# EVALUATION OF A SENSITIVITY TRAINING PROGRAM WITH A COMPONENT CRITERION

Thesis for the Degree of M. A. MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY JOHN R. MIETUS 1969





• • • • .

.



130 dis. 11. 10126 F= E2 0350 P HAN

APR 2 2 2005 0411 06

## ABSTRACT

# EVALUATION OF A SENSITIVITY TRAINING PROGRAM WITH A COMPONENT CRITERION

By

## John R. Mietus

The purposes of this study were threefold: (1) to construct a component criterion of sensitivity to a single person, (2) to evaluate the effectiveness of a sensitivity training program which gave diagnostic feedback of predictive errors, and (3) to investigate specific individual differences in the impact of training.

Sensitivity was defined as the ability of an individual to predict what another person said, felt, and did about himself and others. The components of sensitivity were postulated to be Stereotype, Level and Empathic Accuracy.

The criterion instrument was a paper and pencil diagnostic test of accuracy in judging one individual. It consisted of a written description of the individual and seventy-two MMPI statements which the individual answered. The judge's task was to predict how the criterion individual answered these statements. The training program utilized feedback, diagnosis of errors, and practice on specific principles. It consisted of training sessions, administered to a Fall 1968 sophomore level personality theory class, interpolated between a pre- and a post-test on the criterion. No control group was used. A correlational analysis and matched ttests were used to study training effectiveness.

The major results were as follows:

Training involving diagnostic feedback in judging persons will increase the sensitivity of trainees to a person not used in the practice sessions. Trainees who were initially low in sensitivity made the greatest gains as a result of training. Observant individuals made greater gains in stereotype accuracy. The trainee's course grades, scores on a sensitivity to persons measure, motivation to understand others, and sex were not related to training gains.

Suggestions for the improvement of the criterion, as well as the training materials and procedures were made. It was further suggested that the long range effects of training and the use of smaller training groups be investigated.

Approved ICA Committee Chairman Date ICA IS IS Soft

# EVALUATION OF A SENSITIVITY TRAINING PROGRAM WITH A COMPONENT CRITERION

By John R. Mietus

# A THESIS

Submitted to Michigan State University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Henry Clay Smith for his guidance and patience.

I also wish to thank Drs. James S. Karslake and John H. Wakeley for their suggestions and criticisms.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page				
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii				
LIST OF TABLES	v				
LIST OF APPENDICES	vii				
INTRODUCTION	1				
HISTORY	2				
Sensitivity and Its Components The Training Problem The Centrality of Feedback The Insufficiency of Feedback Individual Differences in the Impact of Training					
PROBLEM	10				
METHOD	12				
The Development of the Criterion The Experimental Design Measures of Individual Differences					
Measure of Scholastic Ability Measure of Sensitivity to People Measure of Self-centered Orientation Measure of Psychological-mindedness Measure of Level of Aspiration Measure of Observational Accuracy					
Training Methods and Materials					
RESULTS	24				
Effectiveness of Training Individual Differences in the Impact of Training					

-

Differences in Scholastic Ability Personality Differences Motivational Differences Differences in Observation Sex Differences 35 Individual Differences Differences in Scholastic Ability Differences in Personality Sensitivity Motivational Differences Observational Differences Sex Differences Who Can Best be Trained? Comments About Principles of Training Training Materials The Criterion Instrument The Experimental Design SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS 45 . . . . . . . . . . . . . 47 . . . . . . 51

Page

# LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	<pre>KR-20 reliabilities of the criterion on the pretest (N=101)</pre>	15
2.	Intercorrelation of the scores on the criterion for the pretest (N=145)	16
3.	Intercorrelation of the scores on the criterion for the post-test (N=145)	16
4.	Sample sizes and sex of trainees	18
5.	Gains on five criteria of predictive ac- curacy (N=145)	25
6.	Analysis of gains (post-test minus pretest) by pretest scores	26
7.	T-tests of differences in training gains of a high scholastic ability group minus the gains of a low ability group when matched on pretest criterion scores (N=61 pairs)	28
8.	T-tests of differences in training gains of a high scoring group minus the gains of a low scoring group on the leader- ship and personality scale when matched on pretest criterion scores (N=61 pairs)	29
9.	T-tests of differences in training gains of a high self-centered orientation group minus the gains of a low self- centered orientation group when matched on pretest criterion scores (N=58 pairs)	31
10.	Correlations of level of aspiration with pretest scores and gains in scores as a result of training (N=145)	32

.

# Table

11.	T-tests of differences in training gains of a high aspiration group minus the gains of a low aspiration group when matched on pretest cri- terion scores (N=56 pairs)	32
12.	T-tests of differences in training gains of a high observation accuracy group minus the gains of a low ob- servation accuracy group when matched on pretest criterion scores (N=44	
	pairs)	33
13.	Summary of evidence for hypotheses	36

Page

# LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix		Page
Α.	The Criterion Instrument	51
в.	Measures of Individual Differences	54
	The STOP Scale The Human Relations Test The First Impressions Test	
с.	Some Training Instruments	61
	Morgan Johnson	

## INTRODUCTION

In the last decade, many have tried to train persons to become more sensitive, i.e., to better "predict what an individual will feel, say and do about you, himself, and others" (Smith, 1966). Few of these efforts have been objectively evaluated; those that have been evaluated, have generally produced negative results. The purpose of this study was to develop a sensitivity training program that stressed immediate feedback and diagnosis and to develop an evaluation criterion that would permit a component analysis of the effects of training. It also has had the aim of exploring variables related to individual differences in the impact of the training.

#### HISTORY

After defining sensitivity the following discussion considers (1) the results of previous evaluations, (2) the importance of feedback in training, the absence of feedback in most situations, the insufficiency of feedback and what further principles of training are needed, and (3) individual differences influencing the impact of training.

## Sensitivity and Its Components

Sensitivity, as defined above, has three components: Stereotype Accuracy, Level Accuracy, and Empathic Accuracy (Smith, 1968).

Stereotype Accuracy refers to the predictive accuracy of the responses of most members of the group in which the person judged is placed. There is some evidence that individuals can more accurately predict the responses of the person judged on the basis of the group to which he belongs than on fuller information about the person judged himself (Stelmachers and McHugh, 1964).

The second component is Level Accuracy, the specific tendency of an individual to rate the person judged as good or bad, high, low, or medium.

A third component is Empathic Accuracy, the tendency of the individual to correctly assume that the judged person's thoughts, actions, and feelings are similar to his own.

These components interact: people evaluate more positively those to whom they assume more similarity (Byrne and Clore, 1967); stereotype groups may have high or low evaluations; and people pay more attention to those to whom they feel similar.

## The Training Problem

The outcomes of general training programs have varied almost as much as the training programs themselves. In general, results have been inconclusive or negative (Crow, 1957, Taft, 1955). Literature reviews have shown that training, when equated with amount of course work in psychology or psychological experience, has not led to improvement in predictive ability (Grossman, 1967, Smith, 1966).

Specifically designed training programs have not fared much better. Methodological problems in evaluating training effects and constructing valid criteria are numerous (Anderson, 1963; Carron, 1964; Miles, 1960). Some training programs have resulted in decrements in predictive accuracy after training (Crow, 1957; Taft, 1955).

## The Centrality of Feedback

Recently a number of studies have exhibited positive training gains. A common factor in these programs is feedback to the trainees of their predictive accuracies.

Murray and Deabler (1958) had fifteen psychologists match figure drawings with five diagnostic labels. After each judging, the judge was given information on the correct diagnosis and allowed time to study the material. Results indicated learning progress.

Oskamp (1962) compared inexperienced undergraduates with experienced clinicians on a task of predicting, on the basis of an MMPI profile, whether a patient was hospitalized for psychiatric or non-psychiatric reasons. He was able to train the undergraduates, who were initially inferior to the experienced clinicians, to attain a level of accuracy equal to that of the clinicians. He felt that the use of objective predictive tasks accompanied by immediate feedback and specific training was responsible for the gains.

Newton (1965) used a different type of feedback to obtain increased accuracy in a multiple-cue inference task. The judges were told the cue validities and their own cue utilization coefficients. Accuracy increased in spite of a three week interval between task and feedback.

Kepes (1965) conducted eight one-hour training sessions designed to increase Individual Accuracy. The

training stressed knowledge of results, practice, and participation. He found the individuals who score low on the pretest improved. It was suggested that these persons make larger errors in their implicit personality theories, in stereotyping, and in assuming similarity.

Grossman (1967) conducted a somewhat similar training program. He ran five one-hour training sessions interpolated between a pre- and post-test on a training criterion. His program stressed feedback, practice, participation, systematizing the prediction process, and using an explicit empirical personality theory. When compared to a control group, the trainees demonstrated a significant improvement in Individual Accuracy, the ability to differentiate between individuals when group membership cues are reduced to a minimum.

Sechrest, et. al. (1967) gave undergraduates the task of interpreting short sentence completion protocols. Those students who received feedback performed better than those who did not. The authors questioned whether the difference was not due to the feedback's increasing the student's motivation, rather than being due to the additional informational cues present.

Watley (1968) studied the effect of providing immediate feedback training to educational counselors who were found in a previous study (Watley, 1966) to predict educational criteria (freshman and overall college grades) at

high, moderate, and low levels of accuracy. The counselors were divided into an immediate feedback group and a notraining group. Compared to the no-training group, the immediate feedback had no observable effect on the initially high and moderate forecasting accuracy groups. However, the low accuracy group increased its predictive accuracy to a level comparable to the counselors who initially predicted at the highest level of accuracy. Watley felt that the initially high judges may have been already predicting at the limits of currently possible accuracy. His 1966 study showed that the superior judges were better able to understand and deal with abstract concepts and were possibly more compulsive. Intelligence may also have accounted for the difference.

Spier (1969) studied the effect of the initial accuracy of judges on stereotype accuracy training improvement. He found the high initial accuracy group decreased slightly on a post-test, the moderate pretest accuracy group increased slightly, and the low initial accuracy group increased substantially on the post-test. He hypothesized that ceiling effects or regression to the mean might be the most plausible explanation for the phenomenon.

Feedback, then, is important for increasing sensitivity. However, as to why and when it is effective, and what kinds of feedback are most effective in certain situations, there is some dispute (Ammons, 1956; Miles, 1960; Todd and Hammond, 1965). Feedback may decrease sensitivity

in situations when things appear to be correlated when in fact they are not (Chapman and Chapman, 1967; Chapman, 1967). Feedback in addition to providing cue information also may focus the trainee's attention on the person he is attempting to understand. It also may increase the trainee's motivation and acceptance of attitude change through the development of game-playing attitudes and self-competition (Sechrest, 1967; Smith, 1966).

However, many situations in which it is important for one to understand others and make predictions do not allow the individual knowledge of his performance. The classroom teacher finds it difficult to profit from experience. He almost never learns of his long range effects upon his students, and he finds it difficult to trace his short term effects to the practices from which they presumably arose (Skinner, 1968).

The clinician and the personnel interviewer find it difficult to improve their predictive accuracy. According to Goldberg (1968), "for learning to occur, some systematic feedback regarding the accuracy of the judgmental response must be linked to the particular cue configuration which led the clinician to make that judgment." But in clinical practice, feedback is infrequent, and if it occurs at all, it does so after a long time interval, thus making it hard to associate the initial cue configuration with the feedback.

## The Insufficiency of Feedback

While the application of the feedback principle is necessary, it may be insufficient. The application of other principles also seems necessary for learning to take place. It is quite important that the trainee diagnose his errors on each of the components (Grossman, 1967; Kepes, 1965; Smith, 1966). The student should be given explicit guidelines for change (Kepes, 1965). His training should be structured so that resistance to change is decreased. Practice materials should move from the less stressful to the more stressful (Smith, 1966). The training should combine theoretical principles with practice in applying them (Grossman, 1967). And the training should attend to whole persons, not to components of a person.

# Individual Differences in the Impact of Training

Persons differ in their ability to understand others and to profit from training in sensitivity. The more intelligent the person is, the better he understands others (Smith, 1966).

Motivation to understand others is a factor in sensitivity. Orientation towards others can be divided into first-, second-, third-person, and non-personal types

(Bronfenbrenner, 1958). The less oriented a person is towards others and away from himself, the less mature he is (Linden, 1965). He should not be as capable of making gains as a result of training as the more other-oriented person.

The person who tends to perceive others in terms of their internal psychological state, that is, their thoughts, feelings, desires, etc., has been found in a past study to be no more sensitive in Stereotype Accuracy than persons who are oriented towards another's physical appearance, his social stimulus value, or his actions (Mullin, 1962).

Bronfenbrenner (1958) suggested that the ability to accurately perceive the stimulus field in a social setting influences sensitivity. Significant positive correlations between sensitivity and observational accuracy have been found by Harris (1962) and Grossman (1963).

Past studies suggest there is no sex difference in interpersonal sensitivity, or at best a slightly superior ability in women (Grossman, 1963, 1967; Taft, 1955).

#### PROBLEM

The study was designed to determine whether feedback and diagnosis of errors in the trainee's predictions about individuals and groups would produce improvements that would generalize to other individuals and groups not included in the training.

