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Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation was two fold: (1) to determine
the effects of a Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness upon the self-
actualization of experienced teachers from four separate high schools,
and (2) to determine the success of the Summer Institute for Cultural
Awareness in terms of participant perception of goal achievement.

Design of the Study

The population consisted of approximately 450 teachers employed
by the Area II portion of Public School District #1 in Portland, Oregon.
The original sample consisted of ninety experienced teachers. The final
sample consisted of thirty-two control and thirty-two experimental group
participants from the four high schools in Area II.

The pre-test of the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was
administered during the pre-session, one week prior to the beginning
of the Institute. One week following the Institute the post-test of
the Personal Orientation Inventory was administered.
The I (Inner-Directed) Scale scores of the POI were used in a two way fixed analysis of covariance with results tested for significance at the .05 level.

Descriptive data was gathered on a weekly basis and included goal identification and achievement, critical incidents, systematic self-observation, and action plan design.

Findings and Conclusions

The investigation was designed to test the following hypotheses:

- **H₁** There will be a significant school effect (rejected)
- **H₂** There will be a significant group effect (rejected)
- **H₃** There will be a significant interaction effect between school and group. (rejected)

Because all three hypotheses were rejected for lack of significant statistical support, it must be assumed that the Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness had no significant effect upon the self-actualization of the participants in the study. Further analysis did indicate trends that support the speculation that participants from three of the schools (experimental school-other) were negatively affected when compared with participants from the fourth school (experimental school-A). The data revealed that the institute participants were at a level of self-actualization above the norm on both the pre- and post-tests. Also the trends seem to support the position that the School-A group was more self-actualized than the school-other group.
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. This investigation covered a time-span of approximately five weeks. Longitudinal studies are recommended that would investigate the teacher's self-actualization while teaching in an actual cross-cultural setting over a longer period of time.

2. Since this study involved a non-random sampling design that found participants self-actualized as a group, it is recommended that a random sampling design be used that would provide for generalization to the larger population.

3. Further research concerning the effect of cross-cultural teaching situations upon self-actualization should be conducted using another comparative instrument.

4. This study chose a specific personality theory to predict behavior. Other predictive data, concerning cross-cultural teachings, should be gathered using other personality theories.

5. Additional research needs to be undertaken to determine the attitudes of experienced teachers who do not participate in cultural awareness inservice programs. (e.g., the control school-other group which indicated non-self-actualizing, identified in this study).

6. It is recommended that further research examine the sub-scales of the POI for possible effect in cross-cultural teaching situations.

7. It is recommended that research continue to examine methods and techniques that seek to change teacher behavioral characteristics to those best suited for cross-cultural teaching (e.g., the Systematic Self Observation technique).
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Need for the Study

From the mid-1960's on, considerable attention has been paid to the cultural diversity among the students in American schools. Most teachers, presently teaching in the American education establishment went through teacher preparation that paid little or no attention to cultural differences (Sullivan, 1974). These certified teachers in all likelihood are expected or will be expected to teach students whose cultures are different from their own. Many will find themselves unprepared for lack of multicultural understanding, attitude and skills. Stent (1973) states the attitudes, beliefs, and knowledge that teachers have about specific cultural groups need to be critically examined and enhanced in light of new knowledge and literature on cultural pluralism produced within the past decade.

The need for experienced teacher preparation for teaching culturally diverse students as found in American urban schools is also stressed by Robert N. Bush (1971).

I have no objection to preparing teachers sufficiently to be equally at home in the slum ghetto and in the urban affluent environment, and I admit that some teachers may have more or less personal preference for working in one of the two situations. Nonetheless, if
they are incapable of working in both situations, I submit that they have not been sufficiently prepared as professional teachers (p. 62).

Sufficient preparation has not been provided a high percentage of teachers in the areas of culturally integrating materials, understanding students from diverse backgrounds and self-diagnosis and understanding (Hilliard 1974). Hilliard goes on to explain that teachers from racial or ethnic minorities require cross-cultural training just as all other teachers do. The training must include an examination of the candidates behavior in a real context, confronting individual and institutional cultural conflict as required. Furthermore, education staff materials and sites must be multicultural.

Hilliard also points out the lack of teachers' ability in demonstrating skill in self-diagnosis and understanding regarding their own behavior in a multicultural context (p. 48). For example, too many cross-cultural teachers do not recognize when they begin to foster dependency in students growing out of the teachers' need to be needed. Also these teachers do not recognize when they are projecting their fears and insecurities on the students.

Smith (1968) states that most educators would agree that the teacher's "personality" or "mental health" are important in the classroom. Some educators might consider these characteristics even more important than knowledge of the subject matter and methods of teaching. He further clarifies that when a teacher
fails, the failure is often attributed to personality defects, such as insufficient warmth, zeal, or sensitivity, or perhaps excessive authoritarianism, rigidity, or permissiveness.

Bohanan (1973), a cultural anthropologist who conducts teacher seminars, provides further focus upon the need for self-understanding and the effects of cross-cultural teaching among teachers. He sites that teachers who are unprepared for culturally different situations and yet are placed in them, may experience a type of cultural shock, thus, distorting their knowledge of self and thwarting their psychological growth and self-actualization. Bohanan's ideas are similar to Maslow's (1943b) in regard to need deprivation and need fulfillment.

Growth, as Maslow sees it, is the result of a never-ending series of situations offering a free choice between the attractions and dangers of safety and those of growth. Maslow's hierarchy of needs includes physiological needs, safety needs, love and belonging needs, esteem needs, and need for self-actualization. According to Maslow, if the basic needs for safety, belongingness, love and respect are met then teachers can feel unthreatened, autonomous, interested and spontaneous and thus dare to choose and function within the unknown. Only when the lower needs are satisfied can a person realize the higher level need of self-actualization.

These ideas are derived from one of the most widely discussed theories of personality which deals with the concept of self-actualization as developed by Abraham Maslow and expressed in the writings

This introductory discussion suggests that many experienced teachers are not prepared for cross-cultural teaching. Furthermore, an area of preparation significantly needed for the teaching of culturally diverse students is self-understanding. The basic idea is that a teacher whose basic needs are not met and who does not have a clear understanding of self may be overwhelmed by events that are uncontrollable. Also, a teacher who understands and accepts himself is more self-actualized and is better able to accept and understand others (Jersild 1955, Bohanan 1973, Rogers 1961, Maslow 1968 and 1971, Combs 1969 and Hamachek 1965 and 1971).

The self-actualization of teachers represents one area of teacher personality and mental health that has remained ignored from a cross-cultural perspective.

It was the intention of this study to examine an institute for cultural awareness relative to the preparation of experienced teachers for cross-cultural teaching. By attempting to relate a teacher training program for cultural awareness to self-actualization it was anticipated that data gathered would add to the knowledge of planning, implementing and assessing cross-cultural teacher inservice programs and the effects of such a program upon the self-actualization of experienced teachers.
Purpose of The Study

The purpose of this investigation was two fold: (1) to determine the effects of a Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness upon the self-actualization of experienced teachers from four separate high schools, and (2) to determine the success of a Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness in terms of goal achievement.

Statistical Hypotheses

H₁ There will be a significant school effect.
H₂ There will be a significant group effect.
H₃ There will be a significant interaction effect between school and group.

Assumptions of the Study

The following assumptions are recognized in this study:
1. Each human being is continually involved in self development toward a higher level of functioning or toward self-actualization; a basic tenet of humanistic psychology.
2. The personality of the classroom teacher is an important factor in the teaching-learning process.
3. Personality is a measurable entity when a particular theory of personality is identified and a valid and reliable instrument is employed as a measurement.
4. The Personal Orientation Inventory is a relatively new instrument and in comparison with other instruments is limited to similarities of concepts being measured.

5. Time is an important factor in affective growth. Five weeks of intensive institute activity may have a limiting influence on the study.

6. Cultural awareness and the education of culturally diverse students are important concerns in the professional preparation of teachers.

Limitations of the Study

1. This study was limited to this one experimental program and group size.

2. The research design is such that references and generalizations are limited beyond the sample group to the larger population.

3. All groups experienced their chosen environments during the course of this study. No controls could be placed on participant's experiences and/or interactions outside of the institute sessions.
Definition of Terms

In order to provide clarity of meaning, the following terms are defined:

**EXPERIENCED TEACHER:** An Oregon State Certificated teacher with at least one year of teaching in a secondary school in Portland School District #1.

**SELF-CONCEPT:** The self-concept or self-structure may be thought of as an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness.

**PERCEPTION:** Any differentiations the individual is capable of making in his perceptual field whether an objectively observable stimulus is presented or not.

**PERSONALITY:** The unique organization of factors which characterizes an individual and determines his pattern of interaction with the environment. An individual's total make-up or the type of person he is.

**CULTURAL AWARENESS:** For the purpose of this study, cultural awareness is defined as a person's recognition and acceptance of other people who have a distinct lifestyle and who are not fully accepted in the mainstream of American life today.

**CROSS-CULTURAL TEACHING:** For the purpose of this study, cross-cultural teaching is the formal instruction of students who are culturally different from each other and/or culturally different from the teacher.
SELF-ACTUALIZED PERSON: Shostrom (1963) defined this as a person who lived a more enriched life than the average person and who developed and utilized all of his unique capabilities or potential- italities, freed of inhibitions and emotional turmoil which characterized those less self-actualized. Self-actualized individuals were seen as more fully using their talents and capabilities, and seemed to be fulfilling themselves, by doing the best they were capable of doing.

This definition is rather incomplete for it is important to think of self-actualization in terms of behavior. Maslow described self-actualizing behavior as follows:

... self-actualization means experiencing fully, vividly, selflessly, with full concentration, and total absorption. It means experiencing without the self-consciousness of the adolescent. At this moment of experiencing the person is wholly and fully human.

... let us think of life as a process of choices, one after another. At each point there is a pro- gression choice and a regression choice. There may be a movement toward defense, toward safety, toward being afraid; but over on the other side, there is the growth choice. To make the growth choice instead of the fear choice a dozen times a day is to move a dozen times a day toward self- actualization. Self-actualization is an ongoing process; it means making each of the many single choices about whether to lie or be honest, whether to steal or not to steal at a particular point, and it means to make each of these choices as a growth choice. This is movement toward self- actualization.

... to talk of self-actualization implies there is a self to be actualized. A human being is not a tabular rasa, not a lump of clay or plastocene. He is something which is already there, at least a "catilaginous" structure of some kind ... most of us, most of the time (and especially does this apply to children, young people), listen not
to outselves but to Mommy's introjected voice or Daddy's voice or to the voice of the Establishment, of the Elders, pf authority, or of tradition.

... frequently when we are in doubt we are not honest ... looking within oneself for many of the answers implies taking responsibility ... that is in itself a great step toward actualization ... each time one takes responsibility, this is an actualizing of the self.

... one cannot choose wisely for a life unless he dares to listen to himself, his own self, at each moment in life, and to say calmly, "No, I don't like such and such."

... making an honest statement involves daring to be different, unpopular, nonconformist. To be courageous rather than afraid is another version of the same thing.

... self-actualizing is not only an end state but also the process of actualizing one's potentialities at any time, in any moment ... self-actualization means using one's intelligence. It does not mean doing some far-out thing necessarily, but it may mean going through an arduous and demanding period of preparation in order to realize one's possibilities.

... finding out who one is, what he is, what he likes, what he doesn't like, what is good for him, and what is bad, where he is going and what his mission is -- opening oneself up to himself ... means identifying defenses, and after defenses have been identified, it means finding the courage to give them up (59:282-83).

PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY (POI): The POI is a comparative value assessment instrument for the measurement of positive mental health as reflected in concepts of self-actualization. The POI consists of 150 two-choice items reflecting values and behavior.

Four major scales and ten sub-scales are used in comparing the examiners responses to normative samples. The POI was developed by E. L. Shostrom.
Shostrom's (1966) Scale Definitions were used as follows:

Time Competence (Tc): The idea of whether or not the person is oriented to living in the present and not predominately in the past or future.

