

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1971

Programmed Interpersonal Relations Training for Small Groups

John Fredricks

Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Fredricks, John, "Programmed Interpersonal Relations Training for Small Groups" (1971). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 5675.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/5675>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



PROGRAMMED INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS
TRAINING FOR SMALL GROUPS.

by

John Fredricks

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Psychology

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1971

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | Page |
|---|------|
| THE PROBLEM | 1 |
| REVIEW OF LITERATURE | 3 |
| OBJECTIVES | 10 |
| HYPOTHESES | 11 |
| METHODS AND PROCEDURES | 12 |
| Sample | 12 |
| Design | 12 |
| INSTRUMENTATION | 13 |
| STATISTICAL ANALYSIS | 15 |
| TRENDS | 32 |
| CONCLUSION | 36 |
| DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH | 38 |
| BIBLIOGRAPHY | 40 |
| APPENDIX | 43 |
| VITA | 46 |

LIST OF TABLES

| Table | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis of Variance for CPI Scores | 16 |
| 2. Non-Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis of Variance for CPI Scores | 19 |
| 3. Leader versus non-leader Analysis of Variance for post test CPI scores | 22 |
| 4. Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis of Variance for Semantic Differential Scores | 25 |
| 5. Non-Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis of Variance for Semantic Differential Scores | 26 |
| 6. Leader versus Non-Leader Analysis of Variance for post test Semantic Differential Scores | 30 |
| 7. Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis of Variance for FIRO-B Scores | 27 |
| 8. Non-Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis of Variance for FIRO-B Scores | 28 |
| 9. Leader versus Non-Leader Analysis of Variance for FIRO-B post test scores | 31 |

ABSTRACT

Programmed Interpersonal Relations
Training for Small Groups.

by

John Fredricks, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1971

Major Professor: Dr. Elwin Nielsen

Department: Psychology

The objective of this study was to determine the effect of the Human Development Institute's (HDI) new group relationship improvement program on the interpersonal functioning of those individuals who undergo the program. The "California Personality Inventory" (CPI), the "Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior" (FIRO-B), and a semantic differential were used to measure changes.

The two hypotheses of this study are:

1. There will be a significant change towards improved interpersonal relationship skills for all groups, as measured from pre- to post testings.
2. There will be no significant difference in the change in interpersonal relations as measured by the pre-and post tests, between the groups using the RIF manual, and the groups having a leader and using an eclectic approach.

An analysis of variance was run to test whether

ABSTRACT (Continued)

there was a significant difference pre to post on all three tests that were administered, or if there was a significant difference between post test scores of the leader and non-leader groups. Variable 5 on the CPI post testing was significant for the leader group. No other significance was obtained.

(46 pages)

The Problem

The Federal and State employment security offices throughout the nation offer a variety of job training programs. The unemployed are taken into these programs, where they are taught and helped to develop the vocational and technical skills necessary for employment. There is some evidence that this training may be ignoring a very important variable in job success. Issacson (1966) reports that difficulty with interpersonal relationships on the job is the single largest cause of employee dismissals.

Likewise, the extremely high rate at which college freshmen drop out of school is in part due to inadequate interpersonal relationship skills which hinder their satisfactory adjustment to the college setting (Brown and Campbell, 1966). *Not indicated by Brown & Campbell* Therefore, an effective training program in interpersonal relationships would be of value to the employment office and the college.

In ever increasing numbers, employment offices and colleges are attempting to improve the interpersonal relationship skills of their clients. While individual counseling traditionally has been the means to do this, the institutions lack the staff to provide this one-to-one service. *Problem* Therefore, many clients receive no training in interpersonal functioning. Those who do are usually given a group counseling experience or some type of lecture course.

The Human Development Institute in 1962 developed a programmed relationship improvement program (RIP), which was

designed to teach and facilitate improvement of interpersonal relationship skills. In the program, two clients work together using the RIP manual, without leadership from professional staff. Consequently, more clients can receive training in interpersonal functioning than previously, because professional leadership is not required.

Within the past year the Human Development Institute has revised their RIP program, so that now the manual is structured for use in a group setting consisting of from four to seven individuals. Due to the recency of this revision there are no available research results on its effectiveness. If it is as effective as current group methods, then the program would be a great asset to both the employment office and the college, because greater numbers of their clients could receive valuable training in interpersonal skills. The problem is then, that there exists a lack of research evidence on the use of this new approach.

Review of Literature

This review will focus upon the specifics of the following points:

1. Pertinent research into the area of interpersonal functioning.
2. Research on the basic rationale and value of group work approaches.
3. Significant studies which have used the RIP program.
4. The value of the RIP program as an adjunct to group work.

Prob Interpersonal functioning has generally been cited as a result of learning rather than any innate characteristic. Truax & Carkhuff (1967), for example, *have* suggested that a deficit in learning is at least in part responsible for the typical therapy patient's inability to relate well to other human beings. Consequently, there is a need for the counselor to teach his clients how to develop effective relationships (Krumboltz, 1968).

Prob *leaderless group* A question can be raised about the necessity of contact between the client and a professional behavioral scientist if the teaching of relationship skills is to be successful. The overwhelming majority of people in our society function fairly adequately interpersonally, yet most have never received any professional training in relationships. Conversely, there is some contention that the client-counselor relationship may impede the development of such skills. Krumboltz (1968) lists some of the dangers involved:

1. The client may learn that the way to establish good relationships is to do all the talking, expecting the other person to do all the listening.
2. He may learn that his own personal problems are of overwhelming interest to other people while other people's problems do not seem worthy of discussion.
3. He may learn to talk about his own personal feelings without ever taking any constructive action to do anything about them.
4. If he does adopt the counselor as a model, he may think that the only way to help other people is to listen with empathy to their problems.

The RIP two-client program hopefully avoids these dangers, since there is no professional counselor for the client to become dependent upon and it is unlikely that the partner client would fulfill the professional role. The group approach virtually assures freedom from these dangers, because it is highly unlikely that a whole group would tolerate such behavior from one individual.

