

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 073 058

SP 006 036

AUTHOR Dykes, Archie R.
TITLE Training Institute for Staff Members of School Systems with Multi-Cultural Schools.
INSTITUTION Tennessee Univ. - Memphis State Univ. Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education, Memphis.
SPONS AGENCY Bureau of Educational Personnel Development (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Jun 66
CONTRACT OEC-6-37-017
NOTE 58p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Culturally Disadvantaged; Human Relations; *Inservice Education; *Integration Methods; *Racial Integration; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

This report describes a training institute for staff members of school systems with multicultural schools. Eighty members of the professional staffs of the Memphis City and Shelby County School Systems participated in the institute. The program was designed to relate to multicultural schools, school desegregation, and culturally disadvantaged children. Training sessions included lectures, large and small group discussions, field trips, demonstrations, and the use of audio-visual materials. Formal presentations before the entire group consumed approximately 15 hours weekly, and planned small group activities utilized approximately an equal amount of time. These activities were supplemented frequently with audio-visual materials and limited visitation to area schools engaged in the desegregation process. Participant response to the program was positive. Evidence indicated the participants became more knowledgeable and understanding of problems of the culturally disadvantaged and more willing to take positive action. Appendixes of related program material are included.) (Author/MJM)

ED 073058

BE - OC
SP

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPIN-
IONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY
REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

for Staff Members of

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE, College of Education / U.T. - M.S.U. CENTER
in Cooperation With The United States Office of Education
Jan. 31 - April 16, 1966

50006 036



Archie Dykes
Institute Director & Reporter

ED 073058

TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR STAFF MEMBERS OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS
WITH MULTI-CULTURAL SCHOOLS

Archie R. Dykes
Director and Author of Report

Contract Number OE-6-37-017
Public Law 88-352, Title IV, Section 404
Civil Rights Act of 1964

RECEIVED
OE/EEOP

AUG 1966
AUG 7 10 11 12 13 14 15 16
A

Conducted by
The University of Tennessee
College of Education
The University of Tennessee-Memphis State University Center
Memphis, Tennessee

The Project Reported Herein Was Supported by a Contract
from the
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

June 20, 1966

ABSTRACT

of

TRAINING INSTITUTE FOR STAFF MEMBERS OF SCHOOL SYSTEMS WITH MULTI-CULTURAL SCHOOLS

DATES

PLANNING PHASE - January 3, 1966 through January 29, 1966
TRAINING PHASE - January 31, 1966 through February 11, 1966
FOLLOW-UP PHASE - February 19, 1966 through April 16, 1966

PARTICIPANTS

Eighty members of the professional staffs of the Memphis City and Shelby County School Systems participated in the Institute. Sixty participants were from the Memphis City schools and twenty were from the Shelby County schools (allocated on the basis of the relative sizes of the two systems). Included were teachers, principals, guidance counselors, and supervisors from all grade levels. The participants were equally divided as to race. Selection of participants was accomplished by personnel of the involved school systems.

GENERAL OBJECTIVES

1. To sensitize teachers and other professional staff members of multi-cultural schools to the unique problems of culturally disadvantaged children.
2. To give Institute participants an increased, individual self-awareness of personal values as these relate to minority-group and disadvantaged children to the end that greater objectivity toward and acceptance of such children might result.

3. To create improved understanding of approaches which may be employed in the integrated school for creating appropriate learning situations, including school organization, teacher-student relationships, and specific techniques.
4. To train individuals who, when they resumed work in their respective professional positions, would be thoroughly prepared to act both in their own schools and on a system-wide basis as resource specialists on educational problems stemming from desegregation.

PROGRAM PROCEDURES

The program developed to implement the objectives of the Institute was based on theoretical and empirical considerations relating to multi-cultural schools, school desegregation, and culturally disadvantaged children. The training sessions included lectures, large and small group discussions, field trips, demonstrations, and the use of appropriate audio-visual materials. Formal presentations before the entire group consumed approximately fifteen hours weekly and planned small-group activities utilized approximately an equal amount of time. These activities were supplemented frequently with audio-visual materials and limited visitation to area schools engaged in the desegregation process.

RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

Response to the program on the part of the participants was generally quite positive. It appeared that an excellent balance of large group presentations (information giving) and small group discussions (concept formation and personalizing of same) was achieved. The participants seemed to develop through

their experiences together meaningful perceptions of the entire spectrum of social, education, and human relations problems bound up in school integration and multi-cultural education.

In addition to the increased understanding of problems occasioned by school desegregation, Institute participants appeared to develop a personalized commitment to take positive action to seek solutions to problems toward which they had heretofore been passive. That is, the participants seemed to feel a greater sense of personal responsibility for alleviating school problems deriving from desegregation.

Evidence indicates that Institute participants became more knowledgeable and more understanding of problems of the culturally disadvantaged and more willing to take positive action in applying their new knowledge and understandings.

I. PARTICIPANTS

Abron, Mrs. Bernice W. - Teacher Lincoln Jr. High School	Davis, Mrs. Bernice E. - Teacher Sherwood Elementary School
Barber, Mr. James A. - Principal Kansas Elementary School	Dinkins, Miss Mary Lou - Teacher Bethel Grove School
Banks, Mrs. Nanilee H. - Teacher Douglass School	Doggett, Miss Verneta - Teacher Chicago Park School
Bourne, Mr. W. A. - Principal Memphis Technical High School	Duke, Mrs. Rudeile - Teacher Westwood School
Branch, Mrs. Willye Lee - Teacher Hamilton Elementary School	Evans, Mrs. Dorothy - Teacher Hamilton School
Bracey, Miss Lillian - Teacher Lawler School	Evans Mrs. Mary - Teacher Bruce School
Bruce, Mrs. Betty - Teacher Whitehaven School	Ferrell, Miss Marilyn - Teacher Bellevue School
Bruning, Mrs. Jan - Teacher Vollentine School	Gandy, Miss Eleanor - Teacher Manassas High School
Burr, Mrs. Gladys - Supervisor Memphis City Schools	Godwin, Mrs. Elgie - Teacher Geeter School
Campbell, Mr. Floyd M. - Principal Meirce High School	Henry, Mrs. Annie C. - Teacher Mitchell Road High School
Carr, Mr. Joseph K. - Teacher Washington High School	Hewitt, Mrs. Betty R. - Teacher Gordon School
Cass, Mr. Harry T. - Principal Hamilton School	Hill, Mrs. Betty - Teacher Elmore Park School
Cass, Mr. Ernest - Coach, Teacher Westwood School	Hobson, Mr. Louis E. - Principal Manassas High School
Castro, Miss Irene - Teacher Fairview Jr High School	Johnson, Mrs. Christine C. - Teacher Norris Elementary School
Chandler, Mrs. Mary W. - Teacher Meirce High School	Jones, Miss Anna - Principal Klondike School
Cole, Mr. Melvin N. - Principal Manassas High School	Jones, Mr. Donald - Principal Rozelle Elementary School
Crosby, Mrs. Mattie R. - Supervisor Memphis City Schools	Jones, Mr. Willie L. - Teacher Capleville High School