Inter-Directedness (I): Concerns whether reactivity orientation is basically toward others or towards self.

Self-Actualizing Value (SAV): The affirmation of a primary value known to be present in self-actualizing people.

Existentiality (EX): The ability to situationally react with a rigid adherence of principles.

Feeling Reactivity (FR): The sensitivity of responsiveness to a person's own needs and feelings.

Spontaneity (S): The freedom to react spontaneously, or to be oneself.

Self-Regard (SR): The affirmation of self because of worth or strength.

Self-Acceptance (SA): The affirmation of self in spite of weaknesses or deficiencies.

Nature of Man (NC): The degree of the constructive view of the nature of man, masculinity, femininity.

Synergy (SY): The ability to transcend dichotomies.

Acceptance of Aggression (A): The ability to accept a person's natural aggressiveness as opposed to defensiveness, denial and repression of aggression.

Capacity for Intimate Contact (C): The ability to develop intimate relationships with other human beings, unencumbered by expectations and obligations.

The Instrument

The instrument to be used in this study is the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) developed by Everett Shostrom.
The POI as expressed by Knapp (1965, 1971) is the best instrument available to measure the development of the self-actualizing individual. Related research and descriptions of the POI are discussed in other chapters.

Summary

This chapter discussed the need for professional preparation of teachers who are teaching or will be teaching culturally diverse students. The need for specific psychological preparation in the area of self-awareness and self-actualization was supported in the writings of Rogers (1961, 1969), Combs (1959, 1965, 1969), Allport (1955), Shostrom (1966), and Bohanan (1973).

The purpose of the study was explained and the statistical hypotheses were stated. Also the assumptions and limitations of the study were provided.

A definition of terms was presented with an explanation of self-actualization and an introduction to the Personal Orientation Inventory.

This chapter suggested the need for research related to cross-cultural teacher preparation and its effect upon the self-actualization of teachers.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature related to (1) the historical antecedents of cultural awareness in education, (2) self-development and cross-cultural teaching, (3) the concept of self-actualization and characteristics of the self-actualized individual, and (4) inservice programs using the Personal Orientation Inventory as a measure of teacher self-actualization.

This review is limited to research having to do with the preparation of the classroom teacher.

Historical Antecedents of Cultural Awareness in Education

Modern American society is a unique mosaic of cultures, linked and interrelated through a pervading way of life contributed to and shared by all Americans. Hunter (1973) explains that if education in the United States is to meet the needs of its peoples, that it must have "a life blood of multicultural content in order to be sociologically relevant, philosophically germane, psychologically material and pedagogically a propos".

The United States school system is unalterably a multicultural system made up mainly of immigrants and migrant peoples. Cultural discrimination emerged during the early development of the public school system and the melting pot cultural concept and ideology was not maintained for all. Although it was recognized that America
was culturally diverse, no national effort was historically made to understand and accommodate different cultural groups; in consequence, ethnic communities or enclaves grew and were maintained. The melting pot concept rejected as unmeltable many ethnic groups, including Native Americans, Blacks, Spanish-speakers, and Orientals. The concept assumed that only the dominant white Anglo-Saxon Protestant culture was worth saving, and it was expected that those who wished to be absorbed by the melting pot had to surrender their own cultural heritage as the price of admission (Pettigrew, 1974).

History reveals the sequence of events from 1916 when John Dewey (1916) introduced the concept of cultural pluralism in an address before the National Education Association and from 1924 when Horace Kallen (1924) unsuccessfully sought to show how cultural pluralism made American life richer. Not until the last decade have the concepts of cultural pluralism and cultural diversity been reasonably recognized by leading educators in the United States.

It has taken the civil rights movement to provide large numbers of educators a concern for cultural diversity. The issue of educational opportunities, and the wide differences in the provisions for different youth that existed for years in America led to a series of legal actions commencing with the Supreme Court decision in 1954 in Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka (1954):

Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local governments. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity of an education. Such an opportunity, where the state has taken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.
Other significant developments are sampled below: (Hunter 1974)

1957 Civil Rights Commission established by Congress to investigate complaints alleging that citizens are being deprived of their right to vote by reason of cultural identity (race, color, religion, or national origin) or by reason of fraudulent practices, etc.

1961-62 Lawsuits to eliminate discrimination in public schools instituted in large cities and small communities in North and West, covering gerrymandered school boundaries, transfer policies and practices, discriminatory feeder patterns, etc. (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1962)

1963 Voting Rights Act (Congressional Action)

1964 Civil Rights Act (Congressional Action)

1966 James S. Coleman (John Hopkins University) survey concerning lack of availability of equal educational opportunities for individuals by reason of cultural identity (race, color, religion, or national origin) in public institutions at all levels (Coleman, 1966).

1971 School busing for equal quality education.

1972 Court orders allowance bilingual programs; Serna V. Portales Municipal Schools.


1973 Student rights - court actions sustaining student rights to due process, Board of Regents v. Roth.

1968-74 The six-year study of educational practices affecting Mexican Americans in the southwest by the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

1974 Job discrimination in employment practices challenged.
The course of events, briefly outlined, indicated a national concern for cultural diversity and cultural awareness in terms of equal opportunity of education for all. It has become apparent to some educators that in order to provide for cultural diversity the curriculum, teaching strategies, facilities and support systems need to be retooled.

Although the civil rights movement had somewhat stimulated the educators' awareness of cultural diversity some educators began to discuss changes that reflect a major philosophical shift from the "melting pot" educational system to a "multicultural" educational system.

In 1973 the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education sponsored a multicultural Education/Competency-Based Teacher Education Project (M/CBTE) which, among other objectives, sought to bring together the findings of separate studies, projects, and research efforts. The project proposed to take a broader approach to the overall problem of quality education by seeking to identify various concerns and needs common to all ethnic groups and diverse cultural situations.

It was recognized that all facets of cultural diversity could not be accommodated in the Project; therefore, the focus in the initial phase of research was upon teacher preparation for a multicultural society.

The Project Writing Conference was convened in June of 1974. From the papers prepared before and during the conference a document
concerning multicultural education was edited by William A. Hunter (1974).

Harry N. Rivlin (1974), who served as the prime writer of the summary chapter of the multicultural document, states that in order to prepare and retool teachers for their roles in developing effective school settings, "we must restructure the academic and pedagogical programs which have become entrenched as part of the traditional mode of teacher education." He further states that teacher preparation programs should be derived from an anthropological, linguistic, psychological and sociological base which would help develop those teaching competencies regarded by the various ethnic groups as important and basic to developing philosophical values in the teacher.

Rivilin (1973) further advocates teacher immersion into other cultures and the involvement of minority ethnic community members as strategies for preparing teachers for cross-cultural teaching.

The intent is to provide teachers the understanding and psychological strength to promote both the teachers' and children's ability to understand and cope with an environment which can and will constantly change.

Rivilin summarizes and reflects the writings of others in the multicultural education conference:

Achievement of this grand plan calls forth from each of us the most penetrating scrutiny of ourselves as teachers and humans. We each view the other through perceptual screens that are as old as we are. We have learned all our lives about how it's 'supposed to be'. The thin veneer of four to six years of professional education is not enough to allow us to be other than we are.
We all have biases and prejudices which affect how we view the world and people in it. But if we would accept the role of teacher of children from diverse groups, we must accept responsibility of discovering and controlling those patterns in our behavior which would interfere with the learner's free and uninhibited access to knowledge and self-development. Teacher education has the responsibility to search out, evaluate and organize programs which will help teachers become competent in this dimension of human development, thereby giving teachers power over themselves and their behavior as they offer every child an equal education opportunity.

This statement emphasizes the importance of teachers' self-development and psychological health with regard to cross-cultural teaching.

Self Development and Cross-Cultural Teaching

Educators have been interested in the personal characteristics of teachers and their ability to function in various settings. Anthropologists have had a similar concern with personal characteristics and adaptability.

The Second Annual Report of the Research and Development Center at Stanford University, which is dedicated to the study of the problems of teaching, states:

Although the idea that men must adapt to social and physical change is widely accepted, some of its consequences have not been recognized or fully accepted. If the ability to adapt to complex life situations is as critical as it appears to be, it is important that a substantial portion of educational effort should be devoted to developing individuals who are adaptive, flexible and inventive. That our educational energies are not so devoted is abundantly clear. (1970)
John Gardner (1961) has provided a general goal for individual fulfillment and self development:

The chief instrument we have devised to further the idea of individual fulfillment is the educational system -- Education in the formal sense is only part of society's larger task of abetting the individual's intellectual, emotional and moral self-discovery, perpetual reshaping to realize one's best self, to be the person one could be. This is a conception which far exceeds formal education in scope. It includes not only the intellectual but the emotions, character and personality. It involves not only the surface, but deeper layers of thought and action. It involves adaptability, creativeness and vitality (p. 136).

Both John Gardner and the personnel at the Stanford Research and Development Center emphasizes the importance of personality characteristics in education. However, most of the research in this area has failed to provide unambiguous data on these relationships for a variety of reasons, including their correlational design, their focus on teacher characteristics instead of teacher behavior, their uses of measures that are not sensitive to the possible effects of teacher behaviors, and their inability to indicate what teachers should do in order to improve student achievement and behavior (Program on Teaching Effectiveness, 1973).

David Baral, et al. (1971) provided a taxonomy of teaching behaviors which included 1137 teacher behaviors classified into nineteen preliminary classifications. Personal characteristics was a category of seventy eight behaviors reflecting teachers' perception of self.
Hannum (1972) states that a personality construct long considered a significant determiner of a person's overt behavior is self-esteem. He suggests that if self-esteem is viewed as a class of covert behavior concerned with a person's self-evaluations, then these self-evaluations may be altered by utilizing behavior principles. Further, changes in internal behavior should presumably lead to identifiable changes in overt behavior. Rogers (1961) suggests that changes in self-esteem may function as important antecedents to external behavior change while Hobbs (1962) has argued that internal change, probably follows rather than proceeds overt change.

Combs (1969) has published a ten-year study that attempts to differentiate between effective and ineffective teachers. According to Combs the difference is not a lack of knowledge or pedagogy, but rather a question of self-concept. That is, the teacher who perceives himself and others in essentially positive ways is more likely to succeed in diverse settings than one who sees himself and others in negative ways.

Dwight W. Allen (1971) states that "personological skills" is an area of performance criteria that is undoubtedly the most demanding and quite possibly the most important for teaching:

Such amorphous traits as respect for students, spontaneity, empathetic understanding, realness, and acceptance are intended to be included under this heading. So, too, are the vague and unspecified goals of many currently used training procedures such as sensitivity groups, role-playing, and interaction analyses. The great difficulty here is that, as professional educators, we have strong intuitions that such traits are in no small way crucial to successful teaching. Yet, unfortunately, we have never taken the time to specify
what we mean carefully enough to formulate measurable criteria by which their presence or absence may be determined. Although the terms are notable by their ambiguity, it is clearly crucial that we begin to specify their meanings more precisely, for if we fail to do so, the probability is high that we will continue to leave the development of such highly relevant personological traits to pure chance. It seems to me a difficult but far from impossible task to make the characteristics of, say, a Rogerian facilitating teacher sufficiently operational to be of use in the development of performance criteria for the teacher's role. Once again, of course, we cannot be satisfied, even in the personological realm, with specifying one set of all-or-none criteria for use with all teachers in all situations. We are obligated to determine which operationally defined personological traits are most appropriate for which instructional situations. In this area perhaps more than the others we are faced with difficult problems in terms of priorities, sequencing the attainment of objectives, and stages of professional growth at which attainment of these goals seems most appropriate. The criteria, however, need to be developed if we wish to demonstrate that teacher training at pre- and inservice levels can have a real and powerful effect on improving and maintaining the professional competency of teachers (p. 128).

Boyd (1972) indicates that the settings in which teachers find themselves affect their behavior and personal growth. He clarifies that one way of viewing a teaching environment is to assess the opportunities for personal growth toward the positive mental health it provides the classroom teacher.