Demonstration that interpersonal functioning can be improved through teaching was shown by a study completed last year by Carkhuff & Bierman (1970). In this study, ten parents of emotionally disturbed children received 25 hours of training in interpersonal skills. This was accomplished in a group setting with a professional leader. Although an increase of ability in interpersonal skills was found, it was confined to adult relationships and was

not generalizable to the play activities with their children. These findings suggested that people do not learn to talk with their children by practicing with adults. Thus, the RIP group program should improve skills among college students if the group consists of college students; improvements should be more generalizable as the groups are more heterogeneous.

→ Dealing specifically with a college population, Berenson, Carkhuff, & Myrus (1966) attempted to train (look up) college students in various methods of interpersonal functioning. [Four previously validated indices (empathic understanding, ^{4 assessment indices used pre & post} positive regard, genuineness, degree of self-exploration ^{a respect or in interpersonal processes} elicited in others), objective tape ratings, and inventory reports (self, ^{Standard} interviewee, and significant others) were used on a pre and post basis to measure any changes. The final results of the study were that group therapy was a more effective method of improving the interpersonal skills of the group members than were individual training sessions. } these were measured by the objective tape on a 5PT scale

→ Pierce & Drasgow (1969) made a similar attempt to teach facilitative interpersonal functioning, but they used male psychiatric inpatients who were randomly selected from a group of patients who had not been assigned to therapy, because their pathology was thought to be too severe for them to receive benefit from such a program. The training group met for a total of 20 hours broken into 1½ hour sessions. An integrated didactic and experiential approach

Developed by Carkhuff 1969

d personally relevant concreteness or specificity of expression

not found group better than individual

was used and two client taped interviews served as the pre and post test measures. The tapes were rated for communication level by trained raters who had been shown in previous research to have high interrater reliability. The data between groups were analyzed using the Tukey two-sample test. There was a significant difference at the .001 level between the control and treatment group.

The results indicate rather conclusively that psychiatric inpatients can significantly improve their level of interpersonal functioning in the brief time of 20 hours. Furthermore, the major implication for traditional therapy is that progress in improving interpersonal relations must be taught directly and systematically since none of the control groups' final levels were even near the final level of the training group (Pierce & Drasgow, 1969, p. 297).

omit →
Group Counsel
 There exists other research into the effectiveness of group counseling, most of which has shown group counseling to be fairly effective (Bordin & Campbell, 1963; Dreese, 1957; Ohlsen, 1960; Wright, 1959). As a result, group counseling is now a commonly accepted approach in working with students. Considerable research is still being conducted in the field of group counseling, largely concentrating on improving the group's effectiveness, rather than proving it. It was in this attempt for improvement that the RIP program was developed.

The RIP program was developed by the Human Development Institute (HDI), which is based in Atlanta, Georgia. HDI was founded in 1962 as a private corporation and was acquired by Bell & Howell Company in 1967. The original RIP was to be used as a training device by industry (Programming

Harmony, 1964), and consisted of a series of ten sessions of programmed instruction through which Rogerian principles of relating were taught. Two individuals worked together on the program, taking turns reading the step-by-step instructions aloud. They answered questions, discussed topics given, and went through other special exercises ranging from conversation to role-playing. The objective was to improve the relationship skills of those who went through the program. The newer RIP is essentially the same, except that it is structured for use by a group, rather than just two people.

The original RIP has been purchased by over 50 companies who have used it primarily as a training tool for new employees, although some have used it exclusively to improve working relations among their present employees. The companies generally have judged the RIP program to be of merit, and 80 percent of the employees in one pilot study indicated that the time required to take the program was well spent (Programming Harmony, 1964). Likewise,

Berlin and Wyckoff (1964) reported that questionnaire responses by participants indicated that they felt the program to be extremely worthwhile, provided that the participants had entered the program voluntarily. The rate of positive judgments dropped to about 85 percent, however, when the participants were selected (Hurst, 1966, p. 51).

The RIP was used along with weekly T-group sessions by Hurst (1966) as a training procedure to increase self and others-acceptance and capacity for interpersonal sensitivity and communication. Results indicated a tendency

toward greater self and others-acceptance, and a greater capacity for interpersonal sensitivity and communication among the T-group members who had additionally undergone the RIP program. However, the differences were not statistically significant.

Another study which had similar results (Baldwin & Lee, 1965) used college subjects enrolled in a course on abnormal psychology who were given the RIP training. The methodology involved pre and post mean ratings on empathy shown in a role-playing interview. The experimental group showed a significant improvement over the control group.

look up

Wrong

In 1964, an experimental evaluation of the RIP was conducted by Brown. His control group consisted of students in a psychology adjustment course. Between-groups comparisons revealed pre- to follow-up changes in the experimental group showing improved interpersonal relationships.

Subjective reports of students completing the program lend strong positive support to this finding. It appears that the program has some effect in producing measurable and durable personality changes which might generalize to improvements in interpersonal relationships (Brown & Campbell, 1966, p. 1).

Two additional studies were cited by Hurst as lending statistical support to the effectiveness of the RIP program. One was conducted by Shepherd at Georgia State College. "The H. D. I. program combined with group meetings produced significant favorable change as indicated by the Edwards Personal Preference and Jourard Self Disclosure scales"

(Hurst, 1966, p. 50). The second study was done by Hough. Ober

Hough and Ober (1966) found significantly greater acceptance and clarification of student ideas in a treatment group of pre-service teachers that combined instruction in interaction analysis with human relations training by means of the H. D. I. Relationship Improvement Program. Hough (1965) had found earlier that in 30 of 40 analyses, groups of pre-service teachers using H. D. I. programs made significant positive changes in human relations skill (Hurst, 1966, p. 51).

These studies suggest the RIP program to be a valuable addition to group work.

No research exists comparing the RIP with other programs in interpersonal relations. However, the total research done on the RIP program indicates considerable success, in terms of accomplishing the objectives for which it was designed. The objectives include: increasing one's sensitivity to his own feelings and to the feelings of others; improving appreciation of one's potential; becoming more flexible in emotional and cognitive aspects of behavior; and developing the ability to relate more satisfactorily with others (Berlin & Wyckoff, 1964). Since freshmen college students seeking counseling frequently voice these types of objectives, and the objectives appear pertinent to the development of clients in the "Manpower Training Programs," it seemed particularly important to study and evaluate the effectiveness of the RIP program as an additional resource for counseling.