better, Mr. Robert L. - Teacher
 ry Jr. High School

ties, Mrs. Aline F. - Teacher
 Pisgah School

ax, Mrs. Hildred C. - Teacher
 ida School

j, Miss Rose Marie - Teacher
 er Elementary School

um, Mr. Arthur J., Jr. - Teacher,
 h Side School Coach

ell, Miss Ruth E. - Teacher
 re Park School

ael, Mr. John - Principal
 s School

ow, Mrs. Marty - Teacher
 antown School

s, Mrs. Odessa W. - Teacher
 er Jr. High School

, Mrs. Teresa - Teacher
 School

st, Mr. Ted - Teacher
 ett School

n, Miss Lucille M. - Principal
 a Park School

arson, Mr. Charles J., Jr. - Principal
 er Avenue School

lips, Mr. Frank L., Jr. - Counselor
 er School

lips, Mr. Paul J. - Teacher
 ington Central School

ey Mrs. Jessie K. - Teacher
 12th Avenue School

y Miss Pearl - Teacher
 stock High School

phatt, Miss Kay - Teacher
 ood Jr. High School

Richter, Mr. Adolph O. - Teacher
 Hillcrest School

Romby, Mrs. Elizabeth K. - Coun-
 Lester High School selor

Romine, Mrs. Shirley H. - Teacher
 Hollywood School

Sanderlin, Mrs. Jeraldine - Teacher
 Dunn Avenue School

Sanderson, Mrs. Elizabeth - Teacher
 Springdale School

Sargent, Mrs. Lonnie H. - Teacher
 Leath School

Schwaiger, Mrs. Elizabeth B. - Teacher
 Cordova School

Sharpe, Mr. Joseph D. - Teacher
 Pine Hill School

Siler, Mr. Rush W. - Principal
 White Station School

Simmons, Mr. D. W. - Principal
 Sherwood Jr. High School

Simonton, Mrs. Va. F. - Teacher,
 Hillcrest High School Counselor

Smith, Mrs. Mary E. - Teacher
 Central High School

Spencer, Mrs. Tinnie S. - Teacher
 Barret's Chapel School

Stanton, Mrs. Katherine - Principal
 Goodlett School

Starks, Mrs. Alma E. - Teacher
 Grant Elementary School

Strong, Mrs. Josephine - Teacher
 Riverview School

Stryker, Miss Agnes - Teacher
 Maury School

Sweet, Mr. William H. - Principal
 T. W. Patterson High School

Verrell, Mrs. Mary B. - Librarian
A. Harrold School

Vaught, Mrs. Iola M. - Teacher
Alonzo Locke School

Thompson, Mrs. Ella B. - Teacher
aldwell School

Warren, Mrs. Sarah F. - Teacher
Hyde Park School

Thompson, Mr. James H. - Teacher
eabody School

Webb, Mrs. Montine - Teacher
Dunbar Elementary School

Thompson, Miss Margaret - Coordinator
entral High School of Guidance

Weiss, Mr. Harold G. - Counselor
Humes High School

Abbs, Mr. Don T. - Guidance
ongview Jr. High School

Woods, Mr. James R. - Teacher
Capleville School

II. STAFF

Permanent Staff

The following members of the University of Tennessee faculty, stationed in the University of Tennessee-Memphis State University Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education in Memphis, provided direction for the Institute and also participated in program activities.

Archie R. Dykes (Director), Ed.D. Professor of Education, The University of Tennessee and Director of the UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education. Coordinated overall program and also served as a discussion leader for one of the small discussion groups.

Harry F. Hodge, Jr., Ed.D. Assistant Professor of Education, The University of Tennessee and instructor in the UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education. Assumed responsibility for the evaluation of the Institute and also served as a discussion leader for one of the small discussion groups.

Serving various functions during the course of the Institute were the following staff members of Memphis State University:

Sam H. Johnson, Ed.D. Dean, the School of Education.

Rosestelle Woolner, Assistant Professor, The School of Education.

Walter Nelms, Ed.D. Assistant Professor, The School of Education.

Robert E. Davis, Ed.D. Assistant Professor, Educational Psychology and Guidance, The School of Education.

Consultants and Guest Lecturers

The following guest speakers and lecturers were among these making major presentations during the Institute:

Dr. Ina C. Brown, Professor of Social Anthropology,
Scarratt College.

Dr. Jack Robertson, Director, Division of Business
and Economics, West Virginia Institute of Technology.

Dr. Juanita Williamson, Professor, LeMoyne College.

Gertrude Noar, Education Director, Anti-Defamation
League of B'nai B'rith.

Dr. Donald Arnstine, Associate Professor, School of
Education, University of Wisconsin.

Dr. A. Harry Passow, Professor, Teachers College,
Columbia University.

Dr. N. A. Crippens, Director, The Nashville Education
Improvement Project, Nashville, Tennessee

Dr. Fred Venditti, Assistant Professor, College of
Education, University of Tennessee.