In addition to giving the trainees feedback and diagnosis of errors, other principles of training were used. The trainees were taught to increase their motivation for a high level of accuracy in understanding others. Trait, developmental, and interpersonal theories of personality were presented to the trainees, and they were told to judge individuals with these in mind. They were taught to note empathic differences and to compensate for emphathic biases. They learned to discount in judging a person whether they like or dislike him. Finally they were taught that in judging an individual, they should apply not only the typical man's theory of himself, but should also apply the judged individual's theory of himself.

The following is hypothesized:

 Training involving diagnostic feedback in judging persons will increase the sensitivity of trainees to a person not used in the practice sessions.

In addition to investigating the above hypothesis, the study also had the aim of exploring variables related to individual differences in the impact of training. Therefore, the following are hypothesized:

- The lower the initial sensitivity of the trainee, the greater his gains.
- 3. The higher the scholastic ability of the trainee, the greater his gains.
- 4. The more sensitive the personality of the trainee, the greater his gains.

The next three hypotheses refer to the relationship between motivation to understand others and the effects of training.

- 5. The stronger the self-centered orientation of the trainee, the less his gains.
- 6. The more psychologically-minded the trainee, the greater his gains.
- 7. The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.
- 8. The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.
- 9. Females make greater gains than males.

## METHOD

The research was divided into phases as follows: (1) development and testing of the training criterion; (2) selection and development of instruments for measuring individual differences in scholastic ability, personality, motivation, and observation; (3) development of the sensitivity training sessions within the design. All subjects used in these phases were undergraduates in a personality course.

# The Development of the Criterion

As previously indicated, the components of sensitivity are postulated to be stereotype, level, and empathic accuracy. Whereas instruments have been constructed to measure these components individually (Grossman, 1963, 1967; Johnson, 1963; Lynch, 1968; Price, 1969), none have attempted to measure total sensitivity to a single person using all these components. This was the goal for the construction of this criterion. Furthermore, as the training aims were to increase stereotype, level and empathic accuracy to diverse individuals, the criterion provided a test of generalization of training.

The initial form of the instrument was constructed during the first months of 1968. It consisted of a written description of an actual person and three scales measuring stereotype, level, and empathic predictions respectively. The instrument had multiple choice responses and the scales were derived from items of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. The individual, hereafter referred to as the person judged, took the MMPI twice, and twenty-three items to which he answered in the same direction as at least two-thirds of a norm group of men (Rorer, 1963; Goldberg, 1963), as well as twenty-three items to which he answered in the opposite direction as the norm group, were selected to comprise the stereotype scale. The level scale consisted of fifty-six items each of which was made up of a pair of statements, one statement being more desirable than the other based on a study by Messick and Jackson (1962). The judge's task was to predict to which of the two statements the person judged answered "true." Finally, the empathy scale consisted of fifty-six neutral items to which the judge was to predict the person judged's response and also to indicate his own response. Total accuracy scores were obtained by summing the scale accuracy scores.

The instrument was administered to 71 members of a Sensitivity training class. A point-biserial item-total correlation, and item difficulty and discrimination analyses were conducted. The stereotype and level scales were reduced to forty items each, and the empathy scale was

dropped from the test. Empathy is now measured by the stereotype and level scales, with the judge responding to each of the items as in the original instrument, but also indicating his own response to the statement. This form was administered to a group of fifty-eight persons. A further item analysis was conducted and the instrument revised and shortened to seventy-two items (see Appendix A).

The following scores were computed for the criterion:

1. Total Accuracy: the total number of correct responses that a trainee makes.

2. Stereotype Accuracy: the number of correct responses on the Stereotype subscale that a trainee makes.

3. Level Accuracy: the number of correct responses on the level subscale that a trainee makes.

4. Assumed Similarity: the number of times the trainee makes the same response as he indicated the person judged made.

5. Actual Similarity: the number of times the trainee makes the same response as the person judged actually made.

6. Errors in Assuming Similarity: the difference between a trainee's Assumed Similarity and Actual Similarity scores.

7. Errors in Level: the total number of incorrect undesirable responses a trainee makes. As stated earlier, the level section of the instrument contains items each of which is made up of a pair of statements, one statement

being more socially desirable than the other. If the trainee incorrectly indicates that the person judged made an undesirable response to the item, this is considered to be an error in level.

The reliability of the instrument was computed by Kuder-Richardson formula 20. Table 1 shows the reliability of the subscales.

Table 1.--KR-20 reliabilities of the criterion on the pretest (N=101)

Scale	Reliability
Stereotype Accuracy Level Accuracy	.47 .63
Total Accuracy	.65
Errors in Assuming Similarity	. 65
Errors in Level	.46

Reliabilities of this size are marginally adequate for measuring group gains.

Tables 2 and 3 indicate the intercorrelations of the scores of the instrument on the pretest and on the posttest for the total sample.

The tables show Stereotype Accuracy to be relatively independent of Level Accuracy, especially on the pretest.

	Stereotype Accuracy	Level Accuracy	Total Accuracy	Errors in Assuming Similarity	Errors in Level
Stereotype Accuracy	1.00				
Level Accuracy	+ .27	1.00			
Total Accuracy	+ .79	+ .81	1.00		
Errors in Assuming Similarity	26	17	28	1.00	
Errors in Level	10	82	59	10	1.00

Table 2.--Intercorrelation of the scores on the criterion for the pretest (N=145)

Table 3.--Intercorrelation of the scores on the criterion for the post-test (N=145)

	Stereotype Accuracy	Level Accuracy	Total Accuracy	Errors in Assuming Similarity	Errors in Level
Stereotype Accuracy	1.00	<u> </u>			
Level Accuracy	+.42	1.00			
Total Accuracy	+ .82	+ .85	1.00		
Errors in Assuming Similarity	35	18	31	1.00	
Errors in Level	40	83	72	+ .23	1.00

Both Stereotype and Level Accuracy scores are highly correlated with Total Accuracy; this is reasonable, as the Total Accuracy score is the sum of the Stereotype and Level Accuracy scores. Level Accuracy has high negative correlations with Errors in Level, which suggests that both scores are measuring somewhat the same thing. Errors in Level is inversely related to Total Accuracy. The Errors in Assuming Similarity score shows a small negative correlation with all three accuracy scores.

# The Experimental Design

The design of the study consisted of the administration of a pretest and post-test on the criterion with controlled intervention in the form of training sessions between testings. Training sessions were conducted by the course instructor, and were 50 minutes in length. No control group was used.

The trainees in the study were Michigan State University students enrolled in a Fall 1968 Psychology of Personality class. Table 4 presents the sex and sample size breakdown of the group.

An initial analysis of all the variables was done by a simple correlational analysis run on the Michigan State University Control Data Corporation 3600 data processing equipment. An analysis of difference scores was done

Subjects	N
Male Female	78 67
Total	145

by matched t-tests. Because of the suspected relationship between pretest scores and gains, the sample was divided into high, medium, and low initial score groups for the

tests of hypotheses.

## Measures of Individual Differences

## Measure of Scholastic Ability

The course grade in the Psychology of Personality class was chosen as the measure of scholastic ability. It was based on the total points an individual obtained on two multiple-choice tests.

# Measure of Sensitivity to People

The Personality and Leadership Scale is a paper and pencil test consisting of selected items from a test of leadership attitudes and a personality inventory. The measure was developed by Smith and Mietus. The Protebob

Table 4.--Sample sizes and sex of trainees

Personality Inventory and a measure of consideration and responsibility (Dore, 1960) were administered to students in a Winter 1968 Psychology of Personality Class. From this sample were picked the tests of students who scored consistently high on a battery of prediction tests and the tests of a low scoring group of students. These students were matched for sex and grade point average. The items in the leadership scale and the personality inventory were item analyzed. The discriminating items formed the November 1968 Personality and Leadership Scale. This scale was given in the Fall of 1968 to the trainees in this study. The KR-20 reliability of this form is .56.

Subsequent to this study, prediction tests used during that quarter were employed to select a high group which was matched with a low group of similar sex and course grade. Another item analysis was conducted and forty-eight items were selected for inclusion in the STOP scale. These items were chosen for both their discrimination values and their internal consistencies, and were arranged in order of their discrimination values. Students in the Winter 1969 personality class took the STOP scale. Groups scoring high and low in the Bill Wilkins, Diagnostic Test of Empathy, and Mr. W tests were separated and matched for sex but not for grade point average. These student's tests were item analyzed. The twenty-four items included

in the REVISED STOP scale are those that stood up under this analysis and are arranged in order (Appendix B).

The next three measures relate to a trainee's motivation to learn about others. Motivation here was not thought to be only one's level of aspiration. It was also considered to be a function of how much satisfaction an individual obtains in human relations, his level of maturity, his interest in the psychological states of others, and whether he relates to other persons in terms of himself or the other person.

# Measure of Self-centered Orientation

The Human Relations Scale (Appendix B) was a measure of self-centered orientation developed by Linden (1965). It measured whether an individual's social orientation was first-person oriented or other-oriented. The instrument used in this study is a 35 item revision of the original. Its KR-20 reliability coefficient is .82 based on this sample.

# Measure of Psychologicalmindedness

Mullin (1962) developed a measure of psychologicalmindedness which he called the First Impressions test (Appendix B). It measured an individual's tendency to respond about another person's internal psychological states, that is, his desires, feelings, or thoughts, rather than his

social stimulus value, his actions, or his physical appearance. The present shortened test form has a KR-20 reliability of .82 based on the trainee's scores.

## Measure of Level of Aspiration

Level of aspiration was measured by the difference score between each trainee's initial Total Accuracy score on the criterion and the goal he set for the post-test. For example, a trainee scored 44 on the criterion pretest, prior to taking the post-test he indicated he would attempt to reach a score of 55 on the post-test. Plus eleven is his level of aspiration.

# Measure of Observational Accuracy

The measure, termed Observations of Mrs. D., Mrs. N., and Mrs. P., presents the trainees with filmed interviews of three persons. While viewing the films the trainees are instructed to note their similarity to the interviewees. They are not informed that they will be tested afterwards on their ability to observe physical characteristics and events accurately. After filling out a short form containing questions about similarity, the trainees are given another test booklet consisting of forty-eight objective questions about what they saw during the films.

# Training Methods and Materials

The training sessions used the case study method. The study of a whole person allows the student the fullest knowledge of the interaction effects in his judging. Accuracy in the judging process seems to be dependent upon interactions between the components of sensitivity, stereotype, level, and empathic accuracies, and interactions between the person judged, the judge, and the judging situation (Smith, 1966). In the case study method, the principles of feedback, diagnosis of errors and practice were used.

In a typical training session, the trainees are given a specific principle to apply. They are presented with training materials (Appendix C), and given information about the case study. They take a pretest, get practice and feedback in a practice section of the materials, take a post-test, and receive feedback on the post-test. In this manner they practice applying principles, get feedback and learn what errors they are making.

Further elaboration and examples of the training materials used in these sessions can be found in the works of Price (1969) and Spier (1969).

Other training is directed wholly to giving the trainee information pertaining to his leveling errors, empathic errors, or stereotyping errors. Materials used in

these training sessions are diagnostic in nature, and provide feedback of a general kind to the trainee.

## RESULTS

The results of this study will be presented in two sections. The first deals with the overall effectiveness of the training program and presents results concerning the principal hypothesis: Training involving diagnostic feedback in judging persons will increase the sensitivity of trainees to a person not used in the practice sessions.

The second section deals with individual differences in the impact of training. It presents results concerning variability in training gains as a result of initial accuracy. It also gives data pertaining to hypotheses about the effects of training upon intellectual efficiency, personality sensitivity, motivation, observant behavior, and sex.

# Effectiveness of Training

# Hypothesis 1. Training involving diagnostic feedback in judging persons will increase the sensitivity of trainees to a person not used in the practice sessions.

Table 5 presents an analysis of training gains on five criteria of predictive accuracy. T-tests of the
Criterion	Post-test	Pretest	Difference	t
Stereotype Accuracy Level Accuracy	23.5 20.7	22.0 20.1	+1.5 +0.6	3.1** 1.2
Total Accuracy	44.1	42.0	+2.1	2.6**
Errors of Level	7.7	8.4	-0.7	2.3**
Errors in Assuming Similarity	+5.8	+6.8	-1.0	1.0

Table 5.--Gains on five criteria of predictive accuracy (N= 145)

\*\* = significant at the .01 level of significance
(one-sided test)

differences between scores on the pretest and the post-test are significant for the Total Accuracy score and the Stereotype Accuracy score, but not for the Level Accuracy score. Also there is a significant decrease in the Errors of Level score.

# Individual Differences in the Impact of Training

# Hypothesis 2. The lower the initial sensitivity of the trainee, the greater his gains.

Table 6 gives a training gains analysis for each of the criterion scores: the analysis divides the training sample into thirds based on each criterion score. A gain

Criterion	Lower 3rd	Middle 3rd	Upper 3rd	Total
Stereotype Accuracy Level Accuracy	+4.0** +3.1**	+1.3* -0.3	-0.7 -1.0	+1.5** +0.6
Total Accuracy	+5.4**	+2.6**	-0.9	+2.1**
Errors of Level	+0.7*	0.0	-2.7**	-0.7**
Errors in Assuming Similarity	-3.3**	-1.0	+4.0**	-1.0

Table 6.--Analysis of gains (post-test minus pretest) by pretest scores

\* = significant at the .05 level of significance
(one-sided test)

\*\* = significant at the .01 level of significance
(one-sided test)

score was obtained by subtracting each trainee's pretest score from his post-test score. The scores reported are the mean gain scores. The N's for each of the scores excluding the Errors in Assuming Similarity are: lower 3rd= 41, middle 3rd=53, upper 3rd=51, and Total Sample=145. For the Errors in Assuming Similarity score, the N's are: lower 3rd=48, middle 3rd=49, upper 3rd=48, and Total Sample= 145. The lower third of the sample exhibited significant gains in accuracy, but made more errors in assuming similarity to the criterion individual. The middle group increased its Total Accuracy through a gain in Stereotype Accuracy. Finally the upper third showed slight decreases in predictive accuracy, a significant reduction of its Errors in Assuming Similarity, and an equally significant reduction in its Errors of Level. An interpretation of these results is found in the Discussion section.

