Fred R. Harris (Oklahoma) President's Special Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders

Truman Wester
Oklahoma Center for Continuing
Education
University of Oklahoma

Gertrude Noar, formerly of Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith

Dale Davis, Professor College of Education Southern Methodist University

Lonnie Wagstaff Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies University of Oklahoma

Ted Freedman, Regional Director Anti-Defamation League Houston, Texas

Don Sullivan, Regional Director National Conference of Christians and Jews Washington, D. C.

APPENDIX B

INSTRUCTIONS TO THE JURY OF JUDGES

The Southwest Center for Human Relations Studies at the University of Oklahoma has been interested for some time in developing an instrument which will identify positive and negative attitudes and opinions of individuals toward other individuals or groups in areas of human relations where conflict, misunderstanding, and tension often appear. The interest of this organization in this problem provided some of the stimulus for the problem of this study. Various factors have prompted the decision to use the Q technique as developed by Stephenson in preparing this instrument.

A brief explanation for those that may not be familiar with this statistical procedure should be offered. Q technique centers particularly in the sorting of items, called Q sorts, and in the correlations among the responses of different individuals to the Q sorts. Q technique is mainly a sophisticated form of rank-ordering objects and then assigning numerals to subsets for statistical purposes.

An unstructured Q sort is a set of items assembled

without specific regard to the variables or factors underlying the items. Theoretically, any sample of homogeneous items can be used in an unstructured Q sort. The important thing for this instrument is to force the individual to make discriminations that he often will not make unless required to do so.

This Q sort instrument will consider eight areas within the broad spectrum of human relations: racial (subdivided into Negro, Indian, and other minority groups), religious, socio-economic, education, judicial, and governmental.

Enclosed you will find thirty items for each area listed above. You are to check (without regard to your own personal degree of agreement or disagreement) fifteen of the items in each area which you believe to be the most relevant statements for identifying both positive and negative attitudes in each of the eight areas. Keep in mind that the sorter taking the test will be required to make a choice as to his own degree of approval or disapproval with each item of the Q sort.

As a judge, you are permitted the freedom of changing the wording of any statement for clarity. Your final result should indicate only fifteen selected items from each of the eight categories.

Circle each statement you believe to be most relevant for identifying positive and negative attitudes

in each of the eight selected areas.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope is provided for the return of the marked items you feel to be most relevant.

Our appreciation for your cooperation is gratefully acknowledged at this time.

APPENDIX C

Q SORT MANUAL

The following pages contain the final form of the test manual:

- (1) The Instruction Sheet
- (2) Tally Sheet
- (3) Instructions for Scoring
- (4) Scoring Sheet
- (5) The Eighty Statements Comprising the Q Sort Instrument.

INSTRUCTION SHEET

I. This activity is called a Q Sort. There are no right or wrong selections. You are asked to simply react to the statement found on each card. You may agree, take a neutral position, or disagree with any of the statements. The only factor which should control your decision is your own personal feelings about the statement.

Treat each card during the entire sorting process independently. None of the items have been designed to mislead you into making opposing choices about the same general topic. Please sort these statements into the order of attention they should receive according to your personal views and opinions.

II. Place the eleven (11) alphabetical cards in order before you.

Most Approve

A B C D E F G H I J K

2 4 6 9 12 14 12 9 6 4 2

III. Read each card and place it in one of three temporary piles:

APPROVE NEUTRAL DISAPPROVE

The numbers listed below the alphabetical card order above indicate the number of cards to be placed in each pile.

From the APPROVE pile select the two card statements that you most approve and place them above the Alphabetical Card "A". Then sort out the next four you most approve and place them above the Alphabetical Card "B"; continue this process until all the cards in the APPROVE pile have been sorted. (The cards within the pile do not need to be ranked within the pile, as all cards have the same value.)

Now move to the DISAPPROVE pile and continue the same sorting process. After all of the cards from this pile have been sorted, move to the NEUTRAL pile and complete the sorting process, making sure that each pile has only the required number of cards in it. You may shift cards from one pile to another pile at any time during the sorting process.