Dr. Aeolian Lockhart, Assistant Principal, Cameron
High School, Nashville, Tennessee

Administrative and Planning Consultants

The following persons were helpful in planning the Institute program:

Dr. E. C. Stimbart, Superintendent, Memphis City Schools

Mr. George Barnes, Superintendent, Shelby County Schools

Miss Margaret Williams, Director of Certificated Personnel,
Memphis City Schools

Mr. Maurice Roach, Coordinator of Federal Projects, Memphis
City Schools

Mr. Arthur Rauscher, Director of Instruction, Shelby
County Schools

Mr. Morgan Christian, Assistant Superintendent for Instruc-
tion, Memphis City Schools

Dr. Fred Venditti, Assistant Professor, College of Education
University of Tennessee

III. OBJECTIVES

The broad purposes of the Institute were two-fold. Its first broad purpose was to sensitize teachers and other professional staff members of integrating schools to the unique problems of culturally disadvantaged children, for a great majority of the Negro pupils who are being integrated into formerly all-white schools must be so categorized. Its second broad purpose was to focus upon specific educational problems that stem typically from desegregation (e.g., those associated with motivation, achievement, instructional methodology, the development of special instructional materials, curriculum design and organizational patterns) and provide participants with the incentive, knowledge, and skills that are requisite to an effective attack upon such problems. The general purposes of the Institute were to be achieved through the accomplishment of the following specific objectives, stated in terms of expected behavioral and concept changes:

1. Ability to make a realistic self-appraisal of one's own personality dynamics and attitudes as they relate to his teaching effectiveness within the integrating school.
2. Understanding that the potential for progress ascribed to the learner by the teacher is one of the most important factors controlling the total learning process.
3. Understanding the fallacy of the notion that the I.Q. is a kind of ironclad determinant of a child's future.
4. An understanding of the characteristics of the impoverished community and the nature, causes, and effects of cultural disadvantage.
5. Insight into typical behavior patterns and attitudes of disadvantaged children and adults and ability to empathize with them.

6. Understanding of the differences between the value systems of middle- and lower-class subcultures and the implications of both in the classroom.
7. Understanding of normal and gifted students, of achievers and under-achievers (with emphasis given to the salutary effects which improved educational, social, and economic conditions produce among able children from disadvantaged settings).
8. Ability to provide a remedial reading program geared to the language and experience limitations of the children involved.
9. Knowledge of and ability to apply and develop instructional techniques appropriate to the needs of culturally disadvantaged children in the fields of mathematics, science, social studies, and art.
10. Skill in analyzing problems of teaching and learning in schools enrolling disadvantaged children, and skill in preparing original teaching materials and adapting existing materials to the needs of these children.

IV. METHODS

The Institute, a "short-term" type, was divided into two distinct parts: (1) a two-week period of consecutive daily sessions and (2) a series of eight weekly follow-up meetings, consuming a full day's time and conducted on subsequent Saturdays.

The Two-Week Phase

The initial two-week phase of the Institute had three broad purposes, the accomplishment of which required the teachers' absence from their regular jobs for an extended period of time. These three purposes were (1) to give the participants broad basic orientation relative to class, racial, and cultural characteristics and differences, (2) to provide them with many opportunities to engage with professional assistance, individ-

ually and in small groups, in meaningful analysis and evaluation of their personal feelings, attitudes, and ideas regarding race and cultural disadvantage, and (3) to inform fully of the effects of racial stigmatization and cultural disadvantage upon children both in and out of school.

During the two-week phase of the Institute accomplishment of the basic objectives stated above was sought through required individual reading and study on the part of the participants, large group lectures, panel discussions, and by involving the participants in frequent small-group discussions during which they might share ideas, raise questions, and express feelings stimulated by the various large-group activities.

In order to give appropriate background information to the participants, selected books and pamphlets were provided each participant at the opening of the Institute. (The books and materials used are listed in Section VI of this report.) The materials remained in the possession of the participants throughout the Institute and were used frequently for reference purposes.

Lectures offered during the two-week phase of the Institute were delivered by highly competent professionals from the fields of psychology, sociology, economics, and anthropology as well as education. (See program for the two-week phase of the Institute, Appendix A.)

All lectures were followed by discussions in small groups. These discussions culminated in the formation of questions group members wished to address to the lecturers in "wrap-up" question-

and-annual sessions conducted on a large-group basis. The participants were thus given maximum opportunity to react personally to ideas and information presented by the consultants. At the same time, an effective means of eliciting broadly relevant questions from the membership of the large-group and funneling them to the consultants was employed. Assigned leaders with appropriate competency met regularly with the participants in their small groups to facilitate and stimulate proceedings. The contribution of the leaders was significant, especially since most had functioned in the same capacity during a previous institute conducted at the University during the winter and spring of 1965.

Frequently, the lectures were supplemented with movies and panel discussions which injected variety into the program and added new dimensions of understanding to the words of the consultants. (See program, Appendix A.)

The Weekly Follow-Up Sessions

The major purpose of the weekly meetings was to acquaint the participants with specific instructional techniques, approaches, materials, aids, and modes of school organization which are especially appropriate for multi-cultural student groups. A complementary purpose of the meetings was to continue to direct the attention of the participants to the broad and pervasive social and economic problems troubling our society (i.e., especially those having relevance for the multi-cultural school) and to provide them with frequent opportunities to discuss with qualified

experts and with each other instructional and other problems they were confronting on their jobs. Such discussion, usually in a small-group setting, provided opportunity for the exchange of ideas, the solicitation of advice, and the reporting of progress.

Methodology employed during the period of follow-up sessions was substantially the same as that employed during the initial two-week phase of the Institute. (See the program for follow-up sessions, Appendix B.) Individual reading and study, lectures, films, panels, and large- and small-group discussions remained an integral part of the program. Demonstrations, displays of materials, and school visitation were added to it.

V. FACILITIES

Large group lectures and small-group discussions took place in air-conditioned facilities in the School of Education Building on the Memphis State University campus. The School of Education auditorium was used for large group meetings while classrooms and discussion rooms were used for the small group meetings. All facilities of the University were fully available to Institute participants. The school visitations were conducted in the Memphis City School System.

VI. TEACHING AIDS

1. A packet of materials donated by the Headquarters of the American Jewish Committee, New York City, to each participant included:

"Films for Human Relations"
"Books to Grow On"

"Securing Our Children Against Prejudice"
 "The Right to Have Scoundrels"
 "Somebody's Brother"
 "The Gentle People of Prejudice"
 "Not Like Other Children"
 "Understanding Intergroup Relations"
 "Give Slum Children a Chance"
 "People Aren't Born Prejudiced"
 "Life Is Fun in a Smiling, Fair-Skinned World"
 "Children and Discrimination"
 "Dixie Teachers Report Their Pupils Learn Well in Mixed-Race Schools"
 "How Adults Influence Children"

2. The following materials, purchased with funds provided by the grant, were supplied each Institute participant:

Education in Depressed Areas (edited by A. Harry Passow)
Learning Together (edited by Meyer Weinberg)
 Public Affairs Pamphlets No. 85 (The Races of Mankind),
 No. 95 (The Negro in America), No. 255 (A Guide to
 School Desegregation), No. 362 (The Poor Among Us--A
 Challenge and Opportunity), No. 367 (Equal Justice for
 the Poor Man)

3. A suggested reading list of inexpensive paperback books and materials in the Memphis State University library was provided each participant. In addition, sources of useful instructional materials were identified.