# Differences in Scholastic Ability

# Hypothesis 3. The higher the scholastic ability of the trainee, the greater his gains.

All pretest criterion scores are significantly correlated with course grades. The course grade correlates +.26 with Stereotype Accuracy, +.28 with Level Accuracy, +.34 with Total Accuracy, -.17 with Errors of Level, and -.15 with Errors in Assuming Similarity. Regarding gain scores, only the Gains in Errors of Level score correlated significantly with course grades.

An analysis to determine the effect of course grade upon training gains was made in the following manner: A trainee with a high course grade and a trainee with a low course grade were paired on the basis of their having essentially the same pretest Total Accuracy criterion score. This matching was done throughout the range of pretest Total Accuracy scores. These paired individuals were then grouped into high, middle, and low pretest Total Accuracy score groups. T-tests of the differences in training gains between the high and low course grade trainees for each of the criterion scores and for the upper, middle, lower, and

total groups were then performed. Results for the total group are presented in Table 7.

Table 7.--T-tests of differences in training gains of a high scholastic ability group minus the gains of a low ability group when matched on pretest criterion scores (N=61 pairs)

Criterion Score	Crite Std. De High	erion viation Low	Criter Mean High	rion n Low	Difference	t
Stereotype Accuracy	4.1	5.0	+1.6	+1.0	+0.6	0.7
Level Accuracy	3.6	5.3	+1.0	-0.3	+1.3	1.6
Total Accuracy	5.8	8.9	+2.9	+0.6	+2.3	1.6
Errors of Level	2.5	3.1	-0.8	-0.1	+0.7	1.3
Errors in Assuming Similarity	6.3	9.7	+0.4	-0.2	+0.6	0.4

Only the results for the total groups are reported in the tables for the following hypotheses. Those gains for the upper, middle, and lower pretest score groups which are significant will be noted in the text.

The upper third of the sample exhibited a significant difference between the high and low scholastic ability groups in Total Accuracy (t=+2.1, significant at .05 level). The table shows no significant differences, although the t's of the Level and Total Accuracy scores approach significance.

#### **Personality** Differences

# Hypothesis 4. The more sensitive the personality of the trainee, the greater his gains.

Neither pretest nor gain scores, with the exception of the Stereotype Accuracy gain score, which correlation is -.18, is significantly correlated with the scores from the test of a sensitive personality. Table 8 shows that there

Table 8.--T-tests of differences in training gains of a high scoring group minus the gains of a low scoring group on the leadership and personality scale when matched on pretest criterion scores (N=61 pairs)

Criterion Score	Crite <u>Std. De</u> High	rion viation Low	Criter Mea High	rion an Low	Difference	t
Stereotype Accuracy	4.7	4.5	+1.7	+1.5	+0.2	0.2
Level Accuracy	4.5	4.7	+0.5	+0.8	-0.3	0.4
Total Accuracy	7.3	6.7	+2.1	+2.1	0.0	0.0
Errors of Level	2.7	2.7	-0.4	-0.8	+0.4	0.7
Errors in Assuming Similari- ty	8.7	7.6	+0.2	+0.8	-0.6	0.4

are no significant differences between trainees who score high and those who score low on the scale, when matched for pretest Total Accuracy score in the manner previously described.

### Motivational Differences

# Hypothesis 5. The stronger the self-centered orientation of the individual, the less his gains.

Self-centered orientation is not related to pretest Accuracy scores, but is significantly correlated with pretest Errors in Assuming Similarity (-.24) and with pretest Errors of Level scores (-.16). Self-centered orientation correlates with the Errors in Assuming Similarity gains score (-.18), but not significantly with any other training gains score. Table 9 shows there were no significant differences between the gains of a high and a low self-centered orientation group when matched for pretest Total Accuracy scores.

# Hypothesis 6. The more psychologically-minded the trainee, the greater his gains.

No relationship was found between psychologicalmindedness and gain scores. A barely significant relationship was found between psychological-mindedness and pretest Level Accuracy (-.16), and pretest Errors of Level (+.16). Because of the lack of relationship indicated, no further analysis was attempted.

Criterion Score	Crite Std. De	erion eviation	Crite: Mea	rion an		
	High	Low	High	Low	Difference	t
Stereotype Accuracy	4.4	4.6	+1.5	+1.5	0.0	0.0
Level Accuracy	4.0	4.4	+0.3	+1.1	-0.8	1.0
Total Accuracy	6.2	7.0	+1.8	+2.5	-0.7	0.6
Errors of Level	2.6	2.8	-0.3	-0.9	+0.6	1.0
Errors in Assuming Similarity	8.2	8.2	+1.1	+1.6	-0.5	0.9

Table 9.--T-tests of differences in training gains of a high self-centered orientation group minus the gains of a low self-centered orientation group when matched on pretest criterion scores (N=58 pairs)

# Hypothesis 7. The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.

Pretest Accuracy scores are negatively correlated with level of aspiration; the error scores are positively correlated (Table 10).

Table 11 shows the difference in the gains of high and low level of aspiration trainees when matched for pretest Total Accuracy scores. The only significant difference in gains was in the Level Accuracy score of the upper third of the sample (t=+2.3, .05 level of significance).

Table 10.--Correlations of level of aspiration with pretest scores and gains in scores as a result of training (N=145)

	Stereotype Accuracy	Level Accuracy	Total Accuracy	Errors of Level	Errors in Assuming Similarity
Pre-test	31**	40**	44**	+.30**	+.18*
Gains	+.10	+.07	+.14	.00	15

\* = significant at the .05 level of significance.

\*\* = significant at the .01 level of significance.

Table ll.--T-tests of differences in training gains of a high aspiration group minus the gains of a low aspiration group when matched on pretest criterion scores (N=56 pairs)

Criterion Score	Crite <u>Std. De</u> High	erion eviation Low	Criten <u>Mea</u> High	rion an Low	Difference	t
Stereotype Accuracy	4.7	4.3	+2.1	+1.3	+0.8	0.8
Level Accuracy	4.2	4.9	+1.1	-0.1	+1.2	1.3
Total Accuracy	6.8	8.0	+2.6	+1.3	+1.3	0.9
Errors of Level	2.7	2.7	-0.9	-0.5	-0.4	0.8
Errors in Assuming Similarity	9.1	8.4	-0.6	+1.0	-1.6	1.0

### Differences in Observation

Hypothesis 8. The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.

Gains in Stereotype Accuracy are significantly correlated with scores on the test of observation (+.21). Table 12 indicates the differences in the gains of high and low observation accuracy trainees when matched on pretest Total Accuracy scores. The high observation accuracy group gained significantly more than the low group in Stereotype Accuracy.

Table 12.--T-tests of differences in training gains of a high observation accuracy group minus the gains of a low observation accuracy group when matched on pretest criterion scores (N=44 pairs)

Criterion Score	Crite <u>Std. De</u> High	rion viation Low	Criterion <u>Mean</u> High Low		Difference	t	
Stereotype Accuracy	4.3	3.5	+2.2	+0.2	+2.0	2.3*	
Level Accuracy	4.0	4.6	+0.5	+0.9	-0.4	0.5	
Total Accuracy	5.3	5.9	+2.6	+0.8	+1.8	1.5	
Errors of Level	2.3	2.7	-0.4	-0.4	0.0	0.0	
Errors in Assuming Similarity	7.7	8.3	-1.6	+1.2	-2.8	1.6	

\*significant at the .05 level of significance (onesided test)

# Sex Differences

Hypothesis 9. Females make greater gains than males.

,

No significant sex differences were found on any of the criterion gain scores.

#### DISCUSSION

Table 13 presents a summary of the results concerning the hypotheses tested.

As indicated in Table 13, the hypothesis regarding the effectiveness of the training was strongly supported. Three of the hypotheses regarding individual differences in the impact of the training were supported. The data did not support five of the hypotheses tested. No strong relationships were found between gains as a result of training and the sensitivity of the personality of the trainee, and the sex of the trainee.

The findings of the study in regard to training effectiveness are consistent with previous studies of a similar nature. The training results indicate that training which stresses feedback, diagnosis of errors in judging, and practice on specific principles does generalize to other individuals not included in the training materials. The studies of Kepes (1965) and Grossman (1967) are most relevant to the present one. Both found some training gains in second person sensitivity. The principles of training used in each study were feedback, participation, and practice on specific principles.

Table 13.--Summary of evidence for hypotheses

<ol> <li>Training involving diagnostic feedback in judging persons will increase the sensi- tivity of trainees to a person not used in the practice sessions.</li> <li>The lower the initial sensitivity of the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The higher the scholastic ability of the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The more sensitive the personality of the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The stronger the self-centered orientation of the individual, the less his gains.</li> <li>The more psychologically-minded the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater gains than males.</li> </ol>		Hypotheses	Evidence
<ol> <li>The lower the initial sensitivity of the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The higher the scholastic ability of the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The more sensitive the personality of the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The stronger the self-centered orientation of the individual, the less his gains.</li> <li>The more psychologically-minded the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.</li> <li>Females make greater gains than males.</li> </ol>	1.	Training involving diagnostic feedback in judging persons will increase the sensi- tivity of trainees to a person not used in the practice sessions.	++
<ul> <li>3. The higher the scholastic ability of the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>4. The more sensitive the personality of the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>5. The stronger the self-centered orientation of the individual, the less his gains.</li> <li>6. The more psychologically-minded the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>7. The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.</li> <li>8. The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.</li> <li>9. Females make greater gains than males.</li> </ul>	2.	The lower the initial sensitivity of the trainee, the greater his gains.	++
<ul> <li>4. The more sensitive the personality of the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>5. The stronger the self-centered orientation of the individual, the less his gains.</li> <li>6. The more psychologically-minded the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>7. The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.</li> <li>8. The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.</li> <li>9. Females make greater gains than males.</li> </ul>	3.	The higher the scholastic ability of the trainee, the greater his gains.	?
<ol> <li>The stronger the self-centered orientation of the individual, the less his gains.</li> <li>The more psychologically-minded the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.</li> <li>Females make greater gains than males.</li> </ol>	4.	The more sensitive the personality of the trainee, the greater his gains.	o
<ul> <li>6. The more psychologically-minded the trainee, the greater his gains.</li> <li>7. The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.</li> <li>8. The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.</li> <li>9. Females make greater gains than males.</li> </ul>	5.	The stronger the self-centered orientation of the individual, the less his gains.	o
<ol> <li>The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.</li> <li>The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.</li> <li>Females make greater gains than males.</li> </ol>	6.	The more psychologically-minded the trainee, the greater his gains.	o
<ul> <li>8. The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.</li> <li>9. Females make greater gains than males.</li> </ul>	7.	The higher the trainee's level of aspiration, the greater his gains.	o
9. Females make greater gains than males. o	8.	The more observant the trainee in a natural setting, the greater his gains.	?
	9.	Females make greater gains than males.	0

++ = statistically significant support.

? = inconsistent or insignificant support.

o = no support.

The size of the training effect is difficult to measure with the present experimental design. The lack of a control group precludes dividing the gains into those due to actual training and those due to practice effects. Furthermore, as the reliability of each of the subscales of the criterion is marginal, random error could be expected to play its part in confounding the results.

### Individual Differences

# Gains and Initial Sensitivity

In explaining the training gains, individual variability based upon initial sensitivity must be considered. The third of the sample which scored lowest on the pretest criterion made substantial gains in the two accuracy components, while the upper third of the sample actually suffered a slight and insignificant loss in accuracy on the post-test. Why this is so may have a variety of explanations.

The most probable factor involved is regression to the mean. Without a control group, the amount of variance due to regression cannot be measured. However, in examining Table 6, it can be seen that the Total Accuracy gains of the lower third of the sample were quite large (mean gain of  $\pm 5.4$ ), those of the middle third of the sample were still large (mean gain of  $\pm 2.6$ ), and those losses of the upper third were insignificant (mean gain of  $\pm 0.9$ ). The total sample exhibited a statistically significant mean gain of  $\pm 2.1$  (t=2.6). The gains of the low and middle group far exceed the losses of the upper initial accuracy group.

The slight losses of the upper group might be due to an interaction of three factors. Ceiling effects might be operating to prevent this superior group from making further gains. The tendency for the scores of this group to regress to the mean may be nullified by the effects of practice on the criterion.

The large gains of the initial low and moderate accuracy groups might be accounted for in a similar manner. Regression to the mean, practice effects, and training effects all might act to increase the trainee's scores. Possibly knowledge of the pretest criterion score indicated to the members of the low group that they had to make relatively many changes in their responses on the post-test. They might be more open to changing their perception of the criterion individual and more motivated to use the knowledge gained in the training sessions. Grossman (1967) thought that the low scorers made relatively large errors in stereotyping, in assuming similarity, in their level accuracy, and in their implicit personality theories. Possibly the training's major impact lies in helping the low scorers to correct their gross errors.