Objectives

The single objective of this study will be to determine the effect of HDI's new group RIP program on the interpersonal functioning of those individuals who undergo the program. The "California Personality Inventory" (CPI), the "Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior" (FIRO-B), and a semantic differential will be used on a pre-post treatment basis to measure changes in interpersonal relations.

Hypotheses

The two hypotheses of this study were:

1. There will be a significant change towards improved interpersonal relationship attitudes for all groups, as measured from pre- to post testings.
2. There will be no significant difference in the amount of change in interpersonal relation attitudes as measured by the pre-and post tests, between the groups using the RIP manual, and the groups having a leader and using an eclectic approach.

Methods and Procedures

Sample

Two control groups and two treatment groups, each consisting of six college students served as subjects. They were randomly selected from those students in university psychology courses who volunteered to take part in the study.

Design

The names of all the volunteers were put on slips of paper and put in a box. The box was thoroughly shaken and then one at a time slips were removed until twenty-four subjects had been chosen. The slips were put into one of the four groups on an alternating basis as they were drawn from the box. The groups met together for a two-hour session before and after the study, for the purpose of pre-and post testing.

During the study each group met five times over a two-week period, each session continued for a minimum of two hours duration. The experimental groups used the RIP manual, while the control groups were lead by a graduate student in counseling psychology who has had previous experience in running groups. His approach was eclectic, primarily using Rogerian and Rational Emotive principles. No attempt was made to control the variable of counselor effectiveness.

Instrumentation

The "Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior" scale (FIRO-B), the "California Psychological Inventory" (CPI), and a semantic differential were used on a pre- and post test basis, to measure subject changes in interpersonal relation attitudes. There are a wide variety of psychometric instruments which could have been used. Thus, it seemed advisable to use a varied set of measurements to obtain as clear a set of data as possible. The CPI and FIRO-B are standardized measures. The "Semantic Differential" was constructed to fit the needs of this particular study and consisted of the following seven concepts relevant to interpersonal functioning: "People," "Myself," "Love," "Honesty With Others," "Acceptance of Other People's Values," "Taking Responsible Action for Myself and Others," "Accepting How Others Perceive Me." A copy of the scale variables and instructions is given in the appendix. The FIRO-B was selected because it was designed to measure how an individual characteristically relates to other people in terms of behavior. "Inclusion," "Control," and "Affection," are each measured for the degree to which each individual expresses and desires such behavior. The FIRO-B was also used because it has been used often to measure changes in interpersonal relations during and following such human relations workshops (Schutz, 1967). The FIRO book reports test-retest reliability of .70 and a .94 coefficient of internal consistency.

Likewise, content and concurrent validity figures run in the high 80's. The CPI was designed as a personality assessment instrument to measure characteristics of personality which have a broad application to human behavior. Additionally, it is related to the favorable and positive aspects of personality, rather than to the pathological. Both Personal and Social Adjustment are assessed and yield global scores. The Personal Adjustment section consists of the following components which also yield separate scores: "Self-Reliance," "Sense of Personal Worth," "Sense of Personal Freedom," "Feeling of Belonging," "Withdrawing Tendencies," and "Nervous Symptoms." The Social Adjustment section consists of the following components and subscores: "Social Standards," "Social Skills," "Anti-Social Tendencies," "Family Relations," "School Relations," "Occupational Relations," and "Community Relations." The manual reports two test-retest reliability studies. The range was from .38 to .87, with a mean of .62 on one study and .75 on the other. The validity evidence in the manual was drawn from cross-validated studies of the inventory using subjective ratings and other psychological tests. Mean correlations of .58 for men and .66 for women are reported.

Statistical Analysis

An analysis of variance was run to test whether there was a significant difference pre to post on all three tests that were administered, or if there was a significant difference between post test scores of the leader and non-leader groups. A significant F ratio from a cumulative F distribution for these data is 4.26, the F ratio being the ratio between the mean square treatment and the mean square error. This essentially means that unless these F ratios were greater than 4.26 it will be assumed there was no difference. If they were greater this will indicate there was a significant difference at the .05 level between pre and post, in which case a co-variance study would have been run on the rest of the data. No mean significance was found on the pre test scores. It was concluded from this that we did not need to run a co-variance to find if leader and non-leader groups were different. The statistical data for the leader and non-leader pre to post CPI scores are presented in Tables 1 and 2, while the same data for the "Semantic Differential" test is given in Tables 4 and 5. Tables 7 and 8 present the pre to post test FIRO-B data.

Then the leader versus non-leader CPI results, which are presented in Table 3, were examined. The critical region remained the same 4.26. That is, those F ratios greater than 4.26 would have indicated a difference for positive growth in that group, significant at the .05 level.

TABLE 1

Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of Variance for CPI Scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | |
| 1. Do Dominance | TOT | 717.958 | | 30.166 | 28.916 | |
| | TRT | 9.375 | 9.375 | | | .291 |
| | ERR | 708.583 | 32.208 | | | |
| 2. Cs Capacity for Status | TOT | 245.958 | | 20.083 | 20.333 | |
| | TRT | .375 | .375 | | | .033 |
| | ERR | 245.583 | 11.162 | | | |
| 3. Sy Socia- bility | TOT | 382.000 | | 24.166 | 24.833 | |
| | TRT | 2.666 | 2.666 | | | .154 |
| | ERR | 379.333 | 17.242 | | | |
| 4. Sp Social Presence | TOT | 592.958 | | 36.250 | 37.166 | |
| | TRT | 5.041 | 5.041 | | | .188 |
| | ERR | 587.916 | 26.723 | | | |
| 5. Sa Self- Acceptance | TOT | 284.958 | | 22.833 | 23.750 | |
| | TRT | 5.041 | 5.041 | | | .396 |
| | ERR | 279.916 | 12.723 | | | |
| 6. Wb Sense of Well- Being | TOT | 801.625 | | 33.666 | 33.083 | |
| | TRT | 2.041 | 2.041 | | | .056 |
| | ERR | 799.583 | 36.344 | | | |