Severson (1972) states that many teachers are unsuccessful because they are captives of cultural forces which prevent them from benefiting from their classroom experiences, thus thwarting their self-expression and growth.
Dimitroff (1972) sites her studies in cross-cultural teaching important because of:

... the emphasis they place on a teacher's self concept which determines her general behavior by what she perceives herself to be and which is the foundation of a harmonious personality. A teacher's personality is of prime importance to success in the classroom (p. 220).

Robert Bush (1974) discusses a need for the ability of teachers to function successfully in various settings. As Director of the Stanford Research and Development Center in Teaching he is stressing the importance of programs to prepare teachers for cultural pluralism. Two programs at the Center are presently involved in cultural awareness for teachers. Recognition of the need Bush describes has stimulated a variety of inservice programs designed to bring awareness and further professional preparation for teachers in cross-cultural settings.

The continued training of experienced teachers has included the distribution of handbooks, involvement in human relations programs and leadership training institutes.

Trubowitz (1968) prepared a handbook aimed at helping the new teacher in a multi-cultural school. It exposes the problems facing teachers and presents detailed practical ways in which successful teachers have dealt with them. Their solutions, which can be as specific as organizing a neat bulletin board to help create a secure atmosphere, are presented in the context of what the children and parents consider necessities for good teaching. Those necessities for teachers emphasized throughout the book are: understanding the
the reasons behind behavioral deviations before treating them; con-
tinuous self-examination; building security; becoming a part of the com-
munity without a depreciating or sympathetic attitude; treating students
as individuals rather than as stereotypes; developing classroom learn-
ing experiences through knowledge and understanding of the students'
experiences, interests, feelings, strengths, and deficiencies; orient-
ing students in a structured way to their environment; and maintaining
positive expectations. There are two appendixes: a 60-item list of
books for children relating to Negro life and a 37-item book list for
teachers. A 72-item bibliography is included.

A similar guide was written by Henderson (1966). This guide
provides classroom teachers with an overview of the characteristics
of cultural and educational differences and indicates how these
characteristics influence the child's reaction to the entire school
setting. Suggestions are given for helping the teacher adjust to the
child and for helping the child adjust to the school. A bibliography
concludes the guide.

Human Relations programs also offered some insight to cross-
cultural teaching according to Barber (1967). Usually attempts are
made to modify teacher attitudes toward culturally different children
and to equip teachers with skills to do a better job of teaching.
One such program conducted by Barber (1967) included school principals
and surveyed building needs in terms of continued desegregation in
the schools.
A core group of teachers with previous experience working with Black children spent a semester developing recommendations for the whole staff to utilize. During the school year, discussion groups were formed on language arts, motivation and self-concept, classroom control, parent-community relationships. Also organizational meetings were held. During the summer 8 teachers learned interview techniques and met with parents of 52 Black children to develop a warm one-to-one relationship before school opened in the fall. A final 2-day workshop was held to introduce the program to new teachers. After a good start, only a minority of the teachers expressed views toward the project. They felt forced to attend meetings which they saw as insulting, since "any good teacher knew how to teach all children." Children's reactions, as expressed on tapes, revealed widespread misinformation and resentment, in spite of the fact that teachers did not indicate their feelings to the students. The new teacher orientation produced similar results. The summer program, for which teachers volunteered and were paid a stipend, was much more successful. The study concluded that real life experiences are more valuable than listening to talks and participating in small discussion groups.

Adams (1968) describes a summer training institute which was conducted to facilitate school and faculty desegregation in the Florida Public Schools. It was intended that the 47 Black and 33 White teachers who participated in the program would demonstrate a strengthened self-concept and increased teaching ability in interracial classrooms. It
was also hoped that the participants would gain an increased knowledge of their subject matter field. Small group seminars, supervised teaching in a desegregated summer school classroom, and two academic courses on the problems of teaching in a multicultural environment were the basic components of the program. It was generally felt that the participants underwent positive changes in racial attitudes and that their teaching methods and self-concept in a desegregated classroom were changed. Following the program, 74 of the 80 participants taught in desegregated schools.

Certainly knowledge of culturally different students and teachers is important. However, knowledge of self has been emphasized as important as well.

Anthropologists Bohanan (1973), Shinn (1972), Dimitroff (1972), and Spindler (1973) advocate that self-knowledge is the essence of field anthropology as well as teaching in cross-cultural settings. Bohanan, who conducts teacher seminars, claims that teachers who cannot cope in culturally different situations are going through cultural shock. Cultural shock is a result of having to face situations in which one does not know what he is expected to do next and, hence, any action taken may lead to misfortune or disaster. It is a kind of psychic deprivation and may be serious if a person cannot deal with it and yet cannot escape. Bohanan (1973) expresses that cultural conflict, as referred to by Shinn and Spindler, takes place when a teacher lacks self-knowledge and is confronted with another culture or sub-culture:
We discover not just the way we see the world, but we also discover some of our feelings about it -- about morality, about cleanliness and godliness, about money, and about ambition. We may thereupon become indignant, angry, frightened. The 'way out' of these feelings is, for the untrained, to blame the other guy, and belittle his culture and his values. This is one way - but a naive way - of saving your own value system, making it unnecessary for you to question your own assumptions and your own feelings (p. 183).

In observing the behavior of a person as described by Bohanan, it may be assumed that safety is very similar to security, however, in terms of emotional security, the teacher is not guaranteed safety of self. Inherent in the frustrations of a teacher in cultural conflict is Arthur Jersild's (1955) notions of "search for self." Jersild's basic thesis is that a person must understand himself before he can understand others. This idea is in agreement with Maslow's (1962) studies which revealed that self-knowledge seems to be the major path to self-improvement.

The Concept of Self Actualization and Characteristics of the Self-Actualized Individual

In recent years, theories of self-reference psychology have continued to assume a recognized place in the field of human psychology. Whether referred to as humanistic, existential, phenomenological or Gestalt psychology, research and writing have been extensive, producing a variety of interrelated theories and explanations of human behavior.

One of the most widely discussed theories of personality deals with the concept of self-actualization as developed by the late

Maslow (1943a, 1943b) refers to his research subjects as "self-actualizers". His studies led to the development of a theory of motivation and individual growth based on a hierarchy of needs. Self-actualization was at the top of the hierarchy. Other needs in the hierarchy include the need for esteem, the need for love, the need for safety and the fulfillment of physiological needs. Only when the lower needs were fulfilled, could the subjects function at a higher level.

Growth, as Maslow (1962) sees it, is the result of a never-ending series of situations offering a free choice between the attractions and dangers of safety and those of growth.

The concept of the individual who is in the process of becoming underlines the importance of continuing education. The person who sees this process is open to change and trusts his impulses and values as guides for behavior in new circumstances. Such persons are probably most likely to adapt and survive as the environment changes. Such persons will be able to create ways to meet new conditions.

These investigations by Maslow (1962) indentified the following distinguishable personality characteristics:

1. They are realistically oriented.

2. They accept themselves, other people, and the natural world for what they are.
3. They are spontaneous in thinking, emotions, and behaviors.

4. They are problem-centered rather than self-centered in the sense of being able to devote their attention to a task, duty, or mission that seemed peculiarly cut out for them.

5. They have a need for privacy and even seek it out on occasion needing it for periods of intense concentration on subjects of interest to them.

6. They are autonomous, independent, and able to remain true to themselves in the face of rejection or unpopularity.

7. They have a continuous freshness of appreciation and capacity to stand in awe again and again of the basic goods of life, a sunset, a flower, a baby, a melody, a person.

8. They have frequent "mystic" or "oceanic" experiences, although not necessarily religious in character.

9. They feel a sense of identification with mankind as a whole in the sense of being concerned not only with the lot of their own immediate families, but with the welfare of the world as a whole.

10. Their intimate relationships with a few specifically loved people tend to be profound and deeply emotional rather than superficial.
11. They have democratic character structures in the sense of judging people and being friendly not on the basis of race, status, religion, but rather on the basis of who other people are as individuals.

12. They have a highly developed sense of ethics and are inclined to choose their behavior with reference to its ethical implications.

13. They have unhostile senses of humor, which are expressed in their capacity to make common foibles, pretensions and foolishness of subject of laughter rather than sadism, smut, or hatred of authority.

14. They have a great fund of creativeness.

15. They resist total conformity to culture (Hamachek, 1971, p. 56-58).

Like Maslow, Rogers (1961) has tried to identify what he terms the "fully functional person";

1. He tends to move away from facades; from a self that he is not to a self that he is.

2. He tends to move away from self-imposed images of what he ought to be.

3. He tends to move away from what the culture expects him to be.

4. He tends to move away from pleasing others and begins to be more self-directing.

5. He tends to be more autonomous and more responsible for himself.
6. He tends to be more accepting of his own inner state and is not disturbed to find out that his feelings toward a given experience or person fluctuate.

7. He tends to be desirous of experiencing his own complexity of being.

8. He tends to be able to live in an open, friendly, close relationship to his own experience.

9. He tends to be more accepting of others.

10. He tends to be more trusting of his own self.

Rogers (1961) views regarding the "fully functional person" were proposed basically as a result of his experiences as a psychotherapist. He described the "fully functional person" as one who was able to maximize his potentialities; one who made self-heightening choices; one who was a creative person whose behavior patterns were not easily predictable, but who was dependable; one who was able to trust his own organism.

Shostrom (1967) described a self-actualizing person as a person who appreciated himself and his fellow man as persons or subjects with unique potential...an expresser of his actual self. He stated that: "The actualizer's philosophy of life was marked by four characteristics: honesty, awareness, freedom and trust." (pp. 23-24) Shostrom described the four fundamental characteristics of the self-actualizing person as follows:

1. Honesty (transparency, genuineness, authenticity)

   The actualizer is able honestly to be his feelings,
whatever they may be. He is characterized by candidness, expression, and genuinely being himself.

2. Awareness (responsiveness, aliveness, interest)
The actualizer fully looks and listens to himself and others. He is fully aware of nature, art, music, and the other dimensions of living.

3. Freedom (spontaneity, openness)
The actualizer is spontaneous. He has the freedom to be and express his potentials. He is master of his life, a subject and not a puppet or object.

4. Trust (faith, belief)
The actualizer has a deep trust in himself and others to relate to and cope with life in the here and now.

(pp. 23-24)

Hamachek (1971) appeared to be in agreement with Maslow, Rogers and Shostrom when he suggested that human behavior was primarily a result of internal phenomena rather than external phenomena. He stated:

Most of our personal and interpersonal problems arise not from disagreements about reality, but from distortions and misperceptions of reality. In order to be as accurate as possible in our perceptions, we must develop as much insight as we can into ourselves as individuals and the ways in which our needs, values and beliefs influence how we perceive the world in which we live.

The need for knowing one's self is basic and universal in human experience . . . The need which has been variously labeled "self-acceptance," "self-love," "self-understanding," and the like is neither innate nor
indistinct in function and origin. It is basically a need for an image of one's self that is accurate enough to be workable and acceptable so a person can enjoy experiencing and expressing it. (p. 58)

Inservice Programs Using the Personal Orientation Inventory as a Measure of Teacher Self-Actualization

This section will review the literature of those who have separated experienced teachers in inservice into self-actualizing and non-self-actualizing groups through utilization of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

Dandes (1966) utilized four instruments to investigate the attitudes and value dimensions of 128 teachers in central New York State. The instruments were the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory for the measurement of permissiveness or warmth or student-centeredness; the California F-scale, Form 40 and 45, for the measurement of authoritarianism; and the Dogmatism Scale, Form E, for the measurement of openness-closedness of belief systems. He then correlated the results of the four instruments with scores from the Personal Orientation Inventory.