There are many possible explanations for the variability in gains as a function of initial accuracy. Which ones are operating and to what extent are not known from the data of this study.

# Differences in Scholastic Ability

It was found that course grade is correlated with pretest criterion score, but not with gains in training. Intellectual ability, as measured by course grade, is a significant factor in sensitivity. The more intellectually able trainees are already scoring high on the criterion pretest, and not likely to exhibit post-test gains. The nature of the sample must be considered. The range of intelligence is restricted, as all trainee were college students. Perhaps with a more random sample of intellectual ability the relationship of gains with scholastic ability would be more rigorously tested.

# Differences in Personality Sensitivity

No relationship of training gains to scores on a test of a sensitive personality was found. That the scale is an untried instrument must be considered foremost in evaluating this finding. Given a more reliable and valid instrument, further investigations into the nature of this possible relationship should be made.

# Motivational Differences

The degree of self-centered orientation of a trainee is not related to his ability to profit from training designed to increase second-person predictive accuracy. The hypothesis regarding the relationship between

psychological-mindedness and gains in predictive accuracy as a result of training is not supported. This is consistent with previous findings of Mullin (1962). The hypothesis concerning the relationship between level of aspiration and gains in training is not supported, although the results indicate a trend in the hypothesized direction. Further investigation of this relationship with more refined instruments is recommended.

In general, level of motivation as measured by self-centered-orientation, psychological-mindedness, and level of aspiration to increase post-test criterion performance was not found to be substantially related to gains as a result of training.

# Observational Differences

This hypothesis is partially supported. Trainees scoring high on a test of observation made greater gains in Stereotype Accuracy than low scorers. This is somewhat consistent with the literature. Harris (1962) found observational accuracy to be related to some types of stereotype accuracy. Grossman (1963) found a significant correlation between observational accuracy and interpersonal sensitivity free of stereotype judgements.

#### Sex Differences

No sex differences in training gains were found. Past studies suggest there is no sex difference in

interpersonal sensitivity ability, or at best a slightly superior ability in women (Grossman, 1963, 1967; Taft, 1955).

#### Who Can Best be Trained?

The data of this study suggests that there are no major limitations upon who can be trained. There remains some question about how much the already sensitive person can profit from training. The level of self-centered-orientation of a trainee, the psychological-mindedness, the aspiration, the personality characteristics, and sex do not influence his trainability. To a certain extent, the more observant trainee will make greater training gains. And the more intelligent trainee will enter the training situation at a higher level of sensitivity and reach the limits of sensitivity that present training methods can help him attain sooner than the less intelligent trainee.

#### Comments About Principles of Training

The principles used in the sessions are effective. Giving trainees knowledge of their performance and showing them where they made incorrect predictions on practice materials has increased their sensitivity to at least the criterion individual. The duration between making the prediction and the feedback should be made as short as possible. In this program, the intervals ranged from very short, on the training materials, to rather long, a week or two, on the diagnostic materials. Ideally, diagnosis of errors would be made shortly after the prediction process, when the material is still fresh in the trainee's mind.

The present study used one very large training group. It is thought that more efficient training could be done using small training groups, where individual problems could be spotted and corrected.

### Training Materials

A simplification of the scoring procedure on the training materials should be made. At present, the trainee has to invest quite a bit of energy in understanding and maintaining response methods.

The present training materials are quite diverse in methods of presenting subjects and methods of measuring sensitivity. The trainee's reactions to types of training materials and methods of presentation should be further examined, as should the effectiveness of these various types of presentation.

#### The Criterion Instrument

At present, the criterion instrument requires the judge to make predictions about one individual. It seems that the presentation of more than one individual would be beneficial, if the individuals were clearly differentiated.

Reliability of the instrument is marginal. A further refinement should be made. Predictive validity of the instrument is unknown. This should be researched. Attempts at establishing construct validity should be continued.

As on the training materials, the scoring procedure is somewhat confusing; a simplification would be in order.

### The Experimental Design

As indicated in the preceding discussion, the experimental design lacked the ability to isolate variance due to practice effects, regression to the mean, and the marginal reliability of the instruments. Future studies should include a control group receiving no training. The realistic problem is to obtain comparable training and control groups.

The long-range effectiveness of the training should be studied. Perhaps a small representative sample of the training group could be re-tested on the criterion instrument at a future time.

### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purposes of the present study were threefold: (1) to construct a component criterion of sensitivity to a single person, (2) to evaluate the effectiveness of a sensitivity training program which gives feedback and diagnosis of errors, and (3) to investigate specific individual differences in the impact of training.

Sensitivity in this study is the ability of an individual to predict what another person said, felt, and did about himself and others. The components of sensitivity are postulated to be Stereotype, Level, and Empathic Accuracy.

The criterion instrument is a paper and pencil diagnostic test of accuracy in judging one individual. It consists of a written description of the individual and seventy-two MMPI statements which the individual answered. The judge's task is to predict how the criterion individual answered these statements.

The training program utilized feedback, diagnosis of errors, and practice on specific principles. It consisted of training sessions, administered to a Fall 1968 Psychology of Personality class, interpolated between a

pre- and a post-test on the criterion. No control group was used. A correlational analysis and matched t-tests were used to study training effectiveness.

On the basis of the data reported, the following conclusions can be made:

Training involving diagnostic feedback in judging persons will increase the sensitivity of trainees to a person not used in the practice sessions.

Trainees who are initially low in sensitivity will make the greatest gains after training. It is suggested that the cause of this lies primarily in regression and ceiling effects.

The more observant trainee makes greater gains in Stereotype Accuracy.

The trainee's course grades, sensitivity of his personality, motivation to understand others, and sex are not related to training gains.

It is recommended that refinements be made in the instruments used in this study, that more immediate feedback be given on predictive errors, and that control groups be used in further studies. It is further suggested that the long range effects of training and the use of smaller training groups be investigated.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ammons, R. B. Effects of knowledge of performance: A survey and tentative theoretical formulations. J. Gener. Psychol. 1956, 54, 279-299.
- Anderson, W. How effective is human relations training for the first line supervisor? <u>Personnel</u>, 1963, 40, 62-65.
- Bronfenbrenner, V., Harding, J., and Gallwey, M. The measurement of skill in social perception. In McClelland, D.C. (ed.). <u>Talent and Society</u>. New York: Van Nostrand, 1958, pp. 29-108.
- Byrne, D. and Clore, G. L., Jr. Effectance Arousal and attraction. <u>J. Person. Soc. Psychol.</u>, 1967, <u>6</u>, (4 whole No. 638).
- Carron, R. J. Human relations training and attitude change: A vector analysis. <u>Personnel Psychol</u>., 1964, <u>17</u>, 403-422.
- Chapman, L. J. Illusory correlation in observational report. J. Verbal Lrng. & Verbal Behav., 1967, <u>6</u>, 151-155.
- Chapman, L. J., & Chapman, J. P., Genesis of popular but erroneous psychodiagnostic observations. J. Abnorm. Psychol., 1967, 72, 193-204.
- Crow, W. J., The effect of training upon accuracy and variability in interpersonal perception. <u>J. Abnorm</u>. Soc. Psychol., 1957, 55, 355-359.
- Dailey, C. A. An experimental method for improving interpersonal understanding. <u>Psychol. Reports</u>, 1963, <u>13</u>, 240.
- Dore, R. The development and validation of forced-choice scales measuring attitudes toward leadership methods. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1960.

Goldberg, L. R. A model of item ambiguity in personality assessment. J. Educ. Psychol. Meas., 1963, 23.

- Goldberg, L. R. Simple models or simple processes? Some research on clinical judgements. <u>American Psychol-</u> ogist, 1968, 23, 479-483.
- Grossman, B. A. The measurement and determinants of interpersonal sensitivity. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1963.
- Grossman, B. A. Evaluation of a training program to improve the ability to differentiate between people. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1967.
- Harris, W. The relation of observational to inferential accuracy in judging people. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1962.
- Johnson, R. L. Correlates of a test of group sensitivity. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1963.
- Kepes, S. Y. Experimental evaluations of sensitivity training. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Linden, J. The self-centered orientation in interpersonal relationships. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1965.
- Lynch, P. Development and evaluation of an empathy training program. Unfinished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1968.
- Mager, R. F. On the sequencing of instructional content. <u>Psychol. Rpts.</u>, 1961, <u>9</u>, 405-413.
- Messick, S. & Jackson, D. N. Desirability Scale values and dispersions for MMPI items. <u>Psych. Rpts</u>., 1961, 8, 409-414.
- Miles, M. B. Human relations training: processes and outcomes. J. counsel. Psychol., 1960, 7, 301-306.
- Mullin, J. A., Empathic drive and its influence on accuracy in judging people. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1962.

- Murray, D. C. & Deabler, H. L. Drawings, diagnoses, and the clinician's learning curve. <u>J. project. tech-</u> niques, 1958, 22, 415-420.
- Newton, J. R. Judgement and feedback in a quasi-clinical situation. <u>J. person. soc. Psychol</u>., 1965, 1, 336-342.
- Oskamp, S. The relationship of clinical experience and training methods to several criteria of clinical prediction. <u>Psychol. Monogr.</u>, 1962, 76, No. 28 (Whole No. 547).
- Price, K. Is the favorableness of interpersonal evaluations a general trait? Unfinished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1969.
- Rorer, L. G. The function of item content in MMPI responses. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1963.
- Sechrest, L., Gallimore, R., & Hersch, P. D. Feedback and accuracy of clinical predictions. <u>J. Consult</u>. <u>Psychol.</u>, 1967, <u>31</u>, 1-11.
- Skinner, B. F., The technology of teaching, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1968.
- Smith, H. C. <u>Sensitivity to people</u>. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Smith, H. C. Bill Wilkins as a model for sensitivity training. Paper delivered at the 76th American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, California, 1968.
- Spier, M. Evaluation of a stereotype accuracy training program. Unfinished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1969.
- Stelmachers, Z. T. & McHugh, R. B. Contribution of stereotyped and individualized information to predictive accuracy. J. Consult. Psychol., 1964, <u>28</u>, 234-242.
- Taft, R. The ability to judge people. <u>Psychol. Bull.</u>, 1955, <u>52</u>, 1-23.
- Todd, F. J. & Hammond, K. R. Differential feedback in two multiple-cue probability learning tasks. <u>Behav-</u> ioral Science, 1965, 10, 429-435.

- Watley, D. J. Counselor variability in making accurate predictions. <u>J. Counsel. Psychol</u>., 1966, <u>13</u>, 53-62.
- Watley, D. J. Feedback training and the improvement of clinical forecasting. <u>J. Counsel. Psychol</u>., 1968, 15, 167-171.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

•

JM/HCS June 1968 Michigan State University

#### THE CASE OF BILL WILKINS

Bill is a 25 year old graduate student in psychology who answered the statements in a long personality inventory on two different occasions. The items in this test are those which he answered in the same way on both occasions. This is a test of your ability to predict his responses.

#### Thumbnail sketch of Bill:

Bill is from a midwestern upper-middle class family. He is married, and has one child. Bill attended Catholic schools until he came to graduate school. He admires his father for his success and level-headedness. His parents stress achievement, and Bill is very ambitious.

Bill attained high status in his college organizations, and in the service was in a responsible position. He joined ROTC in college partly because of patriotism, partly because being an officer would improve his status. He takes little time off for recreation. However, he does enjoy mixing with people. Bill's health is good, although he does have allergies and frequent tension headaches. During unfavorable service assignments, Bill often felt vaguely ill and went to the dispensary. He considered a number of other professions before deciding on psychology.

He is materialistic, yet moralistic. He has masculine interests, is restrained and controlled. Bill appreciates artistic subjects. He has sometimes alienated people who thought he was too self-confident. He enjoys hearing about shrewd deals, is not above manipulating individuals to achieve his ends, but doubts he would do anything he considers immoral in this respect. He is happy. He philosophizes with himself quite a bit, and is not very interested in current events. Bill is interested in what other people think and do, but does not care to change them; he considers people basically honest, good-natured, but not above little wrong doings.

Part A: Steveot 20 scule

Bill's responses to the following statements are the <u>same as the responses of menin-general</u>. A large number of men took the same personality inventory Bill did, For each of the statements below at least two-thirds of the men answered in the same way that he did. Your task is to predict how <u>Bill</u> responded to the statements and also to indicate how you would respond.

- Mark "1" if you think Bill answered true to the statement and you think the statement is true or more true than false of yourself. (TT)
- Mark "2" if you think Bill answered <u>false</u> to the statement and you think the statement is <u>false</u> or more false than true of yourself. (FF)
- Mark "3" if you think Bill answered <u>false</u> to the statement and if you think the statement is true or more true than false of yourself. (FT)
- Mark "4" if you think Bill answered true to the statement and if you think the state statement is false or more false than true of yourself. (TF)
  - f 1. I have had very peculiar and strange experiences.
  - $\tau$  2. I do not always tell the truth.
  - F 3. I am troubled by discomfort in the pit of my stomach every few days or oftener.
  - + 4. I have often wished I were a girl. (Or if you are a girl, I have often wished I were a boy.)
  - F 5. I am easily downed in an argument.