IV. When you have completed the sorting process to your satisfaction, take the identification number on the top of each statement card and record it on the TALLY SHEET above the alphabetical pile in which it was placed.

Return the cards, instruction sheet, and your completed tally sheet to the supervisor.

TALLY SHEET

A	В	С	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K

Place the identification number found at the top of each statement card in the spaces above each alphabetical pile.

The required number of spaces are provided. Be sure that all spaces are filled.

Signature

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SCORING SHEET

Pile	<u>A</u> .	В	С	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
Score											
$(x-\overline{x})$	5	4	3	2	1.	0	-1	-2	-3	{₽	-5

The following steps are used to determine the correlation between the first and second sorts:

- 1. The identification number found at the top of each card is to be matched with the corresponding item number on the scoring sheet. Record the results from the first sort tally sheet under column "x". Record a five (5) for each of the two (2) cards in Pile A; record a four (4) for each of the four (4) cards in Pile B; record a three (3) for each of the six (6) cards in Pile C; continue this process until all the cards in each pile have been recorded.
- 2. The results from the second sort are handled in the same manner. The second sort is recorded under column "y",
- 3. Multiply the score recorded for "x" times the score recorded for "y" for each of the eighty items. This product is recorded in the "xy" column.
- 4. Add the "xy" column and record the sum in the space provided at $\leq xy =$ ______.
- 5. Substitute this value into the formula at the bottom of the scoring sheet and solve for r (This is the sign used to signify correlation between two sets of numbers.)

SCORING SHEET

Item	x	у	хy	Item	x	<u>у</u>	хy	Item	x	У_	жу	
1				27				54				
2				28				55				
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9				29				54 55 56				
$\frac{7}{4}$				3Ó			•	57				
5				30 31				ź8				
6				32				57 58 59				
7				32 33 35 36 37 38 39				6 0				
8				34				61				
9				35				62				
10				36				63 64				
11				37				64				
12				. 38				65				
13 14				39				66				
14				40				67				
15 16				41				68				
16				42				69				
17				43				70				
18				44				71				
19				45 46				72				
20				46				73 74				
21				47 40				74				
22				48				75				
23 24				49				70				
2 4 25				50 51				75 76 77 78				
26 26				52				70				
20				53				79 80				
				<i>)</i>)				00				
									٤	$\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}$	=	

$$\mathbf{r} = \frac{\mathbf{x}\mathbf{y}}{\sqrt{\mathbf{\xi}\mathbf{x}^2 \mathbf{\xi}\mathbf{y}^2}} = \frac{\mathbf{y}}{432}$$

Q SORT STATEMENT ITEMS

Area Number One--Negro

- 1. All Americans have responsibility for helping Negro people better themselves.
- 2. The dignity of the Negro is impaired by segregation.
- 3. Negroes are generally inferior to whites.
- 4. Negro and Caucasian youth should not date each other.
- 5. Poverty for many Negroes has been caused by past injustices and discriminations.
- 6. Negroes moving into a predominately white residential area lower its moral tone and standard of living.
- 7. Negroes tend to achieve about the same as whites when they have equal opportunities.
- 8. I'm for equality, but I think the civil rights movement is allowing Negroes opportunities before they are ready to assume the necessary responsibilities.
- 9. It would be a mistake to employ Negroes as supervisors over whites.
- 10. The Negro has gained enough equal rights through recent civil rights legislation.

Area Number Two--Indian

- 11. The conditions of poverty found among many Indians are the result of white man's injustices.
- 12. Indians would improve themselves if they were given additional opportunities.
- 13. Indians, in general, lack ambition.
- 14. Tribal customs and culture inhibit advancement of Indian youth.
- 15. Many Indians do not desire modern standards of living.
- 16. The innate ability of the Indian is inferior to that of other races.

- 17. We should be just as concerned about the equal rights of the Indian as we are with the Negro even though the Indian race represents a much smaller percentage of our population.
- 18. The American Indian has been accepted with full citizenship privileges and opportunities.
- 19. Indians do not constitute a racial problem in our society.
- 20. You cannot trust an Indian's word.