4. Carefully selected films were used frequently during the Institute. The titles of those shown are included in the official program. (See Appendices A and B.)

VII. INFORMAL PROGRAM

Planned social activities included luncheons together and coffees during the Institute. Important informal associations took place among Institute participants on these occasions. Many participants felt these were extremely valuable since they provided opportunity to get to know well members of the opposite race. For some Institute participants, this was the first such opportunity.

VIII. CONSULTATION AND GUIDANCE

Considerable staff consultation with participants took place throughout the course of the Institute. Most was done in small groups where staff members and/or special consultants were almost always present. In the small group setting, opportunities were provided for participants to question staff members directly about immediate concerns generated by the Institute program and to obtain as well their opinion and advice regarding work-a-day school problems. Consultation between staff members and participants also took place both before and after regular Institute hours whenever participants requested it.

IX. EVALUATION

The general purpose of the evaluation was to examine the opinions relative to Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons held by the participating teachers and administrators. In addition to providing a partial assessment of the effectiveness of the present Institute, it was felt that data from such an investigation might be of assistance in planning other similar institutes.

Specifically, the evaluation dealt with the following questions:

1. What were the opinions regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons held by the participants before and after the Institute?
2. Were there significant intra-group differences in opinions held about Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons?

3. Were there significant differences in opinions held about Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons between the participants before and after the Institute?
4. Was there a relationship between the relative equalitarian orientation of participants and opinions held by them relative to Negroes and the culturally disadvantaged?

Procedures Used in the Investigation

The Sample. The sample of participants consisted of seventy persons who provided complete, usable data. Of this number, thirty-seven were Negro and thirty-three were white. The number providing usable data varied with the instrument used and time when the instrument was administered.

Instrumentation. Sentence completion instruments were used to gather data about the opinions held by participants regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons. These instruments were administered at the beginning and at the end of the Institute. The sentence completion instruments were administered by giving the respondents the complete listing of incomplete sentences and asking that the sentences be completed with the first idea which the incomplete sentence prompted. Approximately thirty seconds were allowed to complete each sentence. (Appendix C contains a copy of the instrument.) The Sentence Completion Instrument contained fifteen incomplete sentences, nine of which were loaded. (See Appendix D for the loaded incomplete sentences contained in each sentence completion instrument.)

Each response was scored as "positive," "other," or "negative" according to criteria previously established. A "positive" response was one which indicated the respondent felt there was need

for helping action. A response that showed insight and understanding or was empathic in tone was also classified "positive." A "negative" response was one which ridiculed, showed hostility, or represented thinking based on a derogatory stereotype. An "other" response category was used for responses which were ambivalent or neutral or merely descriptive. Omissions were also included in the "other" category. Since scoring was subjective and scorer bias was, therefore, a factor, an effort was made to randomize errors. First, "before" and "after" responses were coded and then co-mingled. Second, one person (who had no knowledge of when or from whom the responses had been obtained) scored all of the responses using the criteria specified above.

Additionally, the Traditional Family Ideology Scale (TFIS) was administered to the Institute participants at the start and again at the close of the Institute. The TFIS is a scale designed to assess a person's position relative to family life on the democratic-autocratic continuum. Since it has been found that one's position regarding family life, as measured by the TFIS, exists within the context of an authoritarian-equalitarian personality,¹ the TFIS was used in the present investigation as a measure of a participant's relative equalitarian orientation. The TFIS consists of forty statements, and the respondent indicates the extent of his agreement with each statement on a 1-7 scale. Thus, the total scores can fall between 40 and 280. The lower the score the greater the equalitarian orientation. (A copy of the TFIS is contained in Appendix E.)

¹D. J. Levinson and P.E. Huffman, "Traditional Family Ideology and Its Relation to Personality," Journal of Personality, 23:251-273, March, 1955.

Analysis. To secure an estimate of opinions held by participant groups before and after the Institute, sentence completion responses of the several groups were categorized and percentage distributions prepared. In making the comparisons indicated by the questions two, three, and four which gave direction to the study, the Wilcoxon T test and the X^2 test were used. The .05 level of confidence was used as the minimum for a significant difference in all comparisons.

Results. At the start of the Institute the range in TFIS scores for the total participant group was from 90 to 207. The "before" median was 137. The mean score per item was 3.41, which was somewhat higher than that of most other groups to whom the scale has been administered.² The intra-group differences in regard to equalitarian orientation become apparent by looking at the top 27 per cent (22 participants) of the group based on TFIS scores in relation to the bottom 27 per cent. The range for the top 27 per cent was 149-207, and for the bottom 27 per cent the range was 90-123. At the close of the Institute the TFIS score range for the total participant group was 90-183. The "after" median was 134.5. The "after" mean score per item was 3.36. The range for the top 27 per cent was 151-183, and for the bottom 27 per cent the range was 90-116. When the total group was compared in regard to "before" and "after" scores by means of the Wilcoxon T, it was found that there was not a significant difference at beyond the .01 level of confidence.

²ibid., p. 269.

(The computed T converted to a z was .87.) Inspection of the "before" and "after" medians shows that the group as a whole was more equalitarian in orientation at the close of the Institute. An examination of the composition of the top 27 per cent group "before" and "after" the Institute revealed that ten persons out of nineteen were in this category both "before" and "after." Also, for the bottom 27 per cent group, fourteen persons were in this group both "before" and "after." (Summaries of changes in specific scores may be seen in Appendices F, G, and H.)

Table I shows the pattern of responses of the participant group "before" and "after" the Institute to the sentence completion instrument. Also shown in Table I are certain intra-group comparisons and the resulting X^2 values. It should be noted that even though the response patterns are presented in percentages for readability, the X^2 values were computed using the number--not percentage--of "positive," "other," and "negative" responses. From an examination of Table I it can be seen that:

1. There was no significant difference in the total group patterns "before" and "after" on the sentence completion instrument. However, there was a tendency to give fewer "negative" responses and more "other" and "positive" responses.
2. A significant difference was found between Negro and white participants who responded to the Sentence Completion Instrument before the Institute.
3. When the top 27 per cent of the group based on TFIS scores was compared to the bottom 27 per cent, both "before" and "after" the Institute, significant differences occurred. Inspection of the percentage distributions shows that there was a consistent tendency for the bottom 27 per cent group to give fewer "negative" and more "positive" responses.