Dandes results indicated that the more psychologically healthy a teacher was, the more apt he was to hold values and attitudes that were associated with:

1. Permissiveness, warmth and student-centeredness.
2. Liberalistic education.
3. An absence of authoritarianism.
4. Openness of belief systems.
From his findings, Dandes suggested that teacher educators modify the college curriculum to include experiences such as group counseling and T-groups. Such innovations would aid the potential teacher to grow and develop psychologically, which would then enable them to encourage this growth in their students.

Flanders (1969), reported significant correlations between the POI and the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (MTAI) in a sample of 129 elementary and secondary teachers. The correlations were all positive ranging in magnitude from .12 to .47 against the Time Incompetence Scale of the POI. The teachers were involved in a T-group experience conducted over the course of a year. The POI was administered at the beginning of the program, during the middle of the program, and again at the end. Significant changes in the direction of self-actualization were observed between the first and third administration for 8 of the 12 POI scales.

In contrasting teachers who aspire to be administrators with career teachers, Mace (1970) found the former to be more self-actualized as reflected in higher Inner-Directed scale scores.

Banmen and Capelle (1971) assumed that two few principals, teachers and counselors possess the necessary personal characteristics which facilitate the growth or self-actualization of students. They investigated whether these qualities could be developed, using a model of human relations training. Four hypotheses were formulated: (1) teacher self-actualization, as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory, will be higher after human relations training; (2) attitudes toward the educational process, as measured by the
Educational Process Opinionnaire, will change; (3) human relations training will increase the value, to the participants, of inclusion and affection, and decrease the value of control; and (4) participants' post-training overt behavior will be more consistent with the behavior they desire from others. Hypotheses I and II were supported, i.e., there were significant changes in the direction predicted. Hypotheses III and IV received partial support. It was concluded that human relations training can be of value in assisting educational personnel development of personal characteristics which enhance their functioning.

Summary

This Chapter reviewed the literature related to the historical antecedents to cultural awareness in education, self development and cross-cultural teaching, the concept of self-actualization and characteristics of the self-actualized individual, and inservice programs using the Personal Orientation Inventory as a measure of teacher self-actualization.

American educators have been slow to recognize that schools have culturally diverse groups of adults and children whose future is transitional from a melting pot to a multicultural educational system (Sullivan 1974, Hilliard 1974 and Rivilin 1974).

Educators Gardner, Combs, Allen, Dimitroff, and Bush suggest a need to pursue and identify a conception of perpetual self-discovery, perpetual reshaping to realize one's best self and apply these conceptions to teacher preparation. Personality characteristics of
the teacher are of concern to these educators, however, Swenson, Dimitroff, Bush, Bohanan, Shinn, and Spindler add the dimension of culture. These writers emphasize the need to be aware of cultural implications as related to the stability and success of a teacher in cross cultural settings. Cultural shock may be experienced by teachers.

Trubowitz, Henderson, Barber, and Adams have attempted in-service programs for cultural awareness with various levels of success. Adams specifically had success with teacher self concept improvement and ability in interracial classrooms.

Literature related to self-actualization revealed that self-actualizing people were those who listened to their own voices, who were involved fully and vividly in experiencing, and who took the responsibility for their own actions. Maslow sees self-development in terms of a never-ending series of situations offering a free choice between the attractions and dangers of safety and those of growth.

Research involving the Personal Orientation Inventory as a measure of teacher self-actualization is rather limited and relatively non-existent in the area of cross-cultural teaching. Sandes, Flanders, Banmen and Capelle have written about teacher training programs using group counseling, T-groups, and other techniques of human relations training in conjunction with the Personal Orientation Inventory as an instrument of measurement. It was concluded the human relations training can be of value in assisting teachers' development of personal characteristics which enhance their success in teaching.
CHAPTER III

THE DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This study was designed to test hypotheses related to: (1) whether experienced teachers participating in a Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness moved toward self-actualization more than experienced teachers who did not participate in the Institute; (2) whether changes occur in self-actualization with experienced teachers from different high schools during participation in a cultural awareness institute.

This chapter deals with seven topics related to the design of the investigation: (1) Population and Sample; (2) Experimental Design; (3) Measuring Instrument; (4) The Treatment; (5) Collection of the Data; (6) The Hypotheses; (7) Treatment of the Data.

Population and Sample

The population consisted of approximately 450 teachers employed by Public School District #1 in Portland, Oregon. Specifically, the population included the faculty members of the School District's Area II high schools: Marshall, Madison, Monroe, Adams and Benson.

The Area II high schools are five of fourteen high schools within the Portland schools. The teaching faculties of the Area II high schools represents approximately 30 percent of the total number of high school teachers in the Portland secondary schools. There were approximately 1,025 teaching faculty in the Portland secondary schools.
during the 1973-74 school year.

Sample. The original sample consisted of 90 experienced teachers. Twenty-six of the original sample were not included in the final sample because of failure to complete the Institute or complete the pre-post administrations of the Measuring Instrument. The adjusted sample, therefore, became 64 experienced teachers from Marshall, Madison, Monroe and Benson High Schools.

Experimental Design

The design of this study is based on the control group design presented by Campbell and Stanley (1963). They describe the design as one of the most widespread experimental designs in educational research. It is primarily used for school based research.

The following diagram illustrates the pre-test and post-test design for the study with (0) representing pre-test and post-test and (X) representing treatment of the experimentals.
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As the design is applied in this investigation, the treatment procedure is administered in the same environment as shown in Appendix A. The treatment was teacher participation in the Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness between the pre-test and post-test administrations of the Personal Orientation Inventory. Descriptive data is intended to support the statistical data used in the design.

This particular experimental design often provides unwanted gratuitous information. The design primarily provides valuable
information about the nature of a particular group but caution must be used generalizing the results to other groups. Also any effects could be due to differences between groups, not the treatment however, examination of group effect should reduce this problem.

The Experimentals - Group I

There were 32 experimentals (treatment) subjects, 15 males and 17 females, who volunteered to participate in the Institute and the study. All had been employed by the Portland Public Schools for more than one year. The mean teaching experience was 11.3 years.

The Controls - Group II

There were 32 control (non-treatment) subjects, 15 males and 17 females, who volunteered to participate in the study. All had been employed by the Portland Public Schools for more than one year. The mean teaching experience for the control group was 15.6 years. The control group received no treatment between the administration of the pre-test and post-test of the Personal Orientation Inventory. However, control group members were provided a copy of the institute goals during the administration of the POI post-test. Each control group member was requested to read the Institute goals and respond to an invitation to participate in a similar institute with the same goals the following summer. It is realized that because the control group members did not have access to the identical treatment the results may be influenced.

Further delineation of Group I and Group II is presented in Table 1.
TABLE 1. Composition of Control and Experimental Groups by School, Sex and Teaching Experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>Mean Teaching Experience in Years</th>
<th>Mean Age in Years</th>
<th>MALE</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>Mean Teaching Experience in Years</th>
<th>Mean Age in Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - (Marshall)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>32.15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>36.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B - (Madison)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>49.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>46.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C - (Monroe)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>47.00</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>58.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D - (Benson)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>34.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>49.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>40.06</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>43.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Instrument

The predictive variable used in this study was the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). The instrument was developed in 1965 by Everett Shostrom and is designed to provide a comprehensive measurement of values and behavior seen to be of importance in the development of self-actualization.

The 150 two-choice value and behavior items comprising the inventory were empirically chosen from significant value judgment problems as seen by therapists at the Institute of Therapeutic Psychology in Santa Ana, California. A copy of the inventory is found in Appendix B. The inventory is scored for 10 subscales plus 2 ratio scores. The mean standard score for each scale is 50, with a standard deviation of 10. Theoretically, 95 percent of the population will fall between standard scores of 30 and 70 on any given scale.

The inventory is self-administering and the items are scored twice, first for the two basic scales of personal orientation, inner-directed and time competent; and second, for ten subscales each of which measures a conceptually important element of self-actualization.

When examining the scales on the POI, it is important to keep in mind what each scale is designed to measure in relation to self-actualization behavior. The following is a brief summary of the interpretation of high or low scores on the various scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory as interpreted by Shostrom (1968).
Time competency and inner-directedness: If these scores or most of this scale's scores fall above the mean standard score line based on the normal adult sample, the probability is that the person is one who is functioning relatively effectively and is comparatively competent in his development toward self-actualization.

Time incompetent and other-directed: The time incompetent person is one who lives in the past, with guilts, regrets, and resentment, and/or in the future with idealized goals, plans, expectations, predictions, and fears. The degree of inner-other directed is expressed in a ratio score. The I-O ratio of a self-actualizing person, on the average, is 1:3, which indicates that he depends primarily on his own feelings. A significantly higher ratio, i.e., 1:4 or above may indicate the need to appear "too self-actualized."

Self-actualizing value: A high score indicates that the individual holds and lives by the values of self-actualizing people, and a low score indicates he rejects these values.

Existentiality: Higher scores reflect flexibility in application of values. People who get low scores tend to hold values so rigidly that they may become compulsive or dogmatic.

Feeling reactivity: A high score indicates sensitivity to one's own needs and feelings. A low score indicates insensitivity to one's own needs and feelings.

Spontaneity: A high score indicates the ability to express feelings in spontaneous action. A low score indicates that one is fearful of expressing feelings behaviorally.
Self-regard: A high score indicates the ability to like one's-self because of one's strength as a person. A low score indicates a low self worth.

Self-acceptance: A high score indicates accepting of self in spite of weaknesses. A low score indicates unable to accept self with weaknesses.

Nature of man: A high score indicates that one sees man as essentially good. A low score indicates that one sees man as essentially evil or bad.

Synergy: A high score is a measure of the ability to see opposites of life as meaningfully related. A low score indicates that one sees opposites of life as antagonistic. When one is synergistic, one sees that work and play are not different; that lust and love and other opposites are not really opposites at all.

Acceptance of aggression: A high score indicates the ability to accept anger or aggression within one's self as natural. A low score indicates that one denies having such feelings.

Capacity for intimate contact: A high score indicates the person's ability to develop meaningful, and tactful relationships with other human beings. Low scores indicate a difficulty with warm inner-personal relationships. Making contact may be defined in the here and now, and the ability to meaningfully touch another human being.
Reliability

Klavetter and Moger (1967) administered the Personal Orientation Inventory twice with a one-week interval to a sample of 48 college students. The purpose was to examine the reliability of the Personal Orientation Inventory. All correlations ranged from .52 to .82. The Personal Orientation Inventory scales of Time Competence and Inner-Direction had reliability coefficients of .71 and .77 respectively. The researchers concluded that, with the exception of three subscales, A (.55), Nc (.66), and Fr (.69), the stability coefficients were generally high. Bloxom (1972) reported correlation ranging from .55 to .85. He concluded similarly that with the exception of the same three subscales A (.55), Nc (.66), and Fr (.69), the stability coefficients were generally high.

Illardi and May (1968) examined the stability of Personal Orientation Inventory scores over a one-year period. They tested 46 student nurses and reported nearly identical reliability correlations of the various subscales of the Personal Orientation Inventory with reliability studies of the Edward's Personal Preference Scale. They reported coefficients ranging from .32 to .74.

Validity

Shostrom's study of 1964 was an attempt to demonstrate the validity and effectiveness of the Personal Orientation Inventory as a discriminating instrument. He tested two groups, one judged to be relatively self-actualized and one judged to be relatively non-self-actualized. The subjects in each group were nominated
by practicing clinical psychologists. Results of the analysis indicated that the means for the self-actualized group were above those of the normal adult group means of 11 of 12 scales and means for the non-self-actualized group were below the normal means on all scales. This study was representative of construct validity studies. The critical ratios were significant at the .01 level of significance on the two basic scales and one eighth of the subscales at the .05 level of significance on another subscale. It was concluded that the inventory significantly discriminated between the clinically judged self-actualized and non-self-actualized groups on 11 of the 12 scales.