(over)

- / 6. My table manners are not quite as good at home as when I am out in company.
- r 7. I would like to be a florist.
- F 8. Criticism or scolding hurts me terribly.
- F 9. Sometimes I feel as if I must injure either myself or someone else.
- F 10. I used to keep a diary.
- r 11. I have been inspired to a program of life based on duty which I have since carefully followed.
- F 12. What others think of me bothers me.
- 1 13. When someone says silly or ignorant things about something I know about, I do not try to set him right.
- $\vec{F}$  14. I am not very religious (less than most people).
- F 15. A person should try to understand his dreams and be guided by or take warning from them.
- 7 16. I can be friendly with people who do things which I consider wrong.
- r 17. I have never done anything dangerous for the thrill of it.

Part B: SVS Bill's responses to the following statements are the OPPOSITE of those of menin-general. That is, if Bill answered "true", at least two-thirds of the men would answer "false" and viceversa. Your task is to predict how Bill responded to the statements and also to indicate how you would respond.

Mark this section in the same manner as you did in Part A "1" (TT), "2" (FF). "3" (TF), "4" (FT).

- $\mathcal{T}_{1d}$ . I do not try to correct people who express an ignorant belief.
- $\mathcal{T}$  19. I have spells of hay fever or asthma.
- 7 20. Children should not be taught all the main facts of sex.
- ř 21. I enjoy the excitement of a crowd.
- I usually "lay my cards on the table" with people that I am trying to F 22. correct or improve.
- F 23. I like to let people know where I stand on things.
- $\mathcal{T}$  24. I am afraid of fire.
- $\vec{r}$  25. I strongly defend my own opinions as a rule.
- F 26. During one period when I was a youngster I engaged in petty thievery.
- $\tau$  27. I seldom find it necessary to stand up for what I think is right.
- F 28. At times my mind seems to work more slowly than usual.
- $\tau$  29. I pray several times a week.
- F 30. Any man who is willing and able to work hard has a good chance of succeeding.
- $\mathcal{I}$  31. I am entirely self-confident.
- au 32. I tend to be interested in several different hobbies rather than stick to one of them for a long time.
- F 33. When I get bored I like to stir up some excitement.
- F 34. I like or have liked fishing very much.
- $\vec{r}$  35. I try to remember good stories to pass them on to other people.
- 7 36. When I leave home I worry about whether the door is locked and the windows closed.

Part: C

Nerth

Bill responded "true" to one of the statements in each of the following pairs and "false" to the other. Consider both statements in each pair, and then <u>Mark "1"</u> if you think Bill answered <u>true</u> to the FIRST statement (1) of the pair and if you think the first statement (1) is true or more true than

- false of yourself. (TT) Mark "2" if you think Bill answered <u>false</u> to the FIRST statement of the pair and if you think the first statement is <u>false</u> or more false than true of yourself. (FF)
- <u>Mark "3</u>" if you think Bill answered <u>false</u> to the FIRST statement of the pair and if you think the first statement is <u>true</u> or more true than false of yourself. (FT)
- <u>Mark "4</u>" if you think Bill answered <u>true</u> to the FIRST statement of the pair and if you think the first statement is <u>false</u> or more false than true of yourself. (TF)
- F 31. (1) People often disappoint me.
  - (2) I wake up fresh and rested most mornings.
- F 38. (1) I must admit that I have at times been worried beyond reason over something that really did not matter.
  - (2) Sometimes at elections I vote for men about whom I know very little.
- $\mathcal{T}$  39. (1) I would like to hunt lions in Africa.
- (2) I find it hard to make talk when I meet people.
- F 40. (1) I wish I were not so shy.
- (2) I seldom ask people for advice.
- F 41. (1) I have had periods in which I lost sleep over worry.
- (2) I am neither gaining nor losing weight.
- F 42. (1) I liked "Alice in Wonderland."
- (2) I do not mind seeing women smoke.
- 7 43. (1) I prefer work which requires close attention, to work which allows me to be careless.
  - (2) During one period when I was a youngster I engaged in thievery.
- F 44. (1) In school I found it very hard to talk before the class.
- (2) I practically never blush.
- $\hat{r}$  45. (1) I would like to be a singer.
- (2) I do not like to be with a crowd which plays jokes on one another.
- F 46. (1) When in a group of people I have trouble thinking of the right things to talk about.
  - (2) Something exciting will almost always pull me out of it when I am feeling low.
- $\mathcal{T}$  47. (1) I think nearly everyone would tell a lie to keep out of trouble.
- (2) Sometimes I get so excited I find it hard to go to sleep.
- $\mathcal{T}$  48. (1) I would not like to belong to several clubs or lodges.
  - (2) Some of my family have quick tempers.
- $\tilde{r}$  49. (1) The man who provides temptation by leaving valuable property unprotected is about as much to blame for its theft as the one who steals it.
  - (2) I can read a long time without tiring my eyes.
- F 50. (1) At times I feel like picking a fist fight with someone.
- (2) I like to flirt.
- $\mathcal{T}$  51. (1) I have never felt better in my life than I do now.
  - (2) Once in a while I think of things too bad to talk about.
- J 52. (1) It does not bother me that I am not better looking.
  (2) I like to poke fun at people.

- 4 -
- $\mathcal{T}$  53. (1) I have very few fears compared to my friends.
  - (2) I frequently find myself worrying about something.
- $\int$  54. (1) I have not had to be rough with people who were rude or annoying. (2) I am often inclined to go out of my way to win a point with someone
  - who has opposed me.
- 755. (1) I have periods in which I feel unusually cheerful without any special reason.
  - (2) Sometimes when embarrassed, I break out in a sweat which annoys me greatly.
- F 56. (1) Several times I have been the last to give up trying to do a thing.
  (2) It is unusual for me to express strong approval or disapproval of the actions of others.
- au 57. (1) I daydream very little.
  - (2) I frequently notice my hand shakes when I try to do something.
- r 58. (1) There are certain people whom I dislike so much that I am inwardly pleased when they are catching it for something they have done.
  - (2) I very seldom have spells of blues.
- 7 59. (1) I do not think I feel more intensely than most people do.
  (2) My mother or father often made me obey even when I thought it was unreasonable.
- $\overline{r}$  60. (1) It is always a good thing to be frank.
- (2) At times I have worn myself out by undertaking too much.
- 7 61. (1) I very much like hunting.
  - (2) I don't blame anyone for trying to grab everything he can get in this world.
- f 62. (1) If I were an artist, I would not like to draw flowers.
  - (2) If I were in trouble with several friends who were equally to blame, I would rather take the whole blame than to give them away.
- 5 63. (1) I like to talk about sex.
- (2) I have often felt that strangers were looking at me critically.
- i 64. (1) When I was a child I didn't care to be a member of a crowd or gang.
   (2) When I was a child, I belonged to a crowd or gang that tried to
  - stick together trough thick and thin.
- T 65. (1) I do not have a great fear of snakes.
  - (2) I have difficulty in starting to do things.
- $\overline{j}$  66. (1) I am not apt to hide my feelings to the point that people may hurt me without knowing it.
  - (2) I am always disgusted with the law when a criminal is freed through the arguments of a smart lawyer.
- F 67. (1) It makes me uncomfortable to put on a stunt at a party even when others are doing the same sort of things.
  - (2) I like to cook.
- f 68. (1) At times I have very much wanted to leave home.
  - (2) I have never been in trouble with the law.
- F 69. (1) Sometimes without any reason or even when things are going wrong I feel excitedly happy, "on top of the world."
  - (2) I dream frequently.
- 7 70. (1) It is not hard for me to ask help from my friends even though I cannot return the favor.
  - (2) I have never had any breaking out on my skin that has worried me.
- 7 71. (1) I like tall women.
- (2) I am very careful about my manner of dress.
- T 72. (1) Most nights I go to sleep without thoughts or ideas bothering me.
  (2) A large number of people are guilty of bad sexual conduct.

s1 6/7/68

APPENDIX B

<u>t</u>:

. . .

THE STOP SCALE

	This will THE : When	train be do SEPARA Mark Mark the g TT t FF d FF d FF d	ning escri ATE Al "1" "2" a group true false true false	session bed la NSWER if you as fan is ion for you for you for you	on is ater. SHEET thin as y thin as y lentif you and you an bu but	designed to First, how k the state ou are conc k the state ou are conc ied, circle true for t d false for false for t true for	o increase yever, ANSW ement is "tr erned. ennet is "fa erned. the states he group. the group. the group. the group.	your under ER EACH OF rue" or mo alse" or m nents as f	standing of a THE STATEMEN re true than : ore false than ollows:	group that TS BELOW ON Ealse n true
			CORES	S	<u> </u>	Exer A	Fyer R	Fror C	TMPROVE	
	Assu	umed s	simila	arity	TT+FF	)		EREL C		
	Actu	ual	"(	(X'd I	T+FF)	·				
	DIF	FERENC	Ε	•					Empa	thy(A-C)
	ACCU	JRACY							Tota	1 (C-A)
					<u> </u>					
E	ጥጥ	<b>PP</b>	<b>TTD</b>	TP IT	1	E Como cocol	XERCISE A			-1 1:16-
r	11	ГГ	11	F I	1.	some peopi	e I know ca	in 100K 10	rward to a nap	pier life
F	ፐፐ	नन	ΤF	FT	2	T really d	on't like t	o drink a	lcoholic hever	3065
Τ	TT	FF	TF	FT	3.	T am not p	articularly	z methodic	al in my every	dav life.
ŕ	TT	FF	TF	FT	4.	It is as i	mportant fo	r a perso	n to be revere	nt as it
'						is for him	to be symp	athetic.	,	
T	TT	FF	TF	FT	5.	I always k	eep control	of mysel	f in an emerge	ncy situation
F	TT	FF	TF	FT	6.	I am somew	hat more sh	y than th	e <b>ave</b> rage pers	on.
F	TT	FF	TF	FT	7.	I am seldo	m extremely	excited	or thrilled.	
Τ	TT	FF	TF	FT	8.	I am more facts.	interested	in genera	l ideas than s	pecific
T	TT	FF	ΤF	FT	9.	Compared t means litt	o you <mark>r own</mark> le.	self-resp	ect, the respe	ct of others
F	TT	FF	TF	FT	10.	In a discu about seri	ssion, I te ous literat	end to los ure	e interest if	we talk
F	TT	FF	TF	FT	11.	I have som were wrong	etime <mark>s c</mark> orr , but only	ected oth because t	ers, not becau hey irritated	se they me.
T	TT	FF	TF	FT	12.	I am a fai	rly impulsi	ve person	•	
	Afte and cula ASSU	er you after ite th MED S	have the fol	e answ group llowin RITY.	ered is io g sco: Tota	the question dentified a res and put al number o	ns above an nd you have in the tab f TT and FF	nd on the circled le: response	other side for the answers ab s circled.	yourself ove, cal-

ACTUAL SIMILARITY.Total number of X's in the TT and FF columns.DIFFERENCE.Assumed similarity score minus actual similarity score.ACCURACY.Total number of X's inside circles.

					EXERCISE B
FTT	FF	$\mathbf{TF}$	FT	13.	I have quite a few fears about my future.
TT	FF	TF	FT	14.	Artistic experiences are of great importance in my life.
F TT	FF	ΤF	FT	15.	I consider most matters very carefully before I form an opinion.
$\tau$ TT	FF	TF	FT	16.	I almost never lose my head.
FTT	FF	TF	FT	17.	I dislike it when I am with people a great deal.
FTT	FF	TF	FT	18.	I like to visit exhibits of famous paintings.
FTT	FF	TF	FT	19.	I like to have my life so arranged that it runs smoothly without much change in plans.
7 TT	FF	TF	FT	20.	Radical agitators should be encouraged to make public speeches.
au TT	FF	TF	FT	21.	I am extremely active in my everyday life.
ΤΤ	FF	$\mathbf{TF}$	FT	22.	I am always taking on added social responsibility.
FTT	FF	TF	FT	23.	I generally keep in the background at social functions.
au TT	FF	TF	FT	24.	I am quite self-confident.

#### EXERCISE C

In each question below are two statements of things that a work leader can do. Choose the one you feel it is more important for him to do. Mark "1" if you think alternative (1) is more important. Mark "2" if you think alternative (2) is more important.

It is more important for a leader:

/11	22	12	21	25.	(1)	To take an interest in the worker as a person.
211	22	12	21	26	(2)	To maintain sensible standards of performance.
≪ 11	22	12	21	20.	(1)	To let his workers make all routine daily decisions
.211	22	12	21	27.	(1)	To give instructions on just the way to do each job.
					(2)	To let workers take time out from the monotony.
न्211	22	12	21	28.	(1)	To see that the group produces.
					(2)	To let the workers generally decide how to do their
						work.
/11	22	12	21	29.	(1)	To teach his workers new things.
					(2)	To work along with his men as much as possible.
/11	22	12	21	30.	(1)	To explain carefully each worker's duties to him.
					(2)	To spend some of his time helping to get the work
						done.
/11	22	12	21	31.	(1)	To meet with the workers to consider proposed changes.
					(2)	To pitch right in with the workers to help make
						changes.
/11	22	12	21	32.	(1)	To explain the duties of each worker's job to him
						until he really understands them.
					(2)	To pitch right in with the workers.
/ 11	22	12	21	33.	(1)	To be a skill trainer.
					(2)	To set a good example by working hard himself.
/11	22	12	21	34.	(1)	To make it clear that he is the leader of the group.
					(2)	To have workers settle by themselves problems they
						meet on the job.
/11	22	12	21	35.	(1)	To be respected for his knowledge of the work that
						the group does.
					(2)	To pass along to his workers information from higher
						management.
Z11	22	12	21	36.	(1)	To realize that a worker generally knows when he is
						doing poor work without being told.
					(2)	To explain in detail to each worker the duties of
						his job.
#### HUMAN RELATIONS SCALE

This is a scale measuring beliefs about how people react in different situations. There are no right or wrong answers. In many cases it may be difficult to choose an answer, but please mark a choice for each one.