A significant F ratio equals 4.26.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of Variance for CPI Scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | |
| 7. Re Respon- sibility | TOT | 715.333 | | 28.083 | 28.583 | |
| | TRT | 1.500 | 1.500 | | | .046 |
| | ERR | 713.833 | 32.446 | | | |
| 8. So Social- ization | TOT | 985.958 | | 32.833 | 34.083 | |
| | TRT | 9.375 | 9.375 | | | .211 |
| | ERR | 976.583 | 44.390 | | | |
| 9. Sc Self- Control | TOT | 1410.958 | | 25.000 | 22.916 | |
| | TRT | 26.041 | 26.041 | | | .413 |
| | ERR | 1384.917 | 62.950 | | | |
| 10. To Tolerance | TOT | 470.625 | | 19.750 | 20.000 | |
| | TRT | .375 | .375 | | | .017 |
| | ERR | 470.250 | 21.375 | | | |
| 11. Gi Good Impression | TOT | 340.958 | | 15.583 | 14.333 | |
| | TRT | 9.375 | 9.375 | | | .622 |
| | ERR | 331.583 | 15.071 | | | |
| 12. Cm Commun- ality | TOT | 76.958 | | 25.083 | 25.000 | |
| | TRT | .041 | .041 | | | .011 |
| | ERR | 76.916 | 3.496 | | | |

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of Variance for CPI Scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|---|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | |
| 13. Ac Achievement via Conformance | TOT | 870.500 | | 25.333 | 25.166 | |
| | TRT | .166 | .166 | | | .004 |
| | ERR | 870.333 | 39.560 | | | |
| 14. Ai Achievement via Independence | TOT | 330.500 | | 20.000 | 19.500 | |
| | TRT | 1.500 | 1.500 | | | .100 |
| | ERR | 329.000 | 14.954 | | | |
| 15. Ie Intellectual Efficiency | TOT | 773.625 | | 37.250 | 37.500 | |
| | TRT | .375 | .375 | | | .010 |
| | ERR | 773.250 | 35.147 | | | |
| 16. Py Psychological- mindedness | TOT | 159.958 | | 11.166 | 10.416 | |
| | TRT | 3.375 | 3.375 | | | .474 |
| | ERR | 156.583 | 7.117 | | | |
| 17. Fx Flexibility | TOT | 477.333 | | 10.916 | 10.750 | |
| | TRT | .166 | .166 | | | .007 |
| | ERR | 477.166 | 21.689 | | | |
| 18. Fe Femininity | TOT | 464.958 | | 20.166 | 19.750 | |
| | TRT | 1.041 | 1.041 | | | .049 |
| | ERR | 463.916 | 21.087 | | | |

TABLE 2

Non-Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of variance for CPI Scores.

| | Source | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | Treatment Means | | F Ratio |
|-------------------------------------|--------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|---------|
| | | | | Pre | Post | |
| 1. Do Dominance | TOT | 833.818 | | 26.909 | 27.272 | |
| | TRT | .727 | .727 | | | .017 |
| | ERR | 833.090 | 41.654 | | | |
| 2. Cs Capacity for Status | TOT | 216.954 | | 20.000 | 22.090 | |
| | TRT | 24.045 | 24.045 | | | 2.492 |
| | ERR | 192.909 | 9.645 | | | |
| 3. Sy Socia- bility | TOT | 466.954 | | 22.545 | 23.545 | |
| | TRT | 5.500 | 5.500 | | | .238 |
| | ERR | 461.454 | 23.072 | | | |
| 4. Sp Social Presence | TOT | 734.363 | | 36.181 | 37.272 | |
| | TRT | 6.545 | 6.545 | | | .179 |
| | ERR | 727.818 | 36.390 | | | |
| 5. Sa Self- Acceptance | TOT | 207.090 | | 20.545 | 20.727 | |
| | TRT | .181 | .181 | | | .017 |
| | ERR | 206.909 | 10.345 | | | |
| 6. Wb Sense of Well- Being | TOT | 557.272 | | 34.454 | 35.909 | |
| | TRT | 11.636 | 11.636 | | | .426 |
| | ERR | 545.636 | 27.281 | | | |

A significant F ratio equals 4.26.

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Non-Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of variance for CPI Scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | |
| 7. Re Responsi- bility | TOT | 286.954 | | 28.454 | 29.454 | |
| | TRT | 5.500 | 5.500 | | | .390 |
| | ERR | 281.454 | 14.072 | | | |
| 8. So Social- ization | TOT | 1269.091 | | 33.909 | 37.363 | |
| | TRT | 65.636 | 65.636 | | | 1.090 |
| | ERR | 1203.455 | 60.172 | | | |
| 9. Sc Self- Control | TOT | 1709.091 | | 27.000 | 28.272 | |
| | TRT | 8.909 | 8.909 | | | .104 |
| | ERR | 1700.182 | 85.009 | | | |
| 10. To Tolerance | TOT | 409.863 | | 23.636 | 23.909 | |
| | TRT | .409 | .409 | | | .019 |
| | ERR | 409.454 | 20.472 | | | |
| 11. Gi Good Impression | TOT | 1038.591 | | 15.181 | 16.545 | |
| | TRT | 10.227 | 10.227 | | | .198 |
| | ERR | 1028.364 | 51.418 | | | |
| 12. Cm Commun- ality | TOT | 140.772 | | 24.454 | 24.909 | |
| | TRT | 1.136 | 1.136 | | | .162 |
| | ERR | 139.636 | 6.981 | | | |

TABLE 2 (Continued)

Non-Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of variance for CPI Scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|---|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | |
| 13. Ac Achieve- ment via Conform- ance | TOT | 533.318 | | 25.545 | 25.272 | |
| | TRT | .409 | .409 | | | .015 |
| | ERR | 532.909 | 26.645 | | | |
| 14. Ai Achieve- ment via Independ- ence | TOT | 409.090 | | 22.363 | 22.363 | |
| | TRT | .000 | .000 | | | .000 |
| | ERR | 409.090 | 20.454 | | | |
| 15. Ie Intellec- tual Efficiency | TOT | 371.454 | | 39.363 | 39.545 | |
| | TRT | .181 | .181 | | | .009 |
| | ERR | 371.272 | 18.563 | | | |
| 16. Py Psycholog- ical- mindedness | TOT | 2579.273 | | 16.000 | 12.363 | |
| | TRT | 72.727 | 72.727 | | | .580 |
| | ERR | 2506.545 | 125.327 | | | |
| 17. Fx Flexi- bility | TOT | 344.954 | | 11.545 | 12.545 | |
| | TRT | 5.500 | 5.500 | | | .324 |
| | ERR | 339.454 | 16.972 | | | |
| 18. Fe Femin- inity | TOT | 394.590 | | 21.181 | 20.545 | |
| | TRT | 2.227 | 2.227 | | | .113 |
| | ERR | 392.363 | 19.618 | | | |