Shostrom and Knapp (1966) in a study of content validity, found that all Personal Orientation Inventory scales significantly differentiated a sample of out-patients beginning therapy from those in advanced states of the therapeutic process. The Personal Orientation Inventory scales were negatively correlated with the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) scales for the male and female out-patient samples. Correlations ranged from .00 to .-67, the latter being in the male sample between the Personal Orientation Inventory Spontaneity Scale and the MMPI Social I.E. Scale (Si). The highest average correlation for both sexes was with the major Personal Orientation Inventory scale, Inner-Directed. The investigators concluded that the high negative correlation with the MMPI Social I.E. Scale supported the contention that the Personal Orientation Inventory was sampling areas of psychological well being.
Dandes (1966) empirically investigated the relationship between those constructs of psychological health measured by the POI and value measures such as the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory (Cook, Leeds, and Callis, 1953) previously demonstrated to be related to teaching effectiveness. Positive correlations were obtained between POI scales and teacher permissiveness and liberalism of educational viewpoints as predicted. Correlations between the POI scales and the MTAI were all positive ranging from .15 to .40. Negative correlations were obtained between POI scales and measures of authoritarianism and dogmatism employed.

Relation to the study

An area in which the concepts of humanistic psychology, particularly those concerning the development of the self-actualized individual, might seem particularly relevant is that involving teaching effectiveness. Although this study was not directly concerned with teaching effectiveness and the fact that the POI does not predict teacher effectiveness, implications can still be stated. Dandes (1966) concluded that his results clearly indicated a significant relationship between measured psychological health and important teacher attitudes and values; as predicted, the greater the psychological health, the greater the possession of attitudes and values characteristic of effective teaching.

With the above findings considered this study was concerned with the effects of a cultural awareness institute upon the self-actualization as measured by the POI and goal attainment of institute participants.
While it is possible to obtain profile scores on the entire inventory, for the purposes of hypotheses testing in this study, the I (Inner-Directed) Scale was utilized to indicate the level of self-actualization. The I scale contains 127 of the 150 items of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

The Treatment

The Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness described in this study combined a summer school of some 150 high school students and a training Institute for 40 high school teachers. The summer school and teacher training component took place simultaneously over a four week period.

The Summer School

The summer school occurred over a four week period with three hours of classroom instruction each morning. Students received instruction in four basic areas:

1. Computation: Basic Mathematics
2. Communications: Reading
3. Communications: Writing
4. Electives: Orientation or Special Projects.

Student participants were from diverse cultural and socio-economic backgrounds.

Experienced teachers who volunteered for the Institute were teamed with a cadre of team leaders. The cadre had extensive experience in cross-cultural teaching while all of the volunteer teachers had little or no experience in cross-cultural teaching. Each teacher
functioned as a member of an instructional team. Instructional teams were assigned by the Institute director in a random manner so that any one team did not have all members of the same "home school" faculty.

Time was scheduled on a daily basis for team planning as well as analyzing instruction.

The Teacher Institute

In addition to planning time for instruction, much of the afternoon activities related to teacher training. Seminar and discussion groups about human relations, cultural diversity and techniques for effective cross-cultural classroom instruction were scheduled regularly. A description of the Institute is continued in Appendix A.

The general purposes of the Institute were:

1. To sensitize teachers and other professional staff members in multi-cultural schools to the unique problems of culturally different students.

2. To give Institute participants an increased, individual self-awareness of personal values as these relate to minority group and disadvantaged students to the end that greater objectivity toward understanding and acceptance of such students 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 resume work in their respective professional positions, will 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.

The general purposes of the Institute were achieved through the accomplishment of the following specific objectives, stated in terms of expected behavioral and conceptual changes:

1. Understanding that language is a key to comprehending cultural diversity and cross-cultural communication.

2. 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.

3. 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.

4. Understanding the fallacy of the notion that the I.Q. is a kind of ironclad determinant of a student's future.

5. An understanding of the characteristics of the community and the nature, causes, and effects of culturally different students.

6. Insights into typical behavior patterns and attitudes of disadvantaged children and adults and ability to
empathize with them.

7. Understanding the differences between the value systems of dominant cultures and subcultures and the implications of both in the classroom.

8. Knowledge of and ability to apply and develop instructional techniques appropriate to the needs of disadvantaged children in the fields of mathematics, science, social studies and art.

9. Skill in analyzing problems of teaching and learning in schools enrolling culturally diverse children, and skill in preparing original teaching materials and adapting existing materials to the needs of these children.

In order to recognize the importance of self-growth and include the Institute appraisal process as part of the treatment, the assessment plan for the teacher institute emphasized self-appraisal. The procedures included the setting of personal goals to be achieved, describing critical and important events, completing a standardized inventory and participation in self-observation. Areas of appraisal are outlined below:

1. **Goals Identification.** Participants identified in writing, personal goals to be achieved during the Institute. These goals served as self-assessment criteria for use at the end of the Institute.

2. **Critical Incident.** Participants were asked weekly to respond to four statements related to important perceptions.
A. Describe the best thing(s) that have happened to you today (this week).

B. Describe the worst thing(s) that have happened to you today (this week).

C. Describe how your needs can be better met.

D. Describe what you have learned today (this week) that you are able to incorporate in your teaching.

This information was used through a feed-back decision-making system, to adjust the direction of the Institute as well as to improve the effectiveness of the Institute activities. Data collecting sheets are located in Appendix F.

3. Systematic Self-Observation (SSO). A presentation explaining the systematic self-observation procedures was given during the Institute pre-sessions. This unique system of self-appraisal was used by the teaching teams on a voluntary basis.

4. Standardized Criteria. The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was given Institute participants during the presessions and again at the end of the Institute.

Collection of the Data

The Summer Institute Planning Committee contained members from the Area II high schools. General announcements and discussions at faculty meetings in all the Area II high schools revealed the purposes of the Institute and that a researcher would be involved in the evaluation. Volunteers were solicited. The Institute Planning Committee compiled
a list of 90 volunteers. Forty-five subjects were randomly assigned to participate in the Institute. The remaining 45 were designated as the control group. Identical letters of introduction and the POI were mailed to the 90 volunteers. Copies of these letters are found in Appendix C.

The 90 subjects were requested to complete the POI, place the booklet and answer sheet back into the envelope and return the envelope to the head secretary in their school. The pre-test was administered prior to the beginning of the Summer Institute.

The post-test was administered in the same manner; however, the subject was asked to mail the completed POI to the researcher in the provided self-addressed envelope.

The post-test was mailed to the subjects five weeks after the pre-test and four days after the end of the Summer Institute.

The pre- and post-test completed answer sheets were returned within five days after being sent. Ten of the subjects had to be reminded by telephone that the answer sheets were to be returned within a given time.

Treatment of the Data

The completed Personal Orientation Inventory answer sheets were given ID numbers and sent for scoring to the Educational and Industrial Testing Service in San Diego, California. The results were returned in the form of a listing of POI and ID numbers for each individual and a summary table showing the sums of scores, sums of squared scores,
mean and variance for each POI scale. Summary tables are found in Appendix E. Also a plotted profile for each individual was returned.

Although this preliminary data was received from the Scoring Service, further statistical analysis was used to examine the following hypothesis:

\[ H_1 \text{ There will be a significant school effect.} \]
\[ H_2 \text{ There will be a significant group effect.} \]
\[ H_3 \text{ There will be a significant interaction effect between school and group.} \]

The research design provided for only minimum pre-experimental equivalence and randomization procedures. Therefore, the two-way Fixed Analysis of Covariance design utilizing the F test was used to adjust the treatment means of the dependent variable for differences in the independent variable. For this study, the pre-test score was considered as the covariant (independent) factor and the post-test score was the dependent variable. If the computed F value generated by the analysis of covariance was greater than the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance the hypothesis was retained. If the computed F value was less than the tabular F value, the hypothesis was rejected.

**Summary**

This study was designed to investigate the difference in self-actualization between experienced teachers participating in an Institute for Cultural Awareness and experienced teachers not participating in the Institute. The subjects were experienced teachers in four
Portland, Oregon high schools.

The design of the study was based on the control group design presented by Campbell and Stanley (1963). The Personal Orientation Inventory developed by Shostrom was used to determine level and change in self-actualization.

A description of the Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness, the collection of the data, and treatment of the data were discussed. Furthermore, the statistical hypotheses were stated.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

This chapter concerns the four areas related to the findings of the study; (1) the purposes of the study, (2) statement of the hypotheses tested, (3) statistical analysis used for each hypotheses and the findings of each, and (4) the analysis of the descriptive data.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this investigation was two fold: (1) to determine the effects of a Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness upon the self-actualization of experienced teachers from four separate high schools, and (2) to determine the success of a Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness in terms of good achievement.

Statistical Hypotheses

\[ H_1 \] There will be a significant school effect.

\[ H_2 \] There will be a significant group effect.

\[ H_3 \] There will be a significant interaction effect between school and group.
Statistical Analysis and Findings

The pre-administration of the Personal Orientation Inventory for all participants was completed several days prior to the first day of the Institute. The post-administration of the Personal Orientation Inventory was completed, along with the Institute Goal Rating Scale, several days following the last day of the Institute. Although 90 persons were originally selected for the study 64 actually completed the entire study. Those participating in the study represented four high schools. School and group members are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2. School and Group Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>School - Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exp.</td>
<td>N = 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>N = 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Personal Orientation Inventory answer sheets were machine scored by the Educational and Industrial Testing Service in San Diego, California. The I (Inner-Directed) scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory was utilized as the measure of self-actualization for statistical testing of the first three hypotheses. The .05 level of significance was selected as the acceptance level of statistical significance. Mean data and standard deviation for all scales of the
Personal Orientation Inventory are reported in Tables 3 and 4.

To assist in clarification, the Personal Orientation Inventory scales are restated and defined below and sample profile sheets are available in Appendix D.

I. Ratio Scores

Time Competence (Tc): The idea of whether or not the person is oriented to living in the present and not predominately in the past or future.

Inner-Directedness (I): Concerns whether reactivity orientation is basically toward others or towards self.

II. Sub-Scales

Self-Actualizing Value (SAV): The affirmation of a primary value known to be present in self-actualizing people.

Existentiality (EX): The ability to situationally react with a rigid adherence to principles.

Feeling Reactivity (FR): The sensitivity of responsiveness to a person's own needs and feelings.

Spontaneity (S): The freedom to react spontaneously, or to be oneself.

Self-Regard (SR): The affirmation of self because of worth or strength.

Self-Acceptance (SA): The affirmation of self in spite of weaknesses or deficiencies.

Nature of Man (NC): The degree of the constructive view of the nature of man, masculinity, femininity.

Synergy (SY): The ability to transcend dichotomies.

Acceptance of Aggression (A): The ability to accept a person's natural aggressiveness as opposed to defensiveness, denial and repression of aggression.

Capacity for Intimate Contact (C): The ability to develop intimate relationships with other human beings, unencumbered by expectations and obligations.
TABLE 3. A Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Mean and Standard Deviations for the 14 Scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory for Experimental Group and Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean</th>
<th>Pre-Test Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Post-Test Mean</th>
<th>Post-Test Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean</th>
<th>Pre-Test Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Post-Test Mean</th>
<th>Post-Test Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>5.154</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.889</td>
<td>1.745</td>
<td>4.056</td>
<td>1.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tc</td>
<td>17.846</td>
<td>1.951</td>
<td>19.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>19.111</td>
<td>1.745</td>
<td>18.944</td>
<td>1.984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>35.538</td>
<td>8.161</td>
<td>33.615</td>
<td>12.258</td>
<td>34.500</td>
<td>8.452</td>
<td>36.611</td>
<td>11.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>91.308</td>
<td>8.230</td>
<td>93.077</td>
<td>12.386</td>
<td>92.500</td>
<td>8.452</td>
<td>90.389</td>
<td>11.325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>17.000</td>
<td>2.145</td>
<td>16.308</td>
<td>3.225</td>
<td>16.167</td>
<td>2.618</td>
<td>15.444</td>
<td>3.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nc</td>
<td>7.538</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>7.615</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>7.889</td>
<td>0.900</td>
<td>7.889</td>
<td>1.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy</td>
<td>18.077</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>17.231</td>
<td>3.140</td>
<td>18.000</td>
<td>1.970</td>
<td>17.611</td>
<td>3.202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experimental Group School - Others (B,C,D)
TABLE 4. A Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Means and Standard Deviations for the 14 Scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory for Control Group and Schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Control Group School-A</th>
<th>Control Group School-Others (B,C,D)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Test Mean</td>
<td>Pre-Test Standard Deviation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ti</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>1.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>34.812</td>
<td>8.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>8.295</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>21.500</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex</td>
<td>22.062</td>
<td>4.654</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fr</td>
<td>17.562</td>
<td>2.502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>13.875</td>
<td>2.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sy</td>
<td>7.375</td>
<td>1.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18.062</td>
<td>2.816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5. Analysis of Covariance in a 2-Way Classification Design with Pre-Tests Serving as Covariant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools (A/others)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52.696</td>
<td>52.696</td>
<td>1.174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups (Exp./cont.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>112.664</td>
<td>112.664</td>
<td>2.510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction (Schools/groups)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57.765</td>
<td>57.765</td>
<td>1.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2558.515</td>
<td>44.886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within groups regression coefficient pretest on post-test = 1.064.