TABLE I

COMPARISON OF PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES TO SENTENCE COMPLETION
INSTRUMENT BEFORE AND AFTER INSTITUTE

Comparison	Percent of Responses			X ² Value
	Positive	Other	Negative	
Total Participants SC* Before	45	30	25	
Total Participants SC After	47	33	20	3.72
Negro Participants SC Before	45	34	21	
White Participants SC Before	46	26	28	7.56**
Negro Participants SC After	49	33	18	
White Participants SC After	45	33	22	1.65
Negro Participants SC Before	45	34	21	
Negro Participants SC After	49	33	18	1.44
White Participants SC Before	46	26	28	
White Participants SC After	45	33	22	4.40
Top 27% TFIS Participants SC Before	45	29	26	
Bottom 27% TFIS Participants SC Before	57	30	13	10.18**
Top 27% TFIS Participants SC After	39	33	28	
Bottom 27% TFIS Participants SC After	57	30	13	15.72**

* SC refers to Sentence Completion Instrument responses.

** Significant at the .05 level (X² value of 5.99 required at the .05 level of confidence, 9.21 is required at the .01 level).

To provide some insight into the actual responses provided to the sentence completion instruments by the participants, there are listed below some of the incomplete sentences and illustrative "positive," "other," and "negative" responses.

To me poor people are "usually eager to want help and improve if given the opportunity." (positive)

"to be helped." (positive)

"lack things to live like me." (other)

"unfortunate." (other)

"lacking in ambition." (negative)

"lazy and indifferent." (negative)

Negroes often do foolish things because "they are frustrated or unknowing of the ways of society." (positive)

"of their different cultural patterns." (positive)

"they don't realize it." (other)

"of unknown reasons." (other)

"they like to show off." (negative)

"they don't assume personal responsibility." (negative)

The mark of a successful Negro is "the same as that of a white person." (positive)

"recognition as an American rather than as a Negro." (positive)

"calmness." (other)

"his behavior." (other)

"humility." (negative)

"a large automobile." (negative)

In my opinion the "war on poverty" is "a very good program." (positive)

"necessary." (positive)

"good, if handled properly." (other)

"half good, half ridiculous." (other)

"a trend toward socialism." (negative)

"just a way to spend more government funds." (negative)

Summary and Discussion

Considering the nature and design of the present investigation, it is recognized that any generalizations which might be made are highly tenuous and subject to re-examination. However, it does appear that the following interpretative comments are in order.

First, since no meaningful reliability and validity studies were conducted with the sentence completion instruments, the inter- and intra-group differences found may well be a function of the lack of instrument reliability and/or validity rather than real differences of opinion regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons. Also, inadequate instrumentation plus scorer bias may account for the relative distributions of "positive," "negative," and "other" responses.

Second, it is recognized that often there are discrepancies between verbalized responses relative to a phenomenon and actual behavior--particularly within reasonably well-educated groups. Certainly by the time the "after" Institute data were collected the participants were well aware of what constituted "acceptable" opinions. This could be a significant factor in the changes observed.

Third, due to the design of the investigation, no definitive cause and effect relationships between Institute activities and changes in orientation and opinions can be claimed. All that can be suggested is that there were some occasions when the two phenomena varied together.

Fourth, keeping in mind the limitations identified, it is noted for the samples studied that:

1. The total participant group was relatively more equalitarian in orientation following Institute participation. However, compared to other groups of similar socio-economic status they were still somewhat authoritarian in orientation.
2. The participant group as a whole was less negative in regard to their opinions of Negroes and culturally deprived persons at the close of the Institute than at the beginning. However, there was still a significant expression of negative opinions. (Examination of the actual responses suggests the hypothesis that the negativism may be in part a function of the persisting paternalistic attitude of the immediate culture.)
3. At the start of the Institute Negro participants as a group tended to be more positive in their opinions regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons than their white counterparts. At the close of the Institute the patterns were similar. (Since the "before" difference was to be expected, some evidence for instrument validity is suggested.)
4. Participants who were more equalitarian in orientation tended to be more positive and less negative in opinions relative to Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons than participants who were less equalitarian in orientation. (This suggests that opinions regarding Negroes and culturally disadvantaged persons exist within the context of an authoritarian-equalitarian personality.)
5. The sentence completion instruments consistently evoked more "positive" and "negative" responses and few "other" responses. (It is suggested that the sentence completion technique is more useful in this type of opinion assessment than the word association technique.)

APPENDIX A

INSTITUTE FOR STAFF MEMBERS IN MULTI-CULTURAL SCHOOLS
January 31 - April 16, 1966

THEME: THE CHALLENGE OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY

First Week Schedule

January 31, Monday

8:15 - 9:00	Registration
9:00 - 9:45	Introductory Remarks Dr. Archie Dykes, Program Director
	Dr. Sam Johnson, Dean School of Education Memphis State University
	Dr. E. C. Merrill, Dean College of Education University of Tennessee
	Mr. George Barnes, Superintendent Shelby County Schools
	Dr. E. C. Stimbert, Superintendent Memphis City Schools
9:45 - 10:30	Opinion Assessment Procedures Dr. Harry F. Hodge, Assistant Professor UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study in Education
10:30 - 11:30	"Anthropological Backgrounds of Human Relations" Dr. Ina C. Brown, Professor Social Anthropology, Scarritt College
11:30 - 1:00	LUNCH
1:00 - 2:00	"Basic Factors in Personality Development" Dr. Ohmer Milton, Coordinator Learning Resources Center University of Tennessee
2:00 - 2:20	BREAK
2:20 - 3:00	Small Group Meetings General orientation provided by discussion leaders; participants formulate questions for Dr. Milton and Dr. Brown.
3:00 - 4:00	Question and Answer Period with Dr. Milton and Dr. Brown

February 1, Tuesday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "Science, Technology, and Social Change"
Dr. Jack Robertson, Director
Division of Business and Economics
West Virginia Institute of Technology
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Robertson)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Robertson
- 11:30 - 1:00 LUNCH
- 1:00 - 1:40 Film: "Face of the South"
- 1:40 - 2:00 BREAK
- 2:00 - 4:00 Small Group Meetings
(Institute participants will have oppor-
tunity to discuss ideas and problems
suggested by the lecture and film with
discussion group leaders)

February 2, Wednesday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "Culture and Acculturation"
Dr. Robertson
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Robertson)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Robertson
- 11:30 - 1:00 LUNCH
- 1:00 - 2:10 "Race Rationalization in the
White Community"
Dr. Robertson
- 2:10 - 2:30 BREAK
- 2:30 - 3:00 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Robertson)
- 3:00 - 4:00 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Robertson