TABLE 3

Leader versus non-leader Analysis
of Variance for post test CPI scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|-------------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------------------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Leader</u> | <u>Non- Leader</u> | |
| 1. Do Dominance | TOT | 838.608 | | 28.916 | 27.272 | |
| | TRT | 15.510 | 15.510 | | | .395 |
| | ERR | 823.098 | 39.195 | | | |
| 2. Cs Capacity for Status | TOT | 173.304 | | 20.333 | 22.090 | |
| | TRT | 17.728 | 17.728 | | | 2.393 |
| | ERR | 155.575 | 7.408 | | | |
| 3. Sy Socia- bility | TOT | 465.913 | | 24.833 | 23.545 | |
| | TRT | 9.519 | 9.519 | | | .438 |
| | ERR | 456.393 | 21.733 | | | |
| 4. Sp Social Presence | TOT | 555.913 | | 37.166 | 37.272 | |
| | TRT | .064 | .064 | | | .002 |
| | ERR | 555.848 | 26.468 | | | |
| 5. Sa Self- Acceptance | TOT | 264.869 | | 23.750 | 20.727 | |
| | TRT | 52.437 | 52.437 | | | 5.183 * |
| | ERR | 212.431 | 10.115 | | | |
| 6. Wb Sense of Well- Being | TOT | 851.652 | | 33.083 | 35.909 | |
| | TRT | 45.826 | 45.826 | | | 1.194 |
| | ERR | 805.825 | 38.372 | | | |

* This F Ratio is significant.

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Leader versus non-leader Analysis
of Variance for post test CPI scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|------------------------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Leader</u> | <u>Non-Leader</u> | |
| 7. Re Responsi- bility | TOT | 508.000 | | 28.583 | 29.454 | |
| | TRT | 4.356 | 4.356 | | | .181 |
| | ERR | 503.643 | 23.983 | | | |
| 8. So Social- ization | TOT | 1319.217 | | 34.083 | 37.363 | |
| | TRT | 61.755 | 61.755 | | | 1.031 |
| | ERR | 1257.462 | 59.879 | | | |
| 9. Sc Self- Control | TOT | 1713.739 | | 22.916 | 28.272 | |
| | TRT | 164.640 | 164.640 | | | 2.231 |
| | ERR | 1549.098 | 73.766 | | | |
| 10. To Tolerance | TOT | 544.608 | | 20.000 | 23.909 | |
| | TRT | 87.699 | 87.699 | | | 4.030 |
| | ERR | 456.909 | 21.757 | | | |
| 11. Gi Good Impression | TOT | 721.478 | | 14.333 | 16.545 | |
| | TRT | 28.084 | 28.084 | | | .850 |
| | ERR | 693.393 | 33.018 | | | |
| 12. Cm Commun- ality | TOT | 106.956 | | 25.000 | 24.909 | |
| | TRT | .047 | .047 | | | .009 |
| | ERR | 106.909 | 5.090 | | | |

TABLE 3 (Continued)

Leader versus non-leader Analysis
of Variance for post test CPI scores.

| | Source | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | Treatment Means | | F Ratio |
|---|--------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|------------|---------|
| | | | | Leader | Non-Leader | |
| 13. Ac Achievement via Conformance | TOT | 827.913 | | 25.166 | 25.272 | |
| | TRT | .064 | .064 | | | .001 |
| | ERR | 827.848 | 39.421 | | | |
| 14. Ai Achievement via Independence | TOT | 420.608 | | 19.500 | 22.363 | |
| | TRT | 47.063 | 47.063 | | | 2.645 |
| | ERR | 373.545 | 17.787 | | | |
| 15. Ie Intellectual Efficiency | TOT | 669.739 | | 37.500 | 39.545 | |
| | TRT | 24.011 | 24.011 | | | .780 |
| | ERR | 645.727 | 30.748 | | | |
| 16. Py Psychological- mindedness | TOT | 193.217 | | 10.416 | 12.363 | |
| | TRT | 21.755 | 21.755 | | | 2.664 |
| | ERR | 171.462 | 8.164 | | | |
| 17. Fx Flexibility | TOT | 515.478 | | 10.750 | 12.545 | |
| | TRT | 18.500 | 18.500 | | | .781 |
| | ERR | 496.977 | 23.665 | | | |
| 18. Fe Femininity | TOT | 516.608 | | 19.750 | 20.545 | |
| | TRT | 3.631 | 3.631 | | | .148 |
| | ERR | 512.977 | 24.427 | | | |

TABLE 4

Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of Variance for Semantic Differential Scores.

| | Source | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | Treatment Means | | F Ratio |
|---|--------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|---------|
| | | | | Pre | Post | |
| 1. People | TOT | 3532.000 | | 65.916 | 65.083 | |
| | TRT | 4.166 | 4.166 | | | .025 |
| | ERR | 3527.833 | 160.356 | | | |
| 2. Myself | TOT | 2771.333 | | 73.833 | 72.500 | |
| | TRT | 10.666 | 10.666 | | | .085 |
| | ERR | 2760.667 | 125.484 | | | |
| 3. Love | TOT | 6002.625 | | 74.750 | 77.500 | |
| | TRT | 45.375 | 45.375 | | | .167 |
| | ERR | 5957.250 | 270.784 | | | |
| 4. Honesty With Others | TOT | 2414.625 | | 73.083 | 75.166 | |
| | TRT | 26.041 | 26.041 | | | .239 |
| | ERR | 2388.583 | 108.572 | | | |
| 5. Acceptance of Other People's Values | TOT | 6645.958 | | 66.166 | 68.250 | |
| | TRT | 26.041 | 26.041 | | | .086 |
| | ERR | 6619.917 | 300.905 | | | |
| 6. Taking Re- sponsible Action for Myself and Others | TOT | 5094.500 | | 67.833 | 65.666 | |
| | TRT | 28.166 | 28.166 | | | .122 |
| | ERR | 5066.333 | 230.287 | | | |
| 7. Accepting How Others Perceive Me | TOT | 3843.833 | | 63.583 | 63.583 | |
| | TRT | .000 | .000 | | | .000 |
| | ERR | 3843.833 | 174.719 | | | |

A significant F ratio equals 4.26.