The Case of Hans: The place: Munich, Germany. The time: 1922. Hans Meyerhoff, a poor shopkeeper, has been invited to a secret meeting of a small organization headed by Adolf Hitler. Hans is bewildered throughout the meeting.

- 1. Hans becomes enthralled with Hitler and tries to convince one of his customers, Rudolph, to join the Party. Why is Rudolph hesitant?
  - 1. Hans, himself, doesn't know what he is joining.
  - 2. Hans and the rest will soon outgrow this craze.
  - (3. I wonder why Hans wants me to join the Party.
- 2. In time, however, Hans's friend, Rudolph Hess, joins the Party and becomes one of Hitler's most trusted aides. For some reason in the middle of World War II, Rudolph Hess flew alone right over London only to be shot down. What were Hitler's thoughts about this?
  - C. He did it to embarrass me before the world.
  - 2. He did it to show the others he wasn't a coward like they said.
  - 3. He did it to prove to himself he is brave.
  - 4. He did it in a moment of insanity.
- 3. Hans, however, remained far down the line in Party power. What does his wife think about this?
  - 1. He must feel inadequate not to have been promoted any higher
  - (2. I wonder if he thinks I'm partly responsible.
    - 3. The other members don't respect him at all.
- 4. Hans's only daughter, Hilda, falls in love with one of the few Jews left in Munich. Hans of course is opposed to the romance. What does her lover, Max think about Hans?
  - 1. Hans is weak; even his friends in the Party don't respect him.
  - 2. He is only a poor, frightened shopkeeper.
  - I think he genuinely hates me.
- 5. Hilda and Max elope, as a friendly guard lets them through a checkpoint. What was the guard thinking as they went through?
  - 1. They will have few friends in all of Germany.
  - 2. They will always be grateful to me for letting them out.
  - 3. They know not what they do, only of their mutual love.

The Case of Cardinal Vincenzi: Cardinal Vincenzi is attending the Ecumenical Council in Rome. There is a question on the floor about which he has strong feelings, diametrically opposed to the Pope. He is in the process of preparing his argument.

6. What is he thinking as he writes his speech?
1. The other Cardinals have a high regard for the Pope.
2. I must be careful not to arrouse the Pope's ire against me.

The Case of the Babe: Besides being one of baseball's great heroes, Babe Ruth had a sincere interest in children. He once had an interview with Tommy Smith, reporter for his high school paper.

- 7. What was Tommy thinking during the interview?
  - O. I hope he thinks I'm doing a good job.
  - 2. I wonder if he knows how admired he is.
  - 2 Deserve this hals madily smart to give of his time like this.

The Case of Martha: Martha is an orphan. She is fifteen years old and is being considered for adoption through a social work agency. The interested couple is talking with a social worker.

- 8. The social worker decides to recommend the adoption. What might she be thinking during her conference with her supervisor?
  - (1.) He seems to respect my views.
  - 2. His experience makes him a keen judge of adoption cases.
  - 3. He has a lot of confidence because of his wide experience.
- 9. Her supervisor's thoughts?
  - 1. She's done a good job of analysis.
  - (2) She knows she has to convince me.
  - 3. I've heard she is a very capable worker.
- 10. Martha is adopted by the couple. What is the social worker thinking after her twelfth and final monthly visit?
  - 1. Martha realizes she has never been happier.
  - 2. Her parents and friends have grown to love her.
  - (3. They all seemed terribly grateful to me.
- 11. Two years later Martha falls in love with a college senior named Bill. What do her parents think about this?
  - 1. At eighteen we should expect a girl to fall in love.
  - 2. Bill seems to love her too; he treats her like a queen.
  - (3). She doesn't need us like she used to.
- 12. Martha talks to her social worker for advice about leaving her parents so soon. Martha's thoughts?
  - 1. I hope she doesn't think she made a mistake with me.
  - I hope she doesn't think I let her down.
  - 3. A social worker would be a good person to talk to now.
  - 4. She is respected by her colleagues; she must be a good worker.
- 13. What is the social worker thinking?
  - (L) Martha thinks I can give her some good advice.
  - 2. She knows she needs advice.
- 14. The social worker talks with Martha's parents. Their thoughts?
  - 1. Martha seems to think a lot of her now.
  - 2. She will be good to talk to now.
  - (3. She probably thinks we let her down as parents.
- 15. Martha and Bill decide to get married. Her parents' thoughts now?
  - 1. They make a great couple and have happy days ahead.
  - 2. They know they made the right decision.
  - 3. Hope she still loves us.
- 16. What is Bill thinking now?
  - 1. Her parents still love her and understand her.
  - 2. Our lives are just beginning.
  - $\delta$ , I hope she loves me as much as I love her.

The Case of Lou: Lou is the father of three college-age children. He has been acting rather cold toward his wife as of late. His wife is worried. They had always gotten along well in their 26 years of marriage, and were able to discuss their problems with each other.

- 17. What might Sally be thinking? She is his favorite child.
  - (D. In must be depressed because I left for college.
    - 2. I guess adults have periods of depression just like us kids.
    - 3. I hope he can talk it out with his friends.

The Case of Albert: Little Albert is a schoolboy in Germany. He is doing below average work in math and sees his teacher for help.

- 18. What is Albert thinking during the conference?
  - 1. He is one of my best teachers.
  - $\mathcal{O}$ . I wonder if he's interested in helping me.
  - 3. I wonder what kind of teacher he thinks he is.
- 19. Poor Albert failed his math course. How did his teacher feel?
  1. I hope this doesn't hurt his self-confidence too much.
  (2) I hope he doesn't feel resentful toward me for failing him.
  - 3. He just doesn't have the ability to do math.
- 20. How did his teacher feel a few years later when his former student formulated an equation e = mc<sup>2</sup>, changing world history?
  1. Einstein will go down as one of the great thinkers.
  - $\mathcal{O}$ . I wonder if he thinks I was a poor teacher.
  - 3. He is being hailed by all as our greatest physicist.

<u>The Case of Samuel Reshevsky</u>: Mr. Reshevsky is a world champion chess player. He recently played 50 players simultaneously.

21. What were his opponents thinking as they sat down to play him?

- 1. He is truly one of the world's great players.
- 2. He must know he's pretty good to play so many at once.
- 3. Does he really think that I'm a challenge?
- A. One of the players, a 15 year old boy, beats the Master. His name is Bobby Fisher, current U.S. chess champion. As they played the second time, what was Reshevsky thinking?
  - 1. I don't think success has gone to Bobby's head.
  - 2. He seems to look at me differently than he did the last time.
  - 3. The audience seems really to like him, maybe for his youth.
- 23. What did Bobby think after he defeated the Master again?
  1. His one mistake at the end cost him the game.
  (2) He must think I'm his equal now.

<u>The Case of Cathy</u>: Cathy and her roommate are sophomores at a large university. They just had a fight about keeping the room neat, Cathy claiming her roommate is not neat enough.

- 24. What did Cathy think after talking to her housemother about it?
  - 1. She really understands the problem.
  - 2. Any housemother would have trouble handling this kind of problem.
  - 3. I can see why girls think she is so understanding.
  - $\mathcal{A}$ . I wonder what she thought of me and my side of the argument.
- . . . . .
- 25. Cathy gets a new roommate; her thoughts upon meeting her?
  - 31. I hope she's more well-liked than my old roommate.
  - $\sim$  2. Anything will be better than the old situation.
  - 23. I hope she realizes that her way will not always be the best.

The Case of Bob: Bob is a senior majoring in math and plans to go to graduate school next year. His math teacher, Mr. Lewis, is retiring.

- 26. His wife's thoughts about the news of her husband's retirement? 1. I'm proud of all the praise he's getting from his colleagues.
  - 2. He has a feeling of real satisfaction after these 30 years.
  - 3. These next years might be a good change for him.
  - . 4. Maybe he will need me more now that he is not working.
- 27. Mr. Lewis is replaced by a young Ph. D. She is bright, good-looking and single. What is Bob thinking as she walks into class?
  - 1. This should be an interesting course.
  - 2. I wonder what the staff thinks of this new addition.
  - (3. I hope she likes my work.
- 28. Bob goes to talk to her about his work. Her thoughts? 1. He seems upset at me for marking so hard.
  - 2. He seems genuinely interested in improving his work.
- 29. Bob gets straightened out and ends up with an A in the course. What are his thoughts now?
  - 1. She thinks I really know the material now.
  - $\mathcal{O}$ . The class ended up respecting her and liking her a lot.
  - 3. This was a very beneficial course.

The Case of Leon: Leon Winters is captain of his bowling team. His team loses its first three matches and he resigns as captian. Under his successor, Al, the team wins its next 4 games.

- 30. What are Al's thoughts now?
  - 1. Leon must realize he's more of an asset to the team as a member than as captain
  - 2. His bowling has improved lately, as has the teams'.
  - 3. Heresents me for taking over his job.

The Case of Jan: Jan is a high school dropout. He is seeing an advisor from the Poverty Program to try to get a job.

- 31. What is the advisor thinking as he talks to Jan?
  - 1. He realizes he needs help.
  - Ø. He seems to think I can help him.
  - 3. This program was designed to help this kind of boy.
- 32. Jan gets a job on a construction job. His foreman's thoughts at first. EF. This boy needs to gain some self-confidence. (2). He'll be depending on me to help get him started.
- 33. The foreman's thoughts?
  - (1) Jan will probably worry what I'll do to him about the fight.
  - 2. I wonder if Jan thought it was wrong to have fought with Bret.
  - 3. I wonder what the workers think of Jan.
  - 4. These things happen on any job.

The Case of Mr. Moore: Alan Moore is in the market for a new car. He is deciding between a Lincoln and a Cadillac.

- 34. What might he be thinking as he is talking to one of the salesmen? **(I.** I wonder if he thinks I'm an easy customer to sell. 2. I've heard he's a well-respected selesman.

The Case of Ellen: Ellen has been dating a boy steadily for three months. They are both freshmen and have decided to stop seeing each other for a while.

35. How does Ellen feel?

-

- 1. It's best for both of us because we're too young to get serious. I hope he still likes me even though we're not dating.
- 3. I wonder how he feels about it.

#### Directions:

This is a study of the impressions people make on others. You will see three people in silent movies. Try to form as life-like an impression of each as you can.

The first will be of Mrs. P.: the second of Mr. W.: And the third of Mrs. N. As each film is finished the camera will be stopped. Then, in each of the groups of statements numbered below <u>pick the one that is</u> <u>like your impression of the person</u>. Mark the number of this statement on the separate answer sheet.

Work as rapidly as you can!

THE CASE OF MRS. P.

- 1 1. (1) is sincere (2) wearing a coat (3) fairly attractive.
- 3 2. (1) is about 40 years old (2) talkative (3) self-satisfied.
- 2 3. (1) did most of the talking (2) felt the inerview had been successful
  (3) is one who makes a good impression.
- 24. (1) moistens her lips (2) is glad to leave (3) experienced with small groups.
- 15. (1) feels inadequate (2) is facially expressive (3) average looking.
- 16. (1) is an anxious person (2) a pleasing person (3) a conservative dresser.
- 17. (1) considers the interview serious (2) is gregarious (3) shows signs of amusement.
- 3 8. (1) is a typical housewife (2) has family problems (3) is intelligent
- 2 9. (1) is seeking employment (2) responding quickly (3) an average dresser.
- 310. (1) is a modest dresser (2) active in the community (3) uncertain of her answers.
- 211. (1) gave short answers at first (2) enjoys her family (3) has dark features.
- 312. (1) is amusing (2) a modest dresser (3) feels inadequate.
- 13. (1) wants to make an impression on interviewer (2) is from a laboring class (3) has good posture.
- (1) is one who would go to a neighborhood bar (2) feels self conscious
  (3) dressed in red.
- 315. (1) is verbal (2) a housewife (3) feeling under pressure.
- 216. (1) is using too much makeup (2) worries a lot (3) gabby.
- 217. (1) sat on edge of chair (2) became self confident as interview progressed (3) is a good listener.
- 18. (1) is worrying (2) moving her head (3) wearing a coat.
- 319. (1) is chatty (2) a good housekeeper (3) not sure of herself
- 320. (1) is a neat dresser (2) laughing often (3) indecisive.