February 3, Thursday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "The Anatomy of Prejudice"
Dr. Robertson
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Robertson)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Robertson
- 11:30 - 1:00 LUNCH
- 1:00 - 2:40 Panel Discussion
Dr. Robertson, Moderator
- Dr. Harry F. Hodge, Assistant Professor
UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate Study
- Dr. Sam H. Johnson, Dean
School of Education
Memphis State University
- Dr. Robert E. Davis, Assistant Professor
School of Education
Memphis State University
- Mrs. Rosestelle Woolner, Assistant Professor
School of Education
Memphis State University
- 2:40 - 3:00 BREAK
- 3:00 - 4:00 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion of Dr. Robertson's presentations
and ideas suggested by panel)

February 4, Friday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "The Challenge to Teachers in Multi-Cultural Schools"
Miss Gertrude Noar, Education Director
Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Miss Noar)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Question and Answer Period with
Miss Noar
- 11:30 - 1:00 LUNCH
- 1:00 - 2:30 Films: "The High Wall" and "Walk in
My Shoes"
- 2:30 - 2:50 BREAK
- 2:50 - 4:00 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion of Miss Noar's presentation
and ideas suggested by films)

February 5, Saturday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "Poverty in Memphis and Shelby County"
Dr. Donald D. Stewart
Professor of Sociology
Memphis State University
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Stewart)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Stewart
- 11:30 - 1:00 LUNCH
- 1:00 - 2:00 Film: "The Other Face of Dixie"
- 2:00 - 2:20 BREAK
- 2:20 - 3:00 Summary and Concluding Statement
Dr. Harry F. Hodge

Second Week ScheduleFebruary 7, Monday

8:30 - 9:40 "The Aims of Education in the
Multi-Cultural School"
Dr. Donald Arnstine, Associate Professor
Department of Educational Policy Studies
University of Wisconsin

9:40 - 10:00 BREAK

10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Arnstine)

10:30 - 11:30 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Arnstine

11:30 - 1:00 LUNCH

1:00 - 2:10 "Classroom Practices and the Aims of
Multi-Cultural Schools"
Dr. Arnstine

2:10 - 2:30 BREAK

2:30 - 3:00 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Arnstine)

3:00 - 4:00 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Arnstine

February 8, Tuesday

8:30 - 9:40 "Moving Toward the Ideal Multi-Cultural School"
Dr. Barbara C. Arnstine, Assistant Professor
Division of University Extension
University of Wisconsin

9:40 - 10:00 BREAK

10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Arnstine)

10:30 - 11:30 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Arnstine

11:30 - 1:00 LUNCH

1:00 - 2:40 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Arnstine

2:40 - 3:00 BREAK

3:00 - 4:00 Film: "Incident on Wilson Street"

February 9, Wednesday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "Teaching and Learning in the
Multi-Cultural School" (Part I)
Dr. A. Harry Passow, Professor
Teachers College
Columbia University
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Passow)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Passow
- 11:30 - 1:00 LUNCH
- 1:00 - 2:00 "Teaching and Learning in the
Multi-Cultural School" (Part II)
Dr. Passow
- 2:00 - 2:20 BREAK
- 2:20 - 3:30 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Passow

February 12, Saturday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "The Nashville Education Improvement Project"
Dr. N. A. Crippens, Director
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Crippens)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Crippens
- 11:30 - 1:00 LUNCH
- 1:00 - 2:00 Film: "Superfluous People"
- 2:00 - 2:20 BREAK
- 2:20 - 3:00 Questions and answers, explanation of
schedule for follow-up sessions, and
concluding statements.

APPENDIX B

PROGRAM FOR SATURDAY SESSIONS

February 19 - April 16

February 19, Saturday

- 8:30 - 9:30 "The LeMoyne College Project"
(Emphasis on speech patterns of the
culturally deprived and the implications
for teachers in multi-cultural schools)
Dr. Juanita Williamson, Professor
Department of English
LeMoyne College
- 9:30 - 9:50 BREAK
- 9:50 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Williamson)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Question and answer period
with Dr. Williamson
- 11:30 - 12:30 LUNCH
- 12:30 - 1:30 "The Pre-School Disadvantaged Child"
Marshall Perritt
Coordinator for Federal Projects
Shelby County Board of Education
- 1:30 - 1:50 BREAK
- 1:50 - 2:30 Film: "Children Without"

February 26, Saturday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "How One Integrated Junior High School
Revamped Curriculum and Instruction for
Disadvantaged and Gifted Students"
Dr. Fred Venditti, Assistant Professor
Department of Educational Administration
and Supervision
University of Tennessee
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 11:30 Large Group Discussion of
Dr. Venditti's Presentation
- 11:30 - 12:30 LUNCH
- 12:30 - 1:30 "A Positive Approach to School Discipline"
Dr. Venditti
(Lecture and large group discussion)
- 1:30 - 1:50 BREAK
- 1:50 - 2:30 Film: "A Chance at the Beginning"

March 5, Saturday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "Life in a Multi-Cultural School"
Dr. Aeolian Lockert, Assistant Principal
Cameron High School
Nashville, Tennessee
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 11:00 Question and Answer Period
with Dr. Lockert
- 11:00 - 11:30 Film: "A Morning for Jimmy"
- 11:30 - 12:30 LUNCH
- 12:30 - 1:15 "The Pine Hill Experience"
Mr. Gene Olds, Principal
Pine Hill Elementary School
Memphis, Tennessee
- 1:15 - 1:30 BREAK
- 1:30 - 2:15 Question and Answer Period
with Mr. Olds and Dr. Lockert

March 12, Saturday

- 8:30 - 9:40 "Speech - A Neglected Basic Skill"
Mr. Theodore Soistmann, Doctoral Student
Department of Educational Administration
and Supervision
University of Tennessee
- 9:40 - 10:00 BREAK
- 10:00 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Mr. Soistmann)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Large Group Discussion of
Mr. Soistmann's presentation
- 11:30 - 12:30 LUNCH
- 12:30 - 1:30 "Reading Instruction in the
Multi-Cultural School"
Mr. Soistmann
- 1:30 - 1:50 BREAK
- 1:50 - 2:30 Large Group Reaction to
Mr. Soistmann's presentation

n 19, Saturday

- 8:30 - 9:30 "Materials and Approaches for Improving Reading Skills in a Multi-Cultural School"
Dr. Lucille B. Taylor, Associate Professor
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Memphis State University
- 9:30 - 9:50 BREAK
- 9:50 - 10:30 Small Group Meeting
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Dr. Taylor)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Question and answer period
with Dr. Taylor
- 11:30 - 12:30 LUNCH
- 12:30 - 1:30 "Diagnosis of Reading Problems"
(Emphasis on utilization and interpretation
of appropriate tests)
Dr. Rita Sawyer, Associate Professor
Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Memphis State University
- 1:30 - 1:50 BREAK
- 1:50 - 2:30 Question and answer session
with Dr. Sawyer