TABLE 5

Non-Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of Variance for Semantic Differential Scores.

| | Source | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | Treatment Means | | F Ratio |
|---|--------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|---------|
| | | | | Pre | Post | |
| 1. People | TOT | 3413.318 | | 70.909 | 70.272 | |
| | TRT | 2.227 | 2.227 | | | .013 |
| | ERR | 3411.091 | 170.554 | | | |
| 2. Myself | TOT | 3218.955 | | 71.909 | 72.181 | |
| | TRT | .409 | .409 | | | .002 |
| | ERR | 3218.545 | 160.927 | | | |
| 3. Love | TOT | 2559.273 | | 77.363 | 78.272 | |
| | TRT | 4.545 | 4.545 | | | .035 |
| | ERR | 2554.727 | 127.736 | | | |
| 4. Honesty With Others | TOT | 2301.318 | | 71.636 | 75.181 | |
| | TRT | 69.136 | 69.136 | | | .619 |
| | ERR | 2232.182 | 111.609 | | | |
| 5. Acceptance of Other People's Values | TOT | 4080.591 | | 66.181 | 69.545 | |
| | TRT | 62.227 | 62.227 | | | .309 |
| | ERR | 4018.364 | 200.918 | | | |
| 6. Taking Re- sponsible Action for Myself and Others | TOT | 4685.864 | | 69.090 | 72.454 | |
| | TRT | 62.227 | 62.227 | | | .269 |
| | ERR | 4623.636 | 231.181 | | | |
| 7. Accepting How Others Perceive Me | TOT | 4394.955 | | 62.636 | 67.454 | |
| | TRT | 127.681 | 127.681 | | | .598 |
| | ERR | 4267.273 | 213.363 | | | |

A significant F ratio equals 4.26.

TABLE 7

Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of Variance for FIRO-B Scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | |
| 1. Inclusion | TOT | 39.625 | | 2.750 | 2.000 | |
| | TRT | 3.375 | 3.375 | | | 2.048 |
| | ERR | 36.250 | 1.647 | | | |
| 2. Control | TOT | 128.000 | | 3.833 | 3.166 | |
| | TRT | 2.666 | 2.666 | | | .468 |
| | ERR | 125.333 | 5.696 | | | |
| 3. Affection | TOT | 86.958 | | 2.083 | 2.500 | |
| | TRT | 1.041 | 1.041 | | | .266 |
| | ERR | 85.916 | 3.905 | | | |

A significant F ratio equals 4.26.

TABLE 8

Non-Leader Group Pre to Post Test Analysis
of Variance for FIRO-B Scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Pre</u> | <u>Post</u> | |
| 1. Inclusion | TOT | 75.090 | | 2.636 | 2.636 | |
| | TRT | .000 | .000 | | | .000 |
| | ERR | 75.090 | 3.754 | | | |
| 2. Control | TOT | 98.954 | | 2.818 | 3.090 | |
| | TRT | .409 | .409 | | | .083 |
| | ERR | 98.545 | 4.927 | | | |
| 3. Affection | TOT | 37.818 | | 2.090 | 2.090 | |
| | TRT | .000 | .000 | | | .000 |
| | ERR | 37.818 | 1.890 | | | |

A significant F ratio equals 4.26.

Looking at scale 5, "Self-acceptance," the treatment means are higher for the leader group than the non-leader group. This shows that the subjects in the leader groups scored higher (more positively) on self-acceptance than did the members of the non-leader groups. The differences of means is, of course, not important in itself. It is the F ratio which indicates significance. The F ratio here is 5.18, which is above the 4.26 critical ratio. This is based on post testing only, since we had already established that no significant differences existed between pre test scores. Thus, it appears that the members of the leader groups improved their self-acceptance significantly more than did the members of non-leader groups. This scale, as defined by the CPI manual, "To assess factors such as a sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action," would appear to indicate that the positive movement in this area was personally meaningful for the members of the leader group.

This variable 5 was the only one to show significance in the leader versus non-leader post testing on the CPI.

The 7 scales of the "Semantic Differential" are given in Table 6; the critical F ratio remains the same 4.26. An examination of this table shows no significant differences existing between the leader and non-leader post testing.

Table 9 presents the FIRO-B post testing data of the leader versus non-leader groups. Again no significant F ratio exists.

TABLE 6

Leader versus Non-Leader Analysis
of Variance for post test Semantic Differential Scores.

| | Source | Sum of Squares | Mean Squares | Treatment Means | | F Ratio |
|---|--------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|--------|---------|
| | | | | Lead | N-Lead | |
| 1. People | TOT | 4687.652 | | 65.083 | 70.272 | |
| | TRT | 154.553 | 154.553 | | | .715 |
| | ERR | 4533.098 | 215.861 | | | |
| 2. Myself | TOT | 3757.217 | | 72.500 | 72.181 | |
| | TRT | .581 | .581 | | | .003 |
| | ERR | 3756.636 | 178.887 | | | |
| 3. Love | TOT | 3730.609 | | 77.500 | 78.272 | |
| | TRT | 3.426 | 3.426 | | | .019 |
| | ERR | 3727.182 | 177.484 | | | |
| 4. Honesty With Others | TOT | 2791.304 | | 75.166 | 75.181 | |
| | TRT | .001 | .001 | | | .000 |
| | ERR | 2791.303 | 132.919 | | | |
| 5. Acceptance of Other People's Values | TOT | 6826.609 | | 68.250 | 69.545 | |
| | TRT | 9.631 | 9.631 | | | .029 |
| | ERR | 6816.977 | 324.618 | | | |
| 6. Taking Re- sponsible Action for Myself and Others | TOT | 5195.826 | | 65.666 | 72.454 | |
| | TRT | 264.432 | 264.432 | | | 1.126 |
| | ERR | 4931.394 | 234.828 | | | |
| 7. Accepting How Others Perceive Me | TOT | 5321.652 | | 63.583 | 67.454 | |
| | TRT | 86.008 | 86.008 | | | .344 |
| | ERR | 5235.644 | 249.316 | | | |

A significant F ratio equals 4.26.