The computed F value generated by the analysis of covariance and the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance are compared in Table 6.

TABLE 6. Decision to retain or reject

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Computed F</th>
<th>Tabular F ( a = .05 )</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df</td>
<td>F =</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>3,55</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.510</td>
<td>1,55</td>
<td>4.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.287</td>
<td>3,55</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The analysis of covariance in a 2 way classification design was used and utilized the F test. The analysis of covariance made use of both analysis of variance and of regression. For this study, the pre-test score was considered as the covariant (independent) factor and the post-test was the dependent variable. If the computed F value generated by the analysis of covariance was found to be greater than the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance, the hypothesis was retained. If the computed F value was found to be less than the tabular F value, the hypothesis was rejected. The analysis of covariance results are shown in Table 5, and Table 6 provides decision data.

Hypothesis One

$H_1$ There will be a significant school effect.

The computed F value was 1.174 and the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance was 2.78. Since the computed F value was smaller than the tabular F value, $H_1$ was rejected. Because the hypothesis was rejected it can be assumed that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of school-A and school-others. See Table 7. Thus, it can be assumed that no significant changes in self-actualizing occurred among the members of the schools.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 7. Table of Mean Scores for Schools.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Others</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although the F test did not support $H_1$, there were trends noted in Table 7 and Graph 1.

The graphed mean scores indicate an increase between mean-pre scores and mean-post scores for School-A while there is a decrease between these scores for the other schools. The mean-post scores between School-A and school-others are further apart than the mean-pre scores are from each other.

**Hypothesis Two**

$H_2$ There will be a significant group effect.

The computed $F$ value was 2.510 and the tabular $F$ value at the .05 level of significance was 4.02. Since the computed $F$ value was smaller than the tabular $F$ value, $H_2$ was rejected. Because the hypothesis was rejected, it can be assumed that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental and control groups. There was an indication that no significant changes in self-actualizing occurred in either the experimental or control groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 8. Table of Mean Scores for Groups.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experimental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the F test did not support $H_2$, trends are noted in Table 8 and Graph 2.
GRAPH 1. Graph of Mean Scores for Schools.
GRAPH 2. Graph of Mean Scores for Groups

Experimental

Control

mean-pre

mean-post
The graphed mean scores indicate an increase between the mean-pre scores and mean-post scores for the control group while there was a decrease between these scores for the experimental group. The mean-post scores between the experimental group and control group were nearer than the mean-pre scores were between the groups.

Hypothesis Three

H₃ There will be a significant interaction effect between school and group.

The computed F value was 1.287 and the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance was 2.78. Since the computed F value was smaller than the tabular F value, H₃ was rejected. Because the hypothesis was rejected, it can be assumed that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the schools and groups. See Table 9.

TABLE 9. Table of Mean Scores for Interaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Between</th>
<th>Observations</th>
<th>Mean-pre</th>
<th>Mean-post</th>
<th>Adjusted Mean-post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School-A Control</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>92.000</td>
<td>94.250</td>
<td>93.573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Other Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.467</td>
<td>85.267</td>
<td>84.590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-A Experimental</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>91.308</td>
<td>93.077</td>
<td>93.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-Other Experimental</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>92.500</td>
<td>90.389</td>
<td>91.066</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the F test did not support H₃ trends are noted in Table 9 and Graph 3.
GRAPH 3. Graph of Mean Scores for Interaction
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The graphed mean scores indicate an increase from mean-pre scores to mean-post scores in all areas but school-other experimental. School-other experimental shows a decrease from mean-pre scores to mean-post scores. This decrease is also noted on the graph of mean scores for groups (Graph 2) and on the graph of mean scores for schools (Graph 1).

Although it was assumed that the lack of significant mean score differences indicated no effect upon schools, groups or interaction, the above trends seem to indicate that there may have been some positive effects in areas other than the experimental groups from other schools. The experimental groups from other schools indicate a negative trend on Graph 3.

Further interaction trends are noted when observation is made of the profiles reflecting the mean data for all scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory as reported in Tables 3 and 4. Profiles are found in Appendix D.

The profiles reveal that experimental groups school-A, experimental group school-other and control group school-A are patterned as self-actualized on both the pre- and post-test profiles. The control group school profile indicates a pattern of non-self-actualized on both the pre- and post-test profiles.

Although the I (Inner-Directed) Scale was used in this study to indicate the level of self-actualization it is interesting to see the rather consistent patterns throughout all the scales when comparing any given group. The experimental group profile is consistently above the normal adult profile. The control group school-A is also
above the normal adult profile but does not hold the consistent pattern of the experimental group. The control group school-other has a similar pattern to the control group school-A; however, the pattern primarily drops below the normal adult profile, thus indicating non-self-actualization. The experimental group school-A profile reveals little variation between pre- and post-test administrations. The post-test subscale scores distribute themselves across the pre-test subscale scores revealing closely overlapping profiles. Both profiles are above the normal mean. The I-scale indicates a slight move toward further self-actualization but does not approach pseudo-self-actualization.

The experimental group school-other profile reveals a tendency to move away from self-actualization toward the normal mean. The post-test profile is consistently below the pre-test profile. The I-scale also indicates a slight move away from self-actualization toward the normal mean. However, the I-scale reveals this group to be within the self-actualized range yet below both experimental and control group school-A I-scale scores.

The control group school-A profile is similar to the experimental group school-A profile in that the post-test subscale scores are distributed across the pre-test subscale scores revealing overlapping profiles, however, most of the post-test scores are above the pre-test scores. The I-scale indicates a slight move toward further self-actualization but does not approach pseudo-self-actualization.
The control group school-other profile reveals that the post-test profile has a tendency to move toward the normal profile from a pre-test profile of non-self-actualization.

The I-scale indicates the same tendency as the subscales. The pre-test I-scale score reveals non-self-actualizing and the post-test indicates the normal mean score, but does not approach self-actualizing.

The Descriptive Data

The general emphasis was upon self-assessment and assessment of the Institute by the participants. Information was obtained from the participants as a group. All participants were asked to respond to a variety of information gathering procedures. These procedures included judging and describing the usefulness of critical and important events, setting and evaluating the personal goals to be achieved, participating in self-observation, rating institute goals, and designing action plans.

Specifically, the assessment dealt with the following questions:

1. How useful will be the information and activities of guest lecturers as judged by the participants?

2. How will the participants react to what was happening to them in terms of best and worst and needs fulfillment?
3. Will the participants avail themselves of and grow from the Systematic Self-Observation (SSO) process?

4. Will action plans be prepared by the home teams?

5. Will participants identify personal goals and assess their personal achievement in terms of those goals?

6. How well will the Institute goals be achieved as perceived by the participants?

**Procedures Used in the Assessment**

The original sample consisted of 90 volunteer experienced teachers. Of these 26 of the original sample were not included in the final sample because of failure to complete the Institute or complete the pre-post administration of the Personal Orientation Inventory. The control-experimental group design was only used to measure the effects of the Institute upon the self-actualization of the participants. The rest of the data gathering instruments were administered only to the Institute participants. Of the original Institute group, 32 completed the entire five week experience. (See Table 1 for the group composition.)

Instruments to assess lecturer or event usefulness were administered at the end of each week. At the same time participants were asked to respond to four statements related to important perceptions. See forms in Appendix F.

At the end of the last two weeks of the Institute an "analyzing instructional team effectiveness" inventory was given the participants.
Also during the final week participants were asked to assess the achievement of their personal goals (which were identified earlier during the Institute) and the Institute goals. Sample goals are found in Appendix G.

Critical Incident

The participants were asked to judge the usefulness of specific activities. The charts in Appendix F indicate the responses on a "not useful" to "very useful" scale. Generally the functioning of the instructional and home teams were most useful. Most lectures and activities by consultants were judged useful; however, the consultants from Tacoma, Washington, activities of Dr. Marie Fielder and the film "Five on the Black Hand Side" were judged to be of most use to the participants.

Instructional Team Effectiveness

Of the eight areas enumerated, the area of high trust indicated a steady rise. In the fourth week 92 percent of the team members indicated a 3 and/or 4 trust level. However, the handling conflicts within the team showed little improvement after the first week. The overall trend indicates a steady improvement in areas of trust, degree of mutual support, and communications. The area of team objectives reveals that perhaps the objectives were never really clarified and understood by more than 50 percent of the teams at any given time. It appeared that there was a trend away from commitment to team objectives. Instructional team effectiveness charts are found in Appendix F.
Comments of Participants

There were 141 written responses to the statement: "describe the best thing(s) that have happened to you during this week of the Summer Institute". The first week responses related primarily to student involvement. Statements such as: "meeting the students, trying new group approaches"; "the students are so responsive -- it's great"; "the work with children and relaxed atmosphere at summer session". Some comments concerned visits into the community.

The second week statements were still heavily weighted toward students, however, there were more statements related to Institute activities, consultants and team members. A sample of such responses included: "Rap sessions with team and leader"; "dynamics of Dr. Marie Fielder"; "saw film 'Five on the Black Hand Side'".

The third week statements indicated a major shift from student concerns, although some still referred to students. The emphasis of this week was upon issues of race, Dr. Marie Fielder, and personal success. Comments included "Marie Fielder's presentation on goal and student sub-culture group identification and discussion," I taught something and students (most) learned and enjoyed"; "Feedback and straight talk with the black students".

The fourth week comments stressed human relations. Samples included: "all of the sessions were valuable and provided further communication of ideas and sharing of cultures"; "developed better rapport with several black students"; "White and Black youngsters working together for a successful drama production"; "going out to lunch with team members".
Generally, the best things appeared to be a feeling of success in the classroom, improved relationships with adults and students, and the acquisition of knowledge about racial issues.

Responses to the statement; "describe how your needs can be better met" numbered 102. There was a trend throughout the comments that emphasized the needs for more planning time and organization. There was a subtle shift to just more time needed for many things. The active pace of the Institute appeared in the comments, for example: "more planning time"; "allow more time for team planning"; "more communication - less talk about communication"; "when something is on the agenda - stick with it. Don't let the large group take the time to gripe-gripe-gripe"; "my brain is becoming ossified because I'm so very tired"; "Give us next week off"; "trying to accomplish too many things -- nothing completed. Lack of continuity in afternoon".

To inquire about useful information the Institute participants were asked to: "describe what you have learned thus far in the Summer Institute that you will be able to incorporate in your teaching and/or team work". There were 116 responses that had a wide variation of content. The comments tended to emphasize teaching strategies, human relations in team teaching and cultural and racial differences. Samples of comments are: "I have learned more about teachers attitudes and how they relate to each other"; "Some of the antagonisms between the races is not noticed and there is confidence in the school or home team members - knowing that all of us have a greater appreciation of our pluralistic society"; "I have had more frustrations this week than in the past five years"; "I have learned a certain amount of language and that students group
together in cliques regardless of race; "Tolerance of another individual's method of teaching". "A re-emphasis of my belief that everyone needs success. I will have to make sure to take the time to provide this for each student - even though it may slow down content."