March 26, Saturday

8:30 - 9:40	"Remedial Approaches to Specific Reading Disabilities" Mr. Soistmann
9:40 - 10:00	BREAK
10:00 - 10:30	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Mr. Soistmann)
10:30 - 11:30	Large Group Discussion of Mr. Soistmann's presentation
11:30 - 12:30	LUNCH
12:30 - 1:15	"A Look at Other Language Arts in a Multi-Cultural School" Mr. Soistmann
1:15 - 1:30	BREAK
1:30 - 2:00	Small Group Meetings (Discussion and formulation of questions for Mr. Soistmann)
2:00 - 2:30	Large Group Discussion

April 2, Saturday

- 8:30 - 9:30 "New Approaches and Methodologies"
Mr. Soistmann
- 9:30 - 9:50 BREAK
- 9:50 - 10:30 Small Group Meetings
(Discussion and formulation of questions
for Mr. Soistmann)
- 10:30 - 11:30 Large Group Discussion of
Mr. Soistmann's presentation
- 11:30 - 12:30 LUNCH
- 12:30 - 1:30 "A Linguistic Approach in One Classroom"
Mrs. Theodore Soistmann, Teacher
Knox County Schools
Knoxville, Tennessee
- 1:30 - 1:45 BREAK
- 1:45 - 2:15 Question and answer period
with Mrs. Soistmann
- 2:15 - 2:45 Film: "All the Way Home"

April 16, Saturday

- 8:30 - 9:30 "Opinion Assessment Procedures"
Dr. Harry F. Hodge, Assistant Professor
UT-MSU Center for Advanced Graduate
Study in Education
- 9:30 - 9:50 BREAK
- 9:50 - 11:30 "Implications of the Institute for
Educational Programs and Practices"
Panel of Institute Participants with
contributions from floor
- 11:30 - 12:30 LUNCH
- 12:30 - 1:30 Film: "A Question of Chairs: The
Challenge to American Education"
- 1:30 - 1:45 BREAK
- 1:45 - 2:30 Concluding Session

APPENDIX C

SENTENCE COMPLETION

1. Some of my favorite social scientists are
2. The two great people are
3. Some people who read a lot are
4. Countries which are allowed to spend more are
5. People who work with social sciences are
6. A friend of mine thinks psychology is
7. Negroes often do social science because
8. Social science
9. People who do not have a lot
10. The name of a successful Negro is
11. In my opinion American foreign policy is
12. The trouble with Negroes is
13. Some people do not get ahead because
14. In my opinion the 'war on poverty' is
15. The person who started these conditions is

APPENDIX D

LOADED ITEMS CONTAINED IN SENTENCE COMPLETION INSTRUMENT

To me poor people are
Children should be allowed to attend school who
People who work with their hands are
Negroes often do foolish things because
People who do not have a lot
The mark of a successful Negro is
The trouble with Negroes is
Some people do not get ahead because
In my opinion the "war on poverty" is
To me Negroes are
Some people do not get ahead because
The trouble with Negroes is
Poor people should
Negro children often dislike school because
People who do not have a lot deserve
The main reason some people are poor is
Poor children often dislike school because

APPENDIX E

TRADITIONAL FAMILY IDEOLOGY SCALE

We hope that you will find the following survey interesting. Please read each statement carefully and mark it according to your first reaction. Give your personal point of view. Don't talk the statements over with anyone until you have finished. There are no right or wrong responses. Do not omit any statements.

Write one number from the following scale opposite each statement to indicate your reaction to it:

7--strongly agree	3--slightly disagree
6--agree	2--disagree
5--slightly agree	1--strongly disagree

- ___ 1. Almost any woman is better off in the home than in a job or profession.
- ___ 2. It's a pretty feeble sort of man who can't get ahead in the world.
- ___ 3. A teen-ager should be allowed to decide most things for himself.
- ___ 4. A marriage should not be made unless the couple plans to have children.
- ___ 5. A wife does better to vote the way her husband does, because he probably knows more about such things.
- ___ 6. It is a reflection on a husband's manhood if his wife works.
- ___ 7. Whatever some educators may say, "Spare the rod and spoil the child" still holds, even in these modern times.
- ___ 8. Women have as much right as men to sow wild oats.
- ___ 9. Women think less clearly than men and are more emotional.
- ___ 10. Faithlessness is the worst fault a husband could have.
- ___ 11. It isn't healthy for a child to like to be alone, and he should be discouraged from playing by himself.
- ___ 12. Petting is something a nice girl wouldn't want to do.
- ___ 13. Even today women live under unfair restrictions that ought to be done away with.
- ___ 14. Some equality in marriage is a good thing, but by and large the husband ought to have the main say-so in family matters.
- ___ 15. It helps the child in the long run if he is made to conform to his parents' ideas.

- ___ 16. If children are told much about sex, they are likely to go too far in experimenting with it.
- ___ 17. Women can be too bright for their own good.
- ___ 18. The most important qualities of a real man are strength of will and determined ambition.
- ___ 19. In making family decisions, parents ought to take the opinions of children into account.
- ___ 20. One of the worst problems in our society is "free love," because it mars the true value of sex relations.
- ___ 21. Women who want to remove the word "obey" from the marriage service don't understand what it means to be a wife.
- ___ 22. It doesn't seem quite right for a man to be a visionary; dreaming should be left to women.
- ___ 23. A well-raised child is one who doesn't have to be told twice to do something.
- ___ 24. It is only natural and right for each person to think that his family is better than any other.
- ___ 25. It is a woman's job more than a man's to uphold our moral code, especially in sexual matters.
- ___ 26. A man who doesn't provide well for his family ought to consider himself pretty much a failure as husband and father.
- ___ 27. A child should not be allowed to talk back to his parents, or else he will lose respect for them.
- ___ 28. There is a lot of evidence such as the Kinsey Report which shows we have to crack down harder on young people to save our moral standards.
- ___ 29. Women should take an active interest in politics and community problems as well as in their families.
- ___ 30. In choosing a husband, a woman will do well to put ambition at the top of her list of desirable qualities.
- ___ 31. The saying "Mother knows best" still has more than a grain of truth.
- ___ 32. A man can scarcely maintain respect for his fiancée if they have sexual relations before they are married.
- ___ 33. The unmarried mother is morally a greater failure than the unmarried father.