TABLE 9

Leader versus Non-Leader Analysis
of Variance for FIRO-B post test scores.

| | <u>Source</u> | <u>Sum of Squares</u> | <u>Mean Squares</u> | <u>Treatment Means</u> | | <u>F Ratio</u> |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| | | | | <u>Leader</u> | <u>Non-Leader</u> | |
| 1. Inclusion | TOT | 64.869 | | 2.000 | 2.636 | |
| | TRT | 2.324 | 2.324 | | | .780 |
| | ERR | 62.545 | 2.978 | | | |
| 2. Control | TOT | 142.608 | | 3.166 | 3.090 | |
| | TRT | .032 | .032 | | | .004 |
| | ERR | 142.575 | 6.789 | | | |
| 3. Affection | TOT | 74.869 | | 2.500 | 2.090 | |
| | TRT | .960 | .960 | | | .272 |
| | ERR | 73.909 | 3.519 | | | |

A significant F ratio equals 4.26.

Trends

By looking at the treatment means on a pre to post test basis it may be possible to determine whether or not the groups were moving in a positive or negative direction, or not changing at all. Only differences of one standard deviation or more were considered.

The leader CPI results in Table 1 show an increase on scale 8, "socialization," from a pre test mean of 32, to a post test mean of 34. This movement was from a position near the minus two standard deviation level, to well within the minus one standard deviation level. The CPI interpretive materials indicate that individuals in this score range have a higher degree of social maturity and integrity. This is based on female norms developed from high school and college females. If the male norms are used, which also were developed from high school and college males, then we find that the movement was approximately one half a standard deviation, rather than a full standard deviation.

Table 2 non-leader group treatment means from pre to post for CPI scores show an increase on scale 8, "socialization" from a pre test mean of 34 to a post test mean of 37. This movement is almost identical to the one made by the leader group on the same scale. That is, male norms indicate the movement did not change standard deviation levels, but female norms show a move from the second standard deviation level to within the first

standard deviation level, although it is not a complete standard deviation change. Again, the CPI manual indicates such a move as a manifestation of greater social maturity and integrity.

There was a rather large drop on scale 16, "psychological-mindedness," from a pre test mean of 16 to a post test mean of 12. This is a drop from the plus two standard deviation level, to within the one standard deviation level. This is a move of one full standard deviation level on both the male and female norms. The CPI manual suggests that such a move may indicate that the individuals were less interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives, and experiences of others after the group experience, than they were prior to the group experience.

It seems the two groups in question have not made significant changes; the trends appear to indicate that the leader group may have moved in a positive direction in terms of personality functioning, while the non-leader group may have improved in one area of personality functioning and regressed in another. This in part substantiates hypothesis number one, which says there will be a change towards improved personal relationship attitudes for all groups, as measured from pre to post testings.

The leader group tended to rate the concepts of "Myself," "Love," "Honesty With Others," and "Acceptance of Other People's Values," higher on the post testing of the "Semantic Differential" than on the pre testing (Table 4).

However, they rated as lower the concept of "Taking Responsible Action for Myself and Others." This seeming disparity may result from a positive movement in terms of cognition of concepts, but a hesitancy to take action.

In Table 5 we find that the non-leader group rated higher concepts 4, 5, 6, and 7. Thus, "Honesty With Others," and "Acceptance of Other People's Values" appears to be more acceptable as it was in the leader group. However, this group shows more of an inclination towards taking action and of accepting how others perceive them. This may be a superficial growth, since there does not appear to be any higher rating tendency on the significant concepts of "People," "Myself," and "Love," which appear to this writer to be related concepts. Nevertheless, the two groups show a trend towards higher rating more than they do towards a lower rating or no change. Thus, hypothesis one is again given some support; that is, a change towards improvement seems to be indicated for both groups as measured by the "Semantic Differential" on a pre to post test basis.

Tables 7 and 8 show no pre to post differences of one point or more for the FIRO-B scales, but it is interesting to note that the non-leader group treatment means are almost identical on a pre to post basis, while the leader group moved in a positive direction on control. Consequently, the trend suggests that there was less incongruity between the amounts of affection and inclusion

expressed and desired by the members of the leader group, while there may have been more uncertainty about how much they wanted to control, or be controlled by others.

Conclusion

The first hypothesis of this study stated, "There will be a significant change towards improved interpersonal relationship attitudes for all groups, as measured from pre to post testings." There was no such significance found across the instruments which were used to measure such changes. Therefore, the hypothesis has not been born out. However, the trend analysis suggests that there was movement in the direction of verifying the hypothesis.

The second hypothesis stated, "There will be no significant difference in the change in interpersonal relation attitudes as measured by the pre and post tests, between the groups using the RIP manual, and the groups having a leader and using an eclectic approach." This hypothesis has not been verified since the leader group scored significantly higher on the self-acceptance scale of the CPI, than did the non-leader group. This indicates the leader program brought about a higher sense of personal worth, self-acceptance, and capacity for independent thinking and action, which was not developed in the non-leader group. The trend of FIRO-B results also lends some support to the point that more positive growth was experienced in the leader group.

These results do not clearly indicate whether the RIP manual is, or is not as effective as the average counselor in terms of training subjects in interpersonal skills.

Consequently, use of the RIP in the college or employment setting should wait until more positive research results can be obtained.

Discussion and Implications for Future Research

The process whereby an individual becomes more cognitively aware of his personality and interpersonal functioning is not necessarily a long period in terms of time. An observer may present his observations and/or theoretical concepts about behavior in a brief confrontation. However, a longer period of time may be required for a person to incorporate such data into his everyday behavior functioning and life style. Consequently, it is suggested that a re-run of this study on a longitudinal basis may show more positive results. That is, that post testing should not be conducted until perhaps a lapse of one year following the termination of the groups. Of course, this study made no attempt to ascertain whether or not 10 hours of training is sufficient enough to bring about measurable changes.

The adequacy of the instruments used can certainly be questioned. Although these instruments are widely used and rather commonly accepted in assessing personality variables, they may not be sensitive enough to assess the degree of interpersonal relationship growth which can take place in as brief a time as 10 hours. Unfortunately this criticism may be leveled at most tests since the science of psychometrics is as yet unperfected. These particular tests were used because they objectively and subjectively appeared to be most fitting for this research study. Nevertheless, any future attempt to re-do this study should

consider the use of additional testing instruments. Possibly using some form of behavioral index in which the subjects observed behaviors in a variety of settings could be charted on a pre and post test basis.