Area Number Three--Other Minority Groups

- 21. Laws forbidding marriage between the races are discriminatory.
- 22. Uneducated white people are superior to the uneducated people of minority races.
- 23. White people have every right to set themselves above and apart from people of other races.
- 24. It is quite alright for young people of different races to go to the same parties and dances.
- 25. Minority groups should be satisfied with their present position in our society since their standard of living in the U.S. is higher than in other parts of the world.
- 26. Minorities are happier and have more freedom and initiative in their own separate communities.
- 27. Minority groups are pushing too fast for equal status with Caucasians.
- 28. If a member of a minority group such as a Negro, Mexican, Jew, etc., moved next door to me, I would consider moving.
- 29. It is time to rigidly restrict or completely stop immigration of all foreigners.
- 30. Most members of minority groups are patriotic and willing to make sacrifices for our country.

Area Number Four--Religious

- 31. All churches should permit Negroes to join their congregations.
- 32. Negroes will be happier in a church whose congregation is composed of their own kind.
- 33. The thousands of Jews who were killed by the Nazi during Hitler's reign was necessary to break the financial strangle-hold the Jews had over Germany.
- 34. The recent opinion handed down by the Supreme Court banning prayers and Bible reading in public schools refutes this nation's belief in God.
- 35. If Jews are persecuted or discriminated against, it is basically their own fault.
- 36. If a Negro were to join my church, I would change churches.
- 37. Religious practices of Negroes reflect more emotionalism than devotion to God.
- 38. Religions such as Hinduism, Islam, etc., are not of Western culture and should not be practiced in our country.
- 39. A person's religion is his own personal business and should not affect his acceptance in the community.
- 40. Although I try, I just can't accept people or religious beliefs differing greatly from my own beliefs.

Area Number Five--Socio-Economic

- 41. Poverty is usually due to lack of self-control, will-power, or the desire to get ahead.
- 42. Minority groups have lower standards of living mainly due to their lack of initiative.
- 43. The greatest percentage of criminals comes from minority groups because minority group people are criminally inclined.
- 44. People should be allowed to live where they please if they can afford the price of purchase.

- 45. All persons, regardless of race, religion, or sex have equal job opportunities in our nation.
- 46. Adequate opportunity has always been available to anyone who is willing to work hard.
- 47. A man should be able to sell or trade to whom he pleases.
- 48. Current television programing tends to "over play" the depressed, poverty stricken conditions of the Negro race in contrast to other minority groups.
- 49. Urban renewal and subsidized low rent housing places an unfair tax burden on the American people.
- 50. White people should not be held responsible for the plight of minority groups, because minority group peoples control their own destiny.

Area Number Six--Education

- 51. If given the same opportunities, minority group people can learn as easily as whites.
- 52. Desegregation of schools tends to lower the academic standards of schools and causes white children to learn below their potential.
- 53. All children should be taught the basic principles of human relations so that they can develop appropriate attitudes toward all people.
- 54. Negro teachers should be integrated into formerly all white faculties as schools are desegregated.
- 55. I do not agree with the 1954 Supreme Court ruling that educational facilities that were "separate but equal" are in violation with the Constitution.
- 56. Segregated schools exist in the north as well as in the south.
- 57. Negro teachers will find it difficult to discipline white students because of their apprehension over contact with white parents, thus they tend to avoid such behavior.
- 58. Group intelligence tests tend to have a "culture bias" which operates against youngsters from a poor or culturally impoverished environment.

- 59. Developing knowledge and understanding of human rights is often neglected by schools.
- 60. One of the major obstacles to improved human relations in education is teacher attitudes toward non-academic pupils and the non-conformist.