There were some negative comments that included "so far not much"; "I've learned more what not to do than what to do"; "I really don't know."

There were 109 responses to "describe the most critical and important things to you right now" or "describe any 'nitty gritty' concerns you may have."

These statements at the beginning of the Institute emphasized routine daily needs. Such needs included keys to rooms, teaching materials, meetings to begin on time, open restrooms, etc. The emphasis shifted to concerns for working in racially mixed groups, organization of the Institute, commitment of administration and teachers, returning to the "home" school in the fall, and assimilating all the experiences and information obtained in the Institute. The range of comments was very wide including negative and positive concerns. Samples of responses are: "There is a need in the school, team, and among students for some definite standards. Even though the staff cannot seem to agree on basics, somebody needs to set standards so we can agree on control;" "unlock another restroom ... more pencils for students"; "getting the home team going"; "How well am I learning to work in an interracial situation"; "I am unsure
whether what I think I now know about black students is true or just the result of the 'artificial' association with them here."

Throughout the Institute, responses included relatively negative reaction toward Institute organization and administration. The first weeks concerns were organizationally oriented with one negative statement about the administration. The trend during the second, third and fourth appeared to direct frustration and negative feelings toward the administration. Some comments were more strongly stated than others. These negative expressions were most intensive during the second and third week. Sample responses include: "The large group seminars frustrate me tremendously. I often feel like walking out. It really disturbs me when people ask questions and make statements that are so simple-minded and not adequate for professionals"; "Much better responses on administrator side of Institute"; "For the next Institute the administrators might think of the Institute as a miniature school."

The statements about student discipline revealed teacher frustration as well as ambiguity among teachers concerning the enforcement of rules. Data indicated that most teachers handled discipline differently in the summer school than they would in their own schools; that is most would be more definite and firm in their own school.

Use of Systematic Self-Observation

This system of self-appraisal was offered to teaching teams on a voluntary basis. Although individual teachers indicate an
interest, none availed themselves of the full technique. One team became involved with SSO on a limited basis. No information was collected concerning the use of SSO.

Action Plans

During the last two weeks of the Institute "Home Teams" were formed including teachers and administrators from specific schools, action plans for returning to the "home" school were prepared and presented. The action plans site goals to be achieved, strategies to achieve them and problems to over come. Specific action plans are found in Appendix H.

Identification of Personal Goals

Each Institute participant was requested to identify and submit in writing, five personal goals to be achieved in the Institute. These goals were given to the participants at the end of the Institute so they could estimate the degree of achievement. A sample listing and rating of the goals appear in Appendix G.

The personal goals of institute participants were analyzed for content and placed into nine different categories. The categories were then examined by school, percent of goals by category, and percent of goals rated on an achievement scale from 1 to 7 which reflected the areas of; achieved not at all, achieved moderately, achieved totally. See Appendix I.

Graph 4 expresses the categorization of goals placed into schools and the percent of goals per category. The first four goal categories
GRAPH 4. Categorized personal goals by school and percent of goals in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal goals that relate to:</th>
<th>Total percent of all goals in category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>category</td>
<td>School 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14, 16, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching and understanding culturally different students</td>
<td>Other 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group planning and team teaching</td>
<td>Other 15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General self-awareness</td>
<td>Other 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching strategies</td>
<td>Other 10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication with minority group members</td>
<td>Other 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teaching subject matter</td>
<td>Other 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Alternative ways of handling student discipline</td>
<td>Other 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Using gained information in the &quot;home school&quot;</td>
<td>Other 2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other (goals concerning diverse interests)</td>
<td>Other 1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A
GRAPH 5. Total Percent of all Personal Goals Rated by Participants According to School.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale of Achievement</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Totally</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total percent of all goals rated:

- School-Other: 
- School-A: 

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
indicate the primary focus of the participants' personal goals for they contain 70.4 percent of the goals.

School-A participants have proportionally the same goal interests as school-other participants do among the first three goal categories. However, it appears School-A participants have more interest in "teaching subject matter" goals than "teaching strategy" goals, which is the reverse for school-other participants.

Goals of least concern to School-A participants were in the goal categories of teaching strategies and alternative ways of handling student discipline. Of least concern to school-other participants were goals related to "diverse interests" and "using gained information in the home school."

The total percent of all personal goals rated by the Institute participants according to school is expressed in Graph 5. The graph reveals that participants perceived themselves as having achieved most of their goals moderately high. There is little comparative differences between School-A and School-other participant ratings, however, School-A participants had a tendency to rate themselves as higher achievers of their goals than did School-other participants in rating themselves. On the basis of personal goal achievement the Institute can be assessed as moderately successful.

Achievement of the Institute Goals

Institute participants were asked to estimate the degree of achievement of Institute goals on a rating scale from 1 to 7 ranging
from achieved not at all to achieved moderately to achieved totally.

To assist the clarity of Graph 6 - the Institute goals are stated below:

1.0 The general purposes of the Institute were:

1.1 To sensitize teachers and other professional staff members to multi-cultural schools to the unique problems of culturally different students.

1.2 To give Institute participants an increased, individual self-awareness of personal values as these relate to minority group and disadvantaged students to the end that greater objectivity toward understanding and acceptance of such students might result.

1.3 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.

1.4 To train individuals who, when they resume work in their respective professional positions, will 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.

2.0 The general purposes of the Institute should be achieved through the accomplishment of the following specific objectives, stated in terms of expected behavioral and concept changes:

2.1 Understand that language is a key to comprehending cultural diversity and cross-cultural communication.

2.2 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.

2.3 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.

2.4 Understanding the fallacy of the notion that the I.Q. is a kind of ironclad determinant of a student's future.

2.5 An understanding of the characteristics of the community and the nature, causes, and effects of culturally different students.
GRAPH 6. Percent of rated institute goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute Goals</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Not at all 2</th>
<th>Moderately 3</th>
<th>Moderately 4</th>
<th>Moderately 5</th>
<th>Totally 6</th>
<th>Totally 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.9 Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.6 Insight into typical behavior patterns and attitudes of disadvantaged children and adults and ability to empathize with them.

2.7 Understanding the differences between the value systems of dominant cultures and subcultures and the implications of both in the classroom.

2.8 Knowledge of and ability to apply and develop instructional techniques appropriate to the needs of disadvantaged children in the fields of mathematics, science, social studies and art.

2.9 Skill in analyzing problems of teaching and learning in schools enrolling culturally diverse children, and skill in preparing original teaching materials and adapting existing materials to the needs of these children.

According to the majority of the participants nine of the thirteen Institute goals were moderately to totally achieved. Most goals were rated as moderately achieved. One goal that was moderately to not at all realized included a primary intent of the Institute. The following goal was evidently not reached:

To train individuals who, when they resume work in their respective professional positions, will 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.

Eighty four percent of the participants rated this goal from moderately achieved to not at all achieved. Twenty five percent rated it as not achieved at all. None rated the goal as totally achieved.

Eighty two percent of the participants rated the following goal moderately to totally achieved:

To sensitize teachers and other professional staff members of multi-cultural schools to the unique problems of culturally different students.
GRAPH 7. Total percent of all Institute goals rated by participants according to school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Percent of goals rated</th>
<th>Not at all (1)</th>
<th>Moderately (2)</th>
<th>Totally (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School-Other: 

School-A: 

The tendency of School-A participants to rate the goals as more achieved than School-other participants is noted on most goals. The comparative information otherwise indicates School-A participants as rating each goal with the same basic emphasis as School-other participants.

Graph 7 reveals the total percent of all Institute goals rated by participants according to school. Again the trend of School-A rating the goals as more achieved than School-other participants is noted, however, there is little difference. The school curves are very similar, particular over the scale numbers 5, 6, and 7.

By comparing Graphs 5 and 7 it is indicated that Institute participants tended to rate personal goal achievement higher on the scale than Institute goal achievement. However, the curves are very similar. The great majority of School-other ratings cluster around the scale numbers of 5 and 6 on the personal goals graph and the cluster is around scale numbers 4 and 5 on the Institute goals graph. The same trend is found on both School-A graphs. In each case, however, the apex of the curve is reversed by one scale number between schools on each graph. On the basis of Institute goal achievement the Institute can be assessed as moderately successful.

Summary

This chapter presented (1) the study's purpose and the hypotheses tested (2) analysis of statistical data concerning schools, groups and the interaction of schools and groups, and (3) analysis of
descriptive data concerning experimental group by schools.

There were no statistically significant findings; however, the data demonstrated trends that might have been statistically significant had the reliability of the instrument been higher or the sample size larger.

Chapter V will present a summary and discussion of the study. Recommendations are also provided.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

This chapter deals with (1) a summary of the nature of the problem and purpose of the study, review of related literature, and design of the study, (2) discussion of the findings, (3) discussion and conclusions, and (4) recommendations for further planning and research.

Nature of the problem and purpose of the study

The problem concentrated upon the necessity of providing experienced teachers an opportunity to gain self-understanding and cultural awareness while participating in an Institute for Cultural Awareness.

The disciplines of psychology, anthropology and education offered the basic theories for the study. Maslow's theory of personality and his concept of self-actualization were used to determine the effects of the Institute upon "self-functioning". The concept of cultural shock provided further insight into what may confront the personality of a teacher in a cross-cultural setting.

The Summer Institute inservice design was chosen for it provided both a secondary student summer school and teacher seminar arrangement. Furthermore, the institute was planned by representatives from schools of the participants. Also, the design of the institute provided for participant immersion into the culture in which their
students lived and it attempted to maintain an authentic teaching learning "school-like" environment. The summer school-institute inservice design further provided the experience teachers who participated, the experiences necessary for examining their own cultural biases and how those biases related to their self understanding and functioning.

The primary purpose of the study was to determine if the Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness produced an effect upon the measured self-actualization of the experienced teachers participating in the Institute and to determine the success of the Institute by having the participants rate their personal goals and the Institute goals.

Review of Related Literature

The review of literature and research covered four areas: (1) the historical antecedents to cultural awareness in education, (2) self-development and cross-cultural teaching, (3) the concept of self-actualization and characteristics of the self-actualized individual, and (4) inservice programs using the Personal Orientation Inventory as a measure of teacher self-actualization.

There was recognition that cultural awareness has yet to permeate to American educational system. Although most changes are taking place because of legal requirements, the case for multicultural education in America will have to be made for some years to come. It was generally accepted that the inequities in American education, resulting from lack of cultural awareness and acceptance,
did not happen overnight - nor will they be removed in a short time or as the result of any one single effort.

Authors agreed that the teacher's "personality" or "mental health" (and behavior) are important in the classroom and that teachers should be concerned about their own self development and its influence upon students. However, research in this area has failed to provide unambiguous data for a variety of reasons.

Many authors supported the importance of a teacher's harmonious personality expressed from a teacher's healthy self-concept. That is a teacher's general behavior stems from self perception.

The literature supports the notion that self-knowledge is the essence of functioning in a cross-cultural setting. The basic thesis that a person must understand himself before he can understand others has important implications for cultural awareness and cross-cultural teaching.

Maslow's (1962) studies revealed that self-knowledge seems to be the major path to self-improvement. His studies led to the development of a theory of motivation and individual growth based on a hierarchy of needs. Self-actualization was at the top of the hierarchy. Authors who have expanded Maslow's ideas into humanistic psychological thought agree that the individual who is in the process of "becoming" underlines the importance of personal growth and continuing education. The person who is "becoming" is open to change and trusts his impulses and values as guides for behavior in new circumstances. Self-actualized persons adapt and survive as the
environment changes and will be able to create ways to meet new conditions.

The limited literature dealing with inservice programs for teachers and Personal Orientation Inventory revealed that programs that include experiences such as group counseling, T-groups and/or human relations training do help teachers. That is, such training can be of value in assisting educational personnel in the development of personal characteristics which enhance their functioning.