34. It goes against nature to place women in positions of authority over men.
35. It is important to teach the child as early as possible the manners and morals of his society.
36. A lot of the sex problems of married couples arise because their parents have been too strict with them about sex.
37. The family is a sacred institution, divinely ordained.
38. A woman whose children are messy or rowdy has failed in her duties as a mother.
39. A child who is unusual in any way should be encouraged to be more like other children.
40. There is hardly anything lower than a person who does not feel a great love, gratitude, and respect for his parents.

APPENDIX F

SUMMARY OF TOTAL RESPONSES ON TFIS
BY PARTICIPANTS "BEFORE", "AFTER", DIFFERENCE

Participant Number	Before	"After"	Difference	Participant Number	Before	"After"	Difference
3283	207	175	-32	1243	137	147	+10
3283	205	183	-22	2263	137	145	+ 8
2257	175	145	-30	4302	136	109	-27
328	172	183	+11	1240	136	148	+12
1217	171	156	-15	4301	135	148	+13
4221	168	140	-28	4295	134	158	+24
2217	166	159	- 7	5311	133	130	- 3
4191	166	172	+ 6	3318	130	151	+21
3233	162	156	- 6	3273	129	122	- 7
2272	159	166	+ 7	2262	128	97	-31
1240	157	149	- 8	5316	127	112	-15
1150	156	143	-13	3274	127	128	+ 1
2219	154	182	+28	2265	127	123	- 4
4225	154	165	+11	2258	124	112	-12
4181	153	145	- 8	3284	124	132	- 8
1141	152	118	-34	3272	124	102	-22
1171	149	134	-15	2268	123	116	- 7
4113	146	136	-10	5313	122	135	+13
1151	146	148	+ 2	2271	122	111	-11
2214	141	163	+22	3307	121	107	-14
1118	141	151	+10	1242	117	120	+ 3
1116	145	137	+12	3134	115	111	- 4
2112	143	148	+ 5	2236	114	115	+ 1
1117	142	134	- 8	5317	113	104	- 9
1111	143	130	-13	1246	112	110	- 2
2212	141	161	+20	3310	112	115	+ 3
3111	141	141	- 0	4297	111	118	+ 7
1110	139	124	-15	3180	110	119	+ 9
1112	138	152	+14	4293	110	102	- 8
4110	138	137	- 1	1248	102	90	-12
1114	138	162	+24	3208	101	122	+21
1115	136	121	-15	1141	99	99	0
4211	138	144	+ 6	5314	99	95	- 4
1113	138	152	+14	1234	91	95	+ 4
1114	137	128	- 9	1111	90	95	+ 5

"Before" Range 90-207 "After" Range 90-183
 "Before" Median 137 "After" Median 134.5
 "Before" Mean Score per Item 3.41 "After" Mean Score per Item 3.36



APPENDIX G

SUMMARY OF TOP 27% AND BOTTOM 27% OF PARTICIPANTS
RESPONSES TO TFI SCALE, "BEFORE", "AFTER"

TOP 27% "BEFORE"	
Participant Number	Score
3285	207
3283	205
1255*	189
2257	175
3287	172
3275	171
4303*	170
4291	168
2267	166
4290	166
4298*	163
1253	162
2270	159
1249	157
1250	156
5312*	154
2269	154
4296	154
4289	153
4294*	153
5305	152
1251	149

*Did not take "after" test
N=22
Range 149-207

TOP 27% "AFTER"	
Participant Number	Score
3287#	183
3283#	183
2269#	182
3285#	175
4290#	172
2264	167
3276	167
2270#	166
4296#	165
1244	162
2267#	159
4295	158
4292	157
3275#	156
1253#	156
3281	155
5309	152
3286	152
5318	151

#Also in top 27% of "before" test
N=19
Range 151-183

BOTTOM 27% "BEFORE"	
Participant Number	Score
2261*	123
2268	123
3278*	122
5313	122
2271	122
5307	121
1424	117
5304	115
2256	114
5317	113
1246	112
5310	110
4297	110
3280	110
4293	110
2272*	109
1248	102
5308	100
1241	99
5314	99
1254	91
5306	90

* Did not take "after" test
N=22
Range 90-123

BOTTOM 27% "AFTER"	
Participant Number	Score
2268#	116
2256#	115
5310#	115
5316	112
2258	112
5304#	111
2271#	111
1246#	110
4302	109
5307#	107
5317#	104
4293#	102
3272	102
1241#	99
2262	97
5314#	95
1254#	95
5306#	95
1248#	90

#Also in bottom 27% of "before" test
N=19
Range 90-116

APPENDIX H

SUMMARY OF NEGRO PARTICIPANTS' RESPONSES
"BEFORE"- "AFTER" to TFI SCALE

Participant Number	"Before"	"After"	Difference
3285	207	175	-32
3287	172	183	+11
4291	168	140	-28
1253	162	156	-6
2270	159	166	+7
4296	154	165	+11
4289	153	145	-8
5305	152	118	-34
1251	149	134	-15
2266	146	148	+2
3281	145	155	+10
2260	143	148	+5
3279	143	134	-9
1252	143	130	-13
3276	141	167	+26
1245	139	124	-15
4298	138	137	-1
2259	138	123	-15
4299	138	144	+6
3286	138	152	+14
4302	136	109	-27
1240	136	148	+12
4295	134	158	+24
5311	133	130	-3
3273	129	122	-7
2262	128	97	-31
2258	124	112	-12
3272	124	102	-22
2268	123	116	-7
5313	122	135	+13
5304	115	111	-4
2256	114	115	+1
1246	112	110	-2
2310	110	115	+5
4297	110	118	+8
2241	99	99	0
5306	90	95	+5

"Before" Range 90-207

N=37

"After" Range 95-183

Negroes N=37

20 scored lower on "Before" test (54%)
16 scored higher on "After" test (43%)
1 score remained same (3%)

Whites N=33

16 scored lower on "After" test (49%)
17 scored higher on "After" test (51%)