The comments of the subjects involved surely cannot be considered as scientific data, but they do offer some possible areas of examination to improve the research. One often heard comment from members of the non-leader group was that the manuals were too simple, that is not advanced enough, perhaps more appropriate for high school age subjects. Several members stated that the manuals were somewhat boring. The leader group members mentioned that the sessions were too short and that they were not very comfortable conducting such a group in a college classroom. It might prove worthwhile for future research to use subjects of high school age, or rewrite the manuals on a more sophisticated level, or hold sessions for three or four hours, rather than two hours, and to hold groups in a setting more congenial than the common classroom.

Prob

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- ok*
Baldwin, T., and Lee, Joan. 1965. Evaluation of programmed instruction in human relations. *American Psychologist*. 20, 489. (Abstract) *look up*
- Berenson, B. G., Carkhuff, R. R., & Myrus, P. 1966. The interpersonal functioning and training of college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 13:441-446.
- Maybe in Journal*
Berlin, J. I., and Wyckoff, L. B. 1964. Human relations training through dyadic programmed instruction. Paper presented at the American Personnel and Guidance Association Convention, San Francisco, California, March. *(Developed Rip Jour)*
- over*
12/11
Bordin, E. G., and Campbell, D. P. 1963. Counseling evaluation with better control groups. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 10:334-339.
- (2)*
Brown, Earl C., and Campbell, Robert L. (Georgia State College), 1966. Programmed interpersonal relationships improvement: Objective benefits to college students. *Journal of Programmed Instruction*, 3(3):1-6. *Not at USU*
- look up*
Brown, W. F. 1965. Student-to-student counseling for academic adjustment. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*. 43:811-817.
- Carkhuff, R. R., and Berenson, B. G. 1967. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Carkhuff, R. R., and Bierman, Ralph. 1970. Training as a preferred mode of treatment of parents of emotionally disturbed children. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 17(2):157-161.
- 13*
1967 date
Carkhuff, R. R., Piaget, G., and Pierce, R. 1968. The development of skills in interpersonal functioning. *Counselor Education and Supervision*. 7:102-106.
- Dreese, M. 1957. Group guidance and group therapy. *Review of Educational Research*. 27(2):219-228.
- Fey, W. F. 1955. Acceptance by others and its relation to acceptance of self and others: A re-evaluation. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*. 50:274-276.

- self & peer acceptance*
Order # 67-595
1967 Diss abs # 2343-A
compare 2 diff procedures designed to
- ① — Hurst, J. C. 1966. Comparative effectiveness of two experimental counselor training procedures. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Brigham Young University.
- Hurst, Robert M. 1967. (U. Oregon) Student Attitudes toward an automated counseling system. *9th grade SS* Dissertation Abstracts. 27(10-A):3312-3313.
- Isaacson, Lee E. 1966. Career Information in Counseling and Teaching. Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Krumboltz, John D. 1968. CAPS Capsule, Vol. I.
- Logue, P. E., Zenner M., and Gohman, G. 1968. (Veterans Administration Hospital, Miami, Florida) Video-tape role-playing in the job interview. Journal of Counseling Psychology. 15 (5. Pt. 1.):436-438.
- ok* — Malpass, Leslie F. 1965. Human behavior: A program for self-instruction. NYC: McGraw-Hill Book Co., xvi, 400 p. *look up*
- Ohlsen, M. M. 1960. Counseling within a group setting. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors' Journal. 23:104-109.
- Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., and Tannenbaum, P. H. 1957. The Measurement of Meaning. University of Illinois Press. Urbana.
- Palmer, Bruce Eugene. (U. Oregon) 1964. A programmed instruction method for psychotherapy training. *used tape recorded therapy for program* Dissertation Abstracts, 24(11):4802-4803. *Don't need*
- Perkins, Eugene R. (Colorado State College) 1968. The effect of introducing programmed instruction in interpersonal relationship techniques into counselor practicum training. *good abstract no sig results look up* Dissertation Abstracts. 28(11-A):4450. *WV 110*
- Pierce, R., and Drasgow, J. 1969. Teaching facilitative interpersonal functioning to psychiatric patients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16:295-298.
- Programming Harmony. 1964. Business Week, April 18, 142 & 144.
- Saltzman, Glenn A. (Ohio State University) 1967. Programmed materials and school counselor development. Dissertation Abstracts, 27(7-A):2077-2078.

Schutz, W. C., 1967. The FIRO-B scales manual.
Consulting Psychologists Press, Palo Alto.

Shane, Grant J. (Indiana U.) 1967. Contemporary thought,
with implications for counseling and guidance: A
bibliography. Bulletin of the school of Education,
Indiana University, 43(4):1-106.

Truax, C. B., and Carkhuff, R. R. 1967. Toward effective
counseling and psychotherapy: Aldine Publishing
Company, Chicago.

⑤ Willis, Carl G. (Oklahoma State U.) 1967. A study of
the effects of programmed human relations training
on a selected group of high school dropouts.
Dissertation Abstracts, 27(12-A):4144.

*no my trends
found in right
direction*

Wright, F. W. 1959. Multiple counseling, why? when?
how? Personnel and Guidance Journal, 37:551-557.

Wylie, Ruth C. 1961. The self concept. Lincoln,
Nebraska, University of Nebraska Press.

*order#
67-9317 used
110*

APPENDIX

VITA

John Fredricks

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: Programmed Interpersonal Relations Training
For Small Groups

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Springfield, Ohio, May 21,
1940, son of Clarence F. and Juanita B.
Booghier; married Nancy L. Whitehead
April 5, 1960; one child-Beth Ann.

Education: Attended elementary school in Dayton,
Ohio; graduated from Fairview High School in
1958; received the Bachelor of Science degree
from Ohio State University, with a major in
psychology, in 1969.

Professional Experience: 1970 to present, counseling
psychologist, Community Action Program, Logan,
Utah; 1970 to present, clinical psychologist,
Northern Utah Regional Child Development Clinic,
Logan, Utah; 1969, psychologist, Ohio State
Penitentiary, Columbus, Ohio.