There are many books, periodicals, journals and papers in the field of education, anthropology and psychology; however, few have discussed the relationships of enculturation, Maslow's personality theory and self-actualization and the professional growth of experienced teachers.

There is a glaring lack of research and literature concerning the effects of cultural integration upon the psychological characteristics of teachers. Furthermore, there were few inservice programs designed to deal with cultural awareness and its implications for teaching and learning. Most inservice programs in the area of ethnic understanding have been for reasons of desegregation as legislated by the courts or the government. These programs emphasize the cognitive awareness and deal with strategies rather than the human relations aspects of cultural awareness.
Design of the Study

The population consisted of approximately 450 teachers employed by Area I of the Portland Public School District #1, Portland, Oregon.

The sample consisted of 32 control group and 32 experimental participants who volunteered from the faculties of four Area I high schools.

The Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness used in this study combined a summer school of some 150 high school students and a training institute for 40 high school teachers (32 of the 40 completed the study). The summer school and teacher training component took place simultaneously over a four week period.

During the Institute pre-session, a week before the summer school began, the pre-test of Personal Orientation Inventory was administered to both experimental and control groups. The POI consists of 150 two-choice comparative value and behavior judgments. The items are scored twice, first for two basic scales of personal orientation, inner directed support (127 items) and time competence (23 items) and second for ten subscales each of which measure a conceptually important element of self-actualization.

The post-test of the POI was administered to the same groups approximately five weeks following the administration of the pre-test. The post-test was administered the week following the end of the Institute.
The POI answer sheets were machine scored by the Educational and Industrial Testing Service in San Diego, California. Further statistical analysis was used to examine the following hypothesis:

H₁ There will be a significant school effect.
H₂ There will be a significant group effect.
H₃ There will be a significant interaction effect between school and group.

The two-way Fixed Analysis of Covariance design utilizing the F test was used. The pre-test score was considered as the covariant (independent) factor and the post-test score was the dependent variable. If the computed F value generated by the analysis of covariance was greater than the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance the hypothesis was retained.

The descriptive data collection included the administration of questionnaires and inventories to the participants on a weekly basis throughout the duration of the training period. The descriptive assessment dealt with the following questions:

1. How useful will be the information and activities of great lecturers as judged by the participants?
2. How will the participants react to what was happening to them in terms of best and worst and needs fulfillment?
3. Will the participants avail themselves of and grow from the Systematic Self-Observation (SSO) process?
4. Will action plans be prepared by the home teams?
5. Will the participants identify personal goals and assess their personal achievement in terms of those goals?

6. How well will the institute goals be achieved as perceived by the participants?

Descriptive data analysis was done with discussion charts, and graphs realizing that the data concerned the numerical description of a particular group. The data provides valuable information about the nature of the experimental group as a particular group. There was an attempt to relate the statistical data and the descriptive data.

**Findings**

Hypothesis 1 was rejected. Because the hypothesis was rejected it can be assumed that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of school-A and school-others.

The computed F value generated by the analysis of covariance was 1.174 and the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance was 2.78. The computed F value was less than the tabular F value and therefore H₁ was rejected. Thus, it can be assumed that school membership was judged not effective in causing a significant mean score difference to occur. Although, significance was not found, graphing the mean scores indicated that school-A members tended to increase in mean score differences between pre- and post-test mean scores while school-other members had the reverse tendency. The profile sheets in Appendix D indicate that school-A members are more
self-actualized on both the pre- and post-test profiles than are school-other members.

Hypothesis 2 was rejected. Because the hypothesis was rejected it can be assumed that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group.

The computed F value generated by the analysis of covariance was 2.510 and the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance was 4.02. The computed F value was less than the tabular F value and therefore $H_2$ was rejected. The experimental treatment was judged not effective in causing a significant mean score difference to occur.

Although the F test did not support $H_2$, graphed mean scores tend to indicate an increase between the mean-pre scores and mean-post scores for the control group while there was a decrease between these scores for the experimental group.

The profile sheets in Appendix D indicate that the experimental group was slightly more self-actualized on both the pre- and post-test profiles than was the control group.

Hypothesis 3 was rejected. Because the hypothesis was rejected it can be assumed that there was no significant difference between the mean scores of the schools and groups.

The computed F value generated by the analysis of covariance was 1.287 and the tabular F value at the .05 level of significance was 2.78. The computed F value was less than the tabular F value and therefore $H_3$ was rejected. The interaction between schools and groups was judged not to effect a significant mean score difference to occur.
Although the F test did not support $H_3$, graphed mean scores indicate an increase from mean-pre scores to mean post-scores in all areas but school-other experimental.

The profile sheets in Appendix D indicate that the experimental group school-A, experimental group school-other and the control group school-A were all more self-actualized on both the pre- and post-test profiles than was the control group school-other. In fact the control group school-other indicated a non-self-actualized profile which appears below the norm mean on the pre-test.

The I-scale scores reveal a slight move toward self-actualization in all groups but the experimental group school-other which revealed a tendency to move from self-actualization toward the normal mean.

The descriptive data revealed that the lectures and activities of consultants were judged useful. The lecturers concerning school integration, goal and student subculture group identification and discussion, and the film "Five on the Black Hand Side" were judged to be of most use to the participants.

In terms of best things happening to them the Institute participants had a feeling of success in the classroom, improved relationships, and acquisition of knowledge about racial issues. Participants perceived that the worst things happening to them had to do with Institute organization and follow through, not enough time to do all they felt needed to be done, and frustration concerning student discipline. In general the participants were seeking to adjust to an unfamiliar setting with diverse norms and expectations.
None used the Systematic Self-Observation technique although some discussed it.

Action plans were designed by each school team.

The participants identified and rated personal goals. The goals were classified into nine different categories. Participants perceived themselves as having achieved most of their goals moderately high. School-A participants had a tendency to rate themselves as higher achievers of their goals than did school-other participants in rating themselves. Goals concerning teaching and understanding culturally different students, group planning, team teaching and general self-awareness were more numerous than other areas of interest.

According to the majority of the participants nine of the thirteen Institute goals were moderately to totally achieved. Most goals were rated as moderately achieved. On the basis of institute goal achievement as perceived by the participants the institute was assessed as moderately successful.

**Discussion and Conclusions**

William Hays (1963) explains that a great deal can be learned from good research and stresses that:

Conventions about significant results should not be turned into canons of good scientific practice...

It is a grave error to evaluate the "goodness" of an experiment only in terms of the significant level of its results...
Sometimes the problem itself seems almost secondary to some elegant method of data-analysis. Significant results are often confused with good results. But over emphasizing the role of statistical significance in research is like confusing the paint brush with the painting. This form of statistical inference is a valuable tool in research, but it is never the arbiter of good research.

Careful observation is the main business of empirical science, and statistical methods are useful only so long as they help, not hinder, the systematic exploration of data and the cumulation and coordination of results.

The above quote expresses some of the philosophy underlying the discussion of this study. Certainly statistical significance would have given the study impetus and enhanced the discussion. However, the lack of significant results should not distract the reader from examining the data and the various conclusions of the study.

Traditionally, the fact that the hypotheses were not supported at the .05 level of statistical significance would indicate a final conclusion that there were no school and/or group effects: that is, the activities of the cross-cultural institute had no effect upon the self-actualization of the participants.

However, the reasons for the rejection of the hypotheses may be varied. It is possible that the POI was unable to measure any changes resulting from cross-cultural conflicts. As a paper-pencil instrument the POI reliability primarily rests upon data gathered from non-cross-cultural research. Its reliability has yet to be established cross-culturally. The ethnocentric tendency of the instrument and the characteristics it measures should be examined for cross-cultural effectiveness.
Also the time of the treatment was relatively short. The effects may not have been measurable during the contact phase of the treatment. The assimilation phase following the treatment may have revealed statistically significant effects.

The 5 per cent level of significance (.05) is often used as a standard for acceptance or rejection. This suggests a 95 per cent likelihood or probability that any difference in mean scores would be due to the experimental variable. There existed a 5 per cent chance that the decision to reject the hypotheses was not correct.

There was also a possibility of finding significance by applying a more rigorous test of significance at the 1 per cent level (.01).

Because the reliabilities of the POI subscales are low to moderate (the reliability coefficients range from .52 to .82), the standard error of measurement is fairly large for all subscales. This lack of reliability coupled with the small sample size greatly reduces the probability of identifying statistically significant group and/or school differences.

Although all three hypothesis were rejected for lack of significant statistical evidence, it should not be assumed that nothing significant happened to the institute participants.

By exploring all the data, various observations and speculations are possible.
The written responses of participants reveal early disorientation, frustration and anxiety. The primary concern was teaching students and gaining the environmental support and time to do so. When these needs were not met teachers openly challenged the administration for not being better organized. Furthermore, Institute participants revealed they saw no relationship between what happened in the institute and their teaching in the summer school. This disenchantment reached a peak of intensity during the second and third week. The real human relations issues of differences among people, biases and feelings about minority groups did not surface openly until the third and fourth week. Concern for student discipline appeared to be the catalyst. The Institute ended at the time that participants seemed to be ready for open examination of their major concerns relative to cultural awareness.

Evidence of culture shock in Bohanan's (1973) terms was present but not intense. There was a conflict of values and indignant, angry, frightened feelings among the participants. This was most evident in the area of handling student discipline. Bohanan explains that when people in cross-cultural settings have these feelings they often "blame the other guy and belittle his culture and his values." He goes on to say: "I do not mean that you cease to feel strongly about such things. I only suggest that you know which things you feel strongly about and then govern yourself sensibly when you are in some other ethnic group." He also believes that it is out of cultural shock that teachers and anthropologists get the most
important part of understanding their information and learn to do their job better. It is very possible that most people in cross-cultural teaching go through a type of cultural shock as they adjust to and learn to manage different values and customs. This also implies that members of ethnic minority groups may go through a type of cultural shock when functioning within a school that is in sharp contrast to their cultural heritage. If this speculation is true then there might be significant implications regarding desegregation plans that thrust students and teachers together without appropriate preparation and support to handle the value conflicts arising from cultural shock. It is regrettable that the teacher who, under constant threat of cultural strangeness, either becomes so authoritarian that education is impossible or so apathetic that education seems scarcely desirable, or so angry that education seems "too good" for those members of the "other group".

Although it was apparent that most Institute members handled these frustrations reasonably well there was some evidence that the experience crystallized or clarified and reinforced some prejudices. Discussions with some Institute members revealed that they have noted a more openness about prejudices among some of their colleagues who shared the Institute experience together. One comment was significantly noticed: "I don't know what that institute did to ------. Before he was rather quiet about his prejudices but now he is telling everyone about them." The implication during the discussion was that in some cases the Institute reinforced a racist attitude rather than diminished it.
According to Gordon Allport (1954) such behavior may be predicted. He delineates ten socio-cultural conditions that seem to make for or reinforce prejudice. Such conditions do exist in some school settings. He also explains that prejudice is acted out in at least five ways, (1) expressing antagonism freely among friends, e.g., ethnic jokes, (2) avoidance through withdrawal, or accommodation, (3) discrimination by active detrimental distinctions between groups by practices of exclusion, (4) verbal or physical assault, and (5) genocide.

Evidently some Institute participants were acting out their prejudices that were reinforced in the Institute while teaching the year following the Institute experience.

Allport suggests that the problem of strong prejudice reinforcement may not be solved through assimilation or through cultural pluralism. What is needed is freedom for both assimilation and pluralism to occur according to the needs and desires of the identified group itself.

It is possible that prolonging the institute until the participants were able to deal with their prejudices and biases openly would have provided the opportunity for diminishing rather than crystalizing the prejudices of some of the participants. If this speculation is true educational training institutions and programs that are bicultural or multicultural should provide the freedom to explore feelings of racial prejudice while assimilation and pluralism both exist.
The fact that the Institute participants