- 1 21. (1) is unsure of himself (2) looks like a "beat" (3) is wearing a striped sweater.
- 1 22. (1) is thinking the questions through (2) wearing a sweater(3) talking fast.
- 223. (1) is wearing glasses (2) somewhat perplexed (3) holding his chin.
- 3 24. (1) is unmarried(2) often grasps his chin (3) is on guard most of the time.
- 3 25. (1) is a "lost youth" (2) has little money (3) has little patience with his intellectual inferiors.
- 326. (1) leaves smiling (2) is an attentive young man (3) is uncertain of the future.
- 1 27. (1) does not trust the interviewer (2) could be a delinquent (3) smiles
  little
- 1 28. (1) is confident in his opinions (2) of medium height (3) does not have much money.
- 129. (1) was eager to leave (2) left quickly (3) is reliable.
- 30. (1) has been turned down by several fraternities (2) hopes he has put his story over (3) has black hair.
- 2 31. (1) did most of the talking (2) felt under stress (3) smiled when smiled at.
- 332. (1) is wearing a sweater (2) unable to project his personality
  - (3) considers himself well informed.
- 3 33. (1) rocked back and forth (2) has curly hair (3) is earnestly interested in the situation.
- 1 34. (1) knows what's going on (2) needs a shave (3) is fluent in speaking.
- 2 35. (1) raises eyebrows (2) remains tense throughout interview (3) talks with vigor.
- 1 36. (1) feels confused (2) raises eybrows when speaking (3) had on a loud sweater.
- 137. (1) feels a bit insecure (2) uses his hands in expression (3) is in ... his early 20's.
- 1 38. (1) dresses poorly (2) feels he is being treated unjustly (3) is dark complected.
- 239. (1) has a closed smile (2) thinks before answering (3) needs a haircut.
- 3 40. (1) gives no details in his answers (2) changes his facial expression little (3) is self-concerned.

# THE CASE OF MRS. N.

- 241. (1) has a low skilled job (2) is concerned with giving the right answers (3) wearing glasses.
- / 42. (1) feels she is religious (2) is in her sixties (3) left with an empty smile.
- 1 43. (1) thinks out the answer to each question (2) has her hair combed back
  (3) is friendly.
- 3 44. (1) wears a black coat (2) is well mannered (3) concerned with what is happening.
- 3 45. (1) is a typical grandmother (2) is well mannered (3) interested in others.
- 246. (1) puckers her lips (2) doubts future employment (3) gives answers of moderate length.

- 247. (1) could be a retired school teacher (2) felt she told everything necessary (3) facially expressive.
- 3 48. (1) has her hair in a net (2) has a dry manner (3) does not care about wealth.
- 1 49. (1) has animated hands (2) feels lonesome at times. (3) has a quiet nature.
- (1) is content with life (2) has a sense of humor (3) is dressed suf-1 50. ficiently well.
- 1 51. (1) feels anxious (2) is elderly (3) smug.
- (1) visits her grandchildren from time to time (2) wonders what she'll 252. do when she stops working (3) is in good health.
- 1 53. (1) is wearing glasses (2) proud of her past (3) 50-60 years old.
- (1) is the easy going type (2) is wearing a coat (3) enjoys discussing 1 54. her grandchildren.
- (1) didn't get much out of the situation (2) wears glasses (3) has a 1 55. closed smile.
- 356. (1) is a good homemaker (2) a neat dresser (3) is a satisfied person.
- (1) is elderly (2) unmoved by the situation (3) lower middle class.
- و <sup>57</sup> 2<sup>58</sup> (1) could be a sales clerk (2) feels emotionally stable (3) is the resourceful type.
- (1) her hands became nervous (2) is the grandmother type (3) thought 3 59. deeply on most questions.
- 260. (1) clenched her hands (2) is not used to city life (3) is a stabilizing influence.

APPENDIX C

"Empathy", assuming similarity between ourselves and others, is the basic method we use in trying to understand other people. Consequently, understanding is determined by <u>empathic accuracy</u>, the accuracy of the assumptions of similarity or difference that we make. The aim of the exercise is to improve this kind of accuracy.

Study the sketch of Naomi Warren.

She is a forty year old wife of a social science professor and the mother of three children who are now in college. Naomi is the eldest of four sisters all of whom like to write. Naomi has published several children's books, another sister has published a novel, another sister is a newspaper reporter, and the other sister writes poetry. Naomi's daughter is planning, also, to be a writer. Naomi plays tennis, skates, skiis, and generally enjoys the outdoors. She enjoys cooking but is casual about her housekeeping. She is a member of several civic groups but dislikes speaking before a group.

Answer the following statements for yourself and Naomi.

So that you can know whether the training has benefited you, answer the five statements below now. At the end of the session, you will be given time to answer them again. Finally, the correct answers will be read by the instructor. Circle your answers as follows: TT. If you think the statement is <u>true</u> for you and you think Naomi

answered true for herself.

ASSUMED SIMILARITY

- FF. If you think the statement is <u>false</u> for you and you think Naomi also answered <u>false</u>.
- TF. If you think the statement is <u>true</u> for you but you think Naomi answered <u>false</u> for herself.
- FT. If you think the statement is <u>false</u> for you but you think Naomi answered true for herself.

	BEFC	DRE I	PRAC'	TICE		AFTI	ER PI	RACT	ICE		
	Simi	lar	Dis	sim		Sim	ílar	Dis	sim		
F	TT	FF	TF	FT		TT	FF	TF	FT	1.	Most of the time I am extremely carefree and relaxed.
F	TT	FF	TF	FT		TT	FF	TF	FT	2.	I like to discuss my emotions with others.
F	TT	FF	TF	FT		TT	FF	TF	FT	3.	I am really only interested in what is useful.
F	TT	FF	TF	FT		TT	FF	TF	FT	4.	I like to make a very careful plan before starting in to do anything.
Т	TT	FF	TF	FT		TT	FF	TF	FT	5.	Women should have as much right to propose dates to men as men to women.
							BEF	DRE	AFTER		GAIN
	CORF	RECT			•••						
	ACTI	JAL S	SIMI	LARIT	<b>Y</b>						

# Exercise A.

<u>Circle</u> your answers and what you think Naomi's answers were to the following tinuce statements. "X" the correct answer when it is read by the instructor. Record at the bottom of the page the number of your correct responses, the number that you assumed similarity on, and the number in which you were actually similar.

FTT	FF	$\mathbf{TF}$	$\mathbf{FT}$	1. I have frequently assumed the leadership of
FT	FF	TF	FT	groups. 2. I like to have people around me practically
				, all of the time.
₽ TT	FF	TF	FT	3. There are few things I enjoy more than being a leader of people.

# Excercise B.

After completing Exerecise A, answer the following statements and record your answers in the same way.

FT	FF	TF	FT	4. It is as important for a person to be reverent as it is for him to be sympathetic.
F TT	FF	TF	FT	5. I trust in God to support the right and condemn the wrong
Fт	FF	TF	FT	6. The idea of God means more to me than any other idea.
au TT	FF	TF	FT	7. I think that cremation is the best method of burial.
τtt	FF	TF	FT	8. In the long run science provides the best hope for solving the world's problems.
au TT	FF	TF	FT	<ol> <li>Radical agitators should be allowed to make public speeches.</li> </ol>

Fxercise C.

After completing Exercise B, continue with this exercise in the same way.

₽ TT	FF	TF	FT	10.	I never complain about my sufferings and hardships.
$\mathcal{T}$ TT	FF	TF	FT	11.	I am moderate in my tastes and sentiments.
F TT	FF	TF	FT	1.2.	I spend a lot of time philosophizing with myself.
F TT	FF	TF	FT	13.	I tend to judge people in terms of their corowete accomplishments.
7 TT	FF	TF	FT	14.	I like to be with people who don't take life toc seriously.
7 тт	ff	TF	FT	15.	I always keep control of myself in an emergency situation.
SUM	1757:			A (3)	<b>B</b> (6) <b>C</b> (6)
CORRECT ASSUMED SIMILARITY			ARITY		
ACT	UAL S	IMILA	RITY		

HCS:ta:10-8-58

THE RUTH CASE

This exercise is designed to improve your understanding of Ruth, of values of college students, and of similarities between your values and theirs. During the exercise you will read what Ruth said about herself, take a pretest, get practice, and take the endtest, and finally, find out how much you improved. You should complete the steps in order.

FIRST, read the interview. It is Ruth's half-hour interview of herself. She answered a series of written questions covering her education, family, etc. She answered the questions by speaking into the microphone of a tape recorder while alone. A psychologist talked to Ruth after her self-interview to find out how she had felt and behaved in a variety of situations. Two of her friends were later interviewed to check on the accuracy of her report. The correct answer to each question is based upon information given by Ruth and her friends.

### The Interview

## 1. Educational and Vocational Goals.

My educational goal is to receive a B.A. degree in liberal arts in elementary education. I like teaching very much and if I don't get married then I'd like to make this my life's career. And,--sigh--I guess I'm progressing fairly well.

#### 2. Family.

I have two brothers, one older, one younger, and my mother and father. My mother and father have always encouraged me to go to school but this year I haven't had as close a relationship to my mother and father as I have in previous years. My older brother is married and has one little boy and my younger brother is still in high school. I have a very fond, good relationship with my younger brother at home. And I've always been very very close to my older brother. I don't feel as close to him now as I did before since he is married, and I guess I desire a family of my own probably I'm a little bit jealous.

#### 3. Interpersonal Relationships

I think I get along fairly well with most people. I enjoy being around them. Nothing seems to shock me very much although I don't approve of-of people who talk vulgarly or--pause--or tell dirty stories and things like that although I don't show this when I'm around them. I've been associating with all kinds of different people in my work in a restaurant.

# 4. Relationships with Opposite Sex.

Long pause--I think that my emotional and physical relationships with the opposite sex are probably just as normal as most people's (laugh) although I have been told that I'm very prudish in my--pause--uh, sexual relationships with others, but I guess I have very high standards, moral standards, religious standards that I can't quite do away with even though I am older then -.-than most girls here at the college probably.

### 5. Financial Situation.

Well,--sigh--right now (pause) I'm totally independent. I have no other income except what I make myself. I have good credit rating at my bank at home so I'm not too worried about that although I always have to plan carefully where my money's coming from and so on.

# 6. Religious Views.

I'm basically a pretty religious person although I don't attend church every Sunday. I'm Protestant and I'm taking a course in Catholicism. I'm going with a Catholic fellow and have been for the past four years and have thought about changing to the Catholic religion. I think most religions are alike--God plays an important part in my life. My folks have always taught me to be honest and truthful.

#### 7. Abilities and Skills.

Well, I have abilities along several different lines. I've had many many different jobs and I've always done well on these jobs. I'm somewhat of a perfectionist. I have experience to be a secretary and I've been a waitress and I've taught school. I like a job where I have some responsibility and--am free to make up my own mind about things and I've never had a problem about getting a job.

### 8. Personal Weaknesses.

Pause--sigh--long pause--I have a quick temper sometimes but I get over it easily. I have a tendency to blame other people sometimes for things that aren't their fault. And I am jealous of other people sometimes which I think is an undesirable trait. I'm a perfectionist which is annoying to other people sometimes. Sometimes I get angry with people and I won't speak to them. I'm just very quiet until I've thought it all over and decided it's alright. I like to be alone when I'm angry. I cry quite often. It's my outlet for my anger.

# 9. Personal Strengths.

I always tell the truth. Uhm,--pause--I'm clean very clean person in mind and physically and I uh, I like people. I have ability to talk with most people and I'm-I'm very dependable. If I'm given a job to do I work ahead until it's finished no matter how long it takes me or to what extent it works a hardship to me.

# 10. Other Important Aspects of Life.

I had a very happy early childhood. We were a very close family, did things together, we played lots of games together and we never had much money but we always had lots of fun and we always had a very good Christmas or special occasions. In each of the situations below, one of the two alternatives was "true" for Ruth and the other one was "false". Circle in the pretest column the alternative that you think was correct.

PRE- TEST	END TEST	
		A. Ruth characterizes herself as: $\mathcal{O}$ (1. A person who likes to be "on the run" with activities. $\mathcal{A}$ 2. A person without much real ambition.
		<ul> <li>B. Ruth characterizes her years in Junior High School as the "roughest times". One of the primary reasons for this she feels is:</li> <li>4 (1. She was less mature physically than the other girls.</li> <li>0 2. She was more mature.</li> </ul>
		C. Ruth, along with a few other teachers, decided not to join the National Educational Association because it was expensive. Many of the older teachers were very bitter about this since they had always had 100% membership. When pressure was exerted on her, Ruth:
		4 1. Unhappily joined NEA but only after a long verbal battle with the older teachers.
		ク C. Still refused to join NEA but felt guilty about it.
		D. Ruth reports she: $\mu$ 1. Feels she sometimes talks too much. $\rho$ $\mathcal{O}$ . Would rather listen than talk.
		<ul> <li>E. The first thing Ruth mentioned that she wanted in a husband was:</li> <li>0 1. One that loved children.</li> <li>4 Q. One that could provide for her.</li> </ul>
T		GAIN(Number correct on post-test minus number correct on pretest).

Our <u>evaluations</u> of the likelihood of a person engaging in desirable behavior heavily influences the accuracy of our judgments of him. The *n* accuracy of our <u>stereotypes</u> about what others will consider desirable and the accuracy of our <u>empathy</u> also influence our evaluations and their accuracy. The purpose of this exercise is to analyze these influences on our judgments and to show how they interact with each other.

For each of the five statements below answer questions (1), (2), and (3).

- (1) Do you think the first of the alternatives would have been <u>less</u> or <u>more</u> desirable for Ruth? Circle "L" for less and "M" for more.
- (2) A group of MSU undergraduates checked which alternative they thought was more desirable. Would you assume that your judgment would agree with the judgment of the majority of this group? Circle "Y" for yes and "N" for no in column (2).
- (3) What do you think Ruth actually felt, said, or did? Put a circle in the space before your answer in column (3).