Area Number Seven--Judicial

- 61. Caucasians founded, developed, and advanced civilization and culture in America. Therefore, they should determine how we live and conduct our affairs.
- 62. Miscegenation (interracial marriage) laws are necessary to prevent massive intermarriage between whites and minority group peoples.
- 63. Public laws supporting restricted housing should be permitted.
- 64. Equality of opportunity is possible even when there is racial segregation.
- 65. I believe laws forcing "open housing" are unconstitutional.
- 66. There is very little difference in Martin Luther King's approach to solving civil rights issues and Stokely Carmichael's militancy.
- 67. The courts have become too lenient with law violators.
- 68. The courts are so corrupt today that you cannot expect to receive justice.
- 69. Negroes get preferred treatment in the courts today.
- 70. Justice for the individual appears to be proportional to one's financial resources.

Area Number Eight -- Governmental

- 71. States rights are of a higher order than civil rights.
- 72. The federal government should let every state determine its own laws regarding minority group peoples.
- 73. Most of the advances made during recent years in desegregation are the direct result of the federal government, and would not have been accomplished

by individual states.

- 74. Government should assert its power and authority and put an end to civil rights demonstrations and other minority group movements of this nature.
- 75. The defeat of some civil rights legislation during the past session of Congress was good because the civil rights movement had gotten out of hand.
- 76. The federal government is wrong in forcing the owner and/or the operator of a business to open his establishment to use by Negroes, or other unwanted groups.
- 77. It is time for the government to slacken its pace in the area of civil rights legislation because public opinion polls show a rise in the percentage of people who believe that the pace toward equal rights is going too fast.
- 78. You can legislate laws, but you can't legislate morals.
- 79. Enough has been said about minority group rights. It's time to recognize the majority group rights.
- 80. Our society needs fewer welfare programs today and more emphasis put on the free enterprise system.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., and Sanford, R. N. <u>The Authoritarian Personality</u>. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.
- Brookover, Wilbur B. A Sociology of Education. New York:
 American Book Co., 1955.
- Cornell, Francis G. The Essentials of Education Statistics.

 New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1956.
- Deese, James. The Psychology of Learning. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1958.
- DuBois, W. E. B. <u>Souls of Black Folk</u>. Chicago: McClurg. 16th Edition, 1928.
- Edwards, Allen L. <u>Techniques of Attitude Scale Construction</u>. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1957.
- Gittler, Joseph B., (editor). <u>Understanding Minority</u>
 <u>Groups</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.,
 1956.
- Kahl, Joseph A. The American Class Structure. New York: Rinehart and Co., Inc., 1957.
- Kerlinger, Fred. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Kroeber, Alfred L. <u>Configurations of Culture Growth</u>.

 Berkley: University of California, 1944.
- Landes, Ruth. <u>Culture in American Education</u>. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
- MacIver, R. M. The More Perfect Union. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1948.

- MacWilliams, Carey. <u>Prejudice: Japanese-Americans</u>. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1944.
- . Mask for Privilege. Boston: Little, Brown and Co., 1948.
- Murry, Henry A., et al. Explorations in Personality. New York: Oxford University Press, 1938.
- Remmers, H. H. (editor). Anti-Democratic Attitudes in American Schools. Evanston: Northwestern University Press, 1963.
- Rogers, Carl, and Dymond, Rosalind, (editors). <u>Psycho-therapy and Personality Change</u>. Chicago: Uni-versity of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Stephenson, William. The Study of Behavior. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953.
- Spindler, George D. Education and Culture. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1963.
- Spranger, Eduard. Types of Men. (Translated from 5th German edition of Lebensformen by Paul J. W. Pigors.)
 Halle:: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1928.
- Thurstone, L. L. <u>The Measurement of Attitude</u>. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.
- Tylor, E. B. <u>Primitive Culture</u>. London: John Murry, 1871, Two volumes; Seventh Edition, New York, 1924.
- Vœlker, Paul F. The Function of Ideals and Attitudes in Social Education. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1921.
- Warner, W. Lloyd, Havighurst, Robert J., Loeb, Martin B.

 Who Shall Be Educated. New York: Harper and
 Brothers, 1944.
- Washington, Booker T. <u>Up From Slavery</u>. New York: Doubleday, 1901.