YOUR JUDM (1)	ASSM SIM? (2)	STUD JUDG	ACT SIM?	ACT UAL (3)
LM	YN	<b>Windows</b>	YN	<ul> <li>F. Ruth lived on a farm for some time after she was born. According to a friend, the thing she hated about it was:</li> <li>41. There was always too much work to do b 2. She always had dirty feet.</li> </ul>
LM	YN		YN	<ul> <li>G. Ruth thinks it would be fun to:</li> <li>C. Travel around the U.S. working just enough to pay expenses.</li> <li>U 2. Go to Africa to work temporarily.</li> </ul>
LM	YN		YN	<ul> <li>H. When Ruth encounters discipline problem in school her initial reaction is to:</li> <li>D Q. Blame herself.</li> <li>U 2. Blame no one but try to deny the existence of the problem.</li> </ul>
LM	YN		YN	<ul> <li>I. Ruth feels she was in most of the high school organizations because of her artistic talents. She sees this as:</li> <li>A compliment.</li> <li>Y 2. Something which gave her an "in".</li> </ul>
LM	YN		YN	<ul> <li>J. Ruth feels she chose second grade to teach because:</li> <li>4 1. The children accept more readily what the teacher has to say.</li> <li>&amp; 2. When Ruth was in grade school she enjoyed the second grade most.</li> </ul>
TOTAL			TOTAL	

Write "L" or "M" in the column headed "stud judg" when the instructor reads the desirability judgments of the typical student. Write "X" in column (5) as he reads the answers for the "actual" behavior of Ruth. Then count the following scores to analyze possible reasons for your error.

- EVALUATION ACCURACY. Write the number correct in (5). If you had errors, they may be due to the fact that you consistently judged that Ruth behaved in a less or a more desirable way than she did. To find out, count the number of times that your answer in column (5) corresponded to what you thought was the more desirable answer and the number of times to the less desirable (1).
- EMPATHIC ACCURACY. Compare your judgment in column (1) with the "stud judg" column. If your judgments agree, circle "Y" in the actual similarity column; "N" if your judgments disagreed. Then count the number of "Y"'s in (2) that agreed with Y's in the actual similiarity column. This is your empathic accuracy score, i.e., the correctness of your assumptions of <u>similiarity</u>. If it was low, it may be that you consistently assumed too much or too little empathy. Add the number of "Y"'s in column (2) and in the "stud judg" column and compare.
- STEREOTYPE ACCURACY. This is the accuracy of knowledge of the typical values of undergraduates. Count the number of times that your "Y" or "N" agreed with the Y or N in the actual similiarity column.

This exercise follows exactly the same pattern. If you are in doubt about how to proceed, refer back to the steps in Exercise A. Try to apply what you learned about your judgments of Ruth. Remember, however, that even though she is the same person these are different situations.

YOUR JUDG (1)	ASSM SIM? (2)	S TUD JUDG	ACT. SIM?	ACT UAL (5)
LM	YN		YN	<ul> <li>K. Ruth is reluctant to talk much about herself as a person.</li> <li>40. She is afraid people will not like her.</li> <li>02. She grew up in a family that is very reserved.</li> </ul>
LM	YN		Y N	<ul> <li>L. Ruth feels her most successful year of teaching was her first. She feels it was because:</li> <li># (D) She was more strict with the children.</li> <li>• 2. She had a warmer relationship with her fellow teachers.</li> </ul>
LM	YN		ΥN	<ul> <li>M. Ruth sees premarital sexual relations as:</li> <li> <ul> <li></li></ul></li></ul>
LM	YN		YN	N. Ruth sometimes feels: <u>4</u> (D. The only way she will get married is to become pregnant. <u>2</u> That her only real goal in life is to find a satisfactory husband.
LM	YN		YN	<ul> <li>0. There was a lot of talk at the restaurant where Ruth works about something she had done. The incident involved:</li> <li>4 C. Ruth's necking with a Negro at an employee party.</li> <li>2. Ruth's arguing with the manager.</li> </ul>
TOTAL			TOTAL	

The instructor will read both the judgments of students and Ruth's actual answers as in the first exercise. Record and analyze your scores as in the

first exercise. EVALUATION ACCURACY. EMPATHIC ACCURACY. STEREOTYPE ACCURACY.

END TEST: When you have completed the analysis of your errors, return to the pretest end test page. Answer the same questions in the end test column again, recording your answers even if they are the same. Do you feel that you understand Ruth better and are more confident about your answers? If so, is the confidence reflected in greater accuracy? If not, Why not? THE SELF-IMAGE OF THE COLLEGE MAN

H. C. Smith October, 1968

To understand a person or a group, we need to be able to predict accurately what they think of themselves. The accuracy of our predictions depends, in part, upon how accurately we can judge how much the person or group's image of themselves is like our image of ourselves. The purpose of this exercise is to increase both your understanding of what the typical college man thinks of himself (stereotype accuracy) and you ability to predict the degree of simialrity between yourself and him (empathic accuracy).

### Pretest and End Test

Each of several hundred college men compared himself to other college men on the traits listed below. On each of the traits, the typical student rated himself as LOW (lower than three fourths of college men), as AVERAGE (in the middle half of college men), or as HIGH (in the upper fourth of college men).

In the pretest column, first circle the "you" that corresponds to your rating of <u>yourself</u> (under the LOW column, if you would rate yourself in the bottom 25%, AVERAGE column, if you would rate yourself in the middle 50%, or in the HIGH column, if you would rate yourself in the upper 25%). Then circle the "stud" as you think the typical student actually rated himself. When the exercises are completed on the reverse side, you will rate yourself and the typical student again.

	PRETEST		EN	D TEST			TRAITS	
Low	Average	<u>High</u>	Low	Average	<u>High</u>			
You	You	You	You	You	You	1.	Timid	
Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	You	You	You	2.	Unpredictable	
Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	You	You	You	3.	Unrealistic	
(Stud)	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	You	You	You	4.	Ego <b>tistica</b> l	
Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	You	You	You	5.	Talkative	
Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	You	You	You	6.	Aggressive	
Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	You	You	You	7.	Cooperative	
Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	You	You	You	8.	Friendly	
Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	You	You	You	9.	Cooperative	
Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud	Stud			

SCORES		
End test	Gain	
		ASSUMED SIMILARITY. The number of times that you
		judged that you and the typical student would
		have the same rating.
		ACTUAL SIMILARITY. When the instructor reads the
		correct answers, put an "X". Count the number of
		times that your circle for yourself is in the
		same column as the "X".
		EMPATHIC ACCURACY. The difference between
		assumed and actual similarity. A perfect score
		is "O".
		STEREOTYPE ACCURACY. The number of correct
·····		answers.
		(over)
	SCORES End test	SCORES End test Gain

# PRACTICE EXERCISES Exercise A

Complete the following five ratings exactly as you did in the pretest as soon as you have finished it. The better you understand why you made the rating you did for college men and why you were wrong, if you were, the more accurate your image of the college man is likely to be. As an aid in understanding the "why", jot down the reasons for your answers before getting feedback. If your answer is wrong, jot down the explanation that you think accounts for the rating that the typical student actually made. Also, calculate your assumed and the actual similarity scores to determine whether you are assuming too much or too little similarity. EVELANATION OF ANSWERS

				<u>EAFLANATION</u>	OF HROWERD
LOW	AVERAGE	HIGH	TRAI	T Before feedback	After Feeback
You	You	You	10.	Rebellious	
(tud)	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	11.	Impractical	
Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	12.	Irresponsible	<u></u>
Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	13.	Easily upset	
Stud	Stud	Stud			
You	You	You	14.	Socially poised	
Stud	Stud	Stud		- Fortog	

ASSUMED SIMILARITY
ACTUAL SIMILARITY
DIFFERENCE
STEREOTYPE ACCURACY

AVERAGE

You

(Stud)

You

Stud You

Stud

You

Stud

You

Stud

LOW

You

You

You

You

You

Stud

Stud

Stud

Stud

Stud

# Exercise B

HIGH				
You	15.	Stubborn		
Stud			••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••	
You	16.	Shy	······	
Stud		-		
You	17.	Affectionate		
Stud				
You	18.	Serious		+
Stud				
You	19.	Imaginative		••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••••
Stud		-		

ASSUMED SI	MILARITY
ACTUAL SIM	ILARITY
DIFFERENCE	
STEREOTYPE	ACCURACY

# Exercise C

LOW ·	<b>AVERAGE</b>	HIGH	_	
You	You	You	20.	Adaptable
Stud	Stud	Stud		
You	You	You	21.	Wide range of
Stud	Stud	Stud		interests
You	You	You	22.	Liberal
Stud	Stud	Stud		
You	You	You	23.	Adventurous
Stud	Stud	Stud	•	
You	'You	You	24.	Trustful
Stud	'Stud	Stud		
	ASSUMED SI	MILARITY	:	
	-DIFFERENCE	ILARITY		
		L ACCURACY		

H. C. Smith October, 1968

#### THE CASE OF THE YOUNG PSYCHOLOGIST, MORGAN JCHNSON

The accuracy of our understanding of a man depends upon our understanding of the typical man (stereotype accuracy). It also, however, depends upon our understanding of the differences between groups of men (differential stereotype accuracy). In addition, of course, it depends upon skill in applying our knowledge to a particular man. This exercise is designed to improve your understanding of the interests of the typical man and the differences between his interests and the typical psychologist's, as well as your ability to apply this understanding in judging the interests of Morgan Johnson.

### Pretest and End Test

<u>The Interests of the Typical Man</u>. The replies of several thousand business and professional men to the hundreds of items on the Strong Vocational Interest Blank were analyzed. To some of the interests, the majority of men said they liked the interest and to others the majority said they did <u>not</u> like the interest. In the pretest column (on the back page) headed "most men" circle "Yes" if you think most men <u>said</u> they would like the interest and "No" if you think most men said they would <u>not</u> like the interest.

The Different Interests of Psychologists. The replies of several hundred male psychologists were compared with the replies of men-in-general. To many of the interests, the replies of the psychologists were the same as those of the typical man. To some of the interests, however, <u>more</u> psychologists said they would like it. In the pretest column headed "more psychologists" circle "Yes" if you think more psychologists than men-in-general said they would like it and "No" if you think <u>fewer</u> would.

The Interests of Morgan Johnson. Morgan, a 23 year old graduate student in psychology, also completed the Strong Test. After reading the following sketch, answer "Yes" in the Morgan column if you think he said he would like the interest and "No" if you think he said he would not like the interest.

Morgan's parents died when he was four, and he and his younger brother were raised by permissive grandparents in Brooklyn. Of his childhood, Morgan said: "As I grew up, I always had the feeling that I was inferior to everybody else because I had no parents. In grade school, I was very loud and boisterous and made persistent attempts to dominate my peers and to excel in everything I did." Today he places stress on being a "well-rounded scholar." About his values, he now says:

"I do not believe there are any determining forces in the universe that make us what we are; everybody rules his own destiny. I can think of nothing more important than being a good friend or having good friends, but I don't think it is possible to have more than a few really close ones. I place little value on material things: cars, clothes, etc."

PRETEST		Г	END TEST							
Most	More	Morgan?	Most	t	More	e	More	gan?		
Men?	Psych?		Men'	?	Psyc	ch?				
Yes No	(es)No	tes No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	l.	Meeting new situations
(Ies) No	Yes (No)	Yes No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	2.	Thirty people
(Yes) No	Yes No	Yes (No)	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	3.	Algebra
(Yes) No	(Yes) No	Yes No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	4.	Economics
(yes) No	Yes (No)	Yes No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	5.	Saving money
Yes (No)	Yes (NO)	Yes No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	6.	Drilling in a company
Yes 🚺	(es No	(Yes) No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	7.	Politician
Yes (No)	(es No	(Yes) No.	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	8.	Poet
Yes (No)	Yes (No	tes No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	9.	Auto Racer
Yes No	Yes 🔟	Yes No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	10.	Auctioneer
Accurac;	y Score	Pretest	Er	nd T	est	G	ain			
Men-in-	general		-			-				
Psychol	ogists		-							
morgan d	Jonnson		-			-				

# EXERCISE A

This exercise concerns the <u>differences</u> between the typical man and psychologist. Circle "Yes" if you think more psychologists and "No" if you think fewer psychologists than men-in-general said they would like the interest.

(Yes) No	ll. Carelessly dressed people
(Yes) No	12. Absent-minded people
Yes No	13. Orchestra conductor
Yes No	14. People who make fortunes in business
Yes (No)	15. Regular hours of work
Yes (No)	16. Golf

# EXERCISE B

This exercise concerns the answers of Morgan. Circle "Yes" if you think he said he would like and "No" if you think he would not like the interest. "Psy" in () indicates that more psychologists than men-in-general liked the interest. "Non" in () indicates that more non-psychologists liked the interest. The figure is the percent of men-in-general who said they would like the interest.

Yes No	17. Ph losophy (57% Psy.)
Yes No	18. Literature (57% Psy.)
Yes No	19. Sick people (20% Psy.)
Yes No	20. Auto repairman (19% Non.)
Yes No	21. Regular hours of work (58% Non.)
Yes No	22. Progressive people (85% Non.)
Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No Yes No	23. Quick-tempered people (7% Psy.) 24. Pet monkeys (8% Psy.) 25. Physics (58% Psy.) 26. Driving an Automobile (77% Non.) 27. Sporting pages (50% Non.) 28. Fortune tellers (5% Non.)