Pamphlets

Alport, Gordon W. The Resolution of Intergroup Tensions.

New York: The National Conference of Christians and Jews, 1961.

رطيت .

- Kennedy, John F. A Nation of Immigrants. New York: One Nation Library, 1963.
- Kilpatrick, William H. Modern Education and Better Human Relations. New York: Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1957.
- Mack, Raymond W., and Duster, Troy S. <u>Patterns of Minority</u>
 Relations. New York: The Anti-Defamation League
 of B'nai B'rith, 1964.
- Noar, Gertrude. <u>Information Is Not Enough</u>. New York: The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1961.
- Raab, Earl, and Lipset, Seymour M. <u>Prejudice and Society</u>. New York: The Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, 1963.

Articles and Periodicals

- Block, Jack. "A Comparison of Forced and Unforced Q-Sorting Methodology," <u>Educational and Psychological Measurement</u>, XVI (1956), pp. 481-493.
- Cronbach, Lee and Gleser, Goldine. "William Stephenson.

 The Study of Behavior: Q-Technique and its

 Methodology," Psychometrika, XIX (1954), pp. 327330.
- _____. "Assessing Similarity Between Profiles," <u>Psy-chological Bulletin</u>, L (1953), pp. 456-473.
- Dodson, Dan W. "Conference Summary," <u>Conference Report</u>
 <u>1965</u>. Commission on Equal Opportunities in Education, California State Department of Education.
- Jones, Austin. "Distribution of Traits in Current Q-Sorting Methodology," <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, LIII (1956), pp. 90-95.
- Kent, James K. "The Coleman Report: Opening Pandora's Box," Phi Delta Kappan, XLIX (January, 1968), pp. 242-245.
- Livson, Norman H. and Nichols, Thomas F. "Discrimination and Reliability in Q-Sort Personality Descriptions," <u>Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology</u>, LII (1956), pp. 159-165.
- Mead, George H. "Psychology of Social Consciousness Implied in Instruction," <u>Science</u>, Vol. XXXI, pp. 689-690.

- Remmers, H. H., and Others. "Studies in Attitudes--A Contribution to Social-Psychological Research Methods," <u>Studies in Higher Education XXVI</u>, Bulletin of Purdue University, Vol. XXXV, No. 4, December, 1934.
- , (editor). "Further Studies in Attitudes, Series II," <u>Studies in Higher Education XXXI</u>, Purdue University, 1936.
- Sundland, Donald. "The Construction of Q Sorts: A Criticism," <u>Psychological Review</u>, LXIX (1962), pp. 62-64.
- Samelson, Babette. "Does Education Diminish Prejudice?"

 Journal of Social Issues, Vol. I (1945), pp. 11-13.
- Tumin, Melvin. "Sociological Aspects of Desegregation,"

 The Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. XXIX (January, 1958), pp. 180-185.

Encyclopedia

Boaz, Franz. "Anthropology," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. II (New York: Macmillian Company, 1937), pp. 73-100.

Other Publications

- Buros, Oscar K., (editor). Sixth Mental Measurements Yearbook. Highland Park, New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1965.
- Coleman, James S., et al. <u>Equality of Educational Opportunity</u>. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.
- Williams, Robin M., Jr. The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions: A survey of Research on Problems of Ethnic, Racial, and Religious Group Relations. New York:
 Social Science Research Council, Bulletin No. 57, 1942.

Standardized Tests

Allport, Gordon W., Lindzey, Gardner, and Vernon, Philip E. Study of Values. Boston: Houghton Mifflin - Company, 1960.

- Gardner, Eric F., and Thompson, George G. <u>Syracuse Scales</u>
 of <u>Social Relations</u>. New York: Harcourt, Brace
 and World, Inc., 1959.
- Remmers, H. H., (editor). <u>Master Attitude Scales</u> (Level A). West Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue Research Foundation, 1960.
- Tiegs, Ernest W., Clark, Willis W., and Thorpe, Louis P.

 The California Test of Personality. Monterey,
 California: California Test Bureau, 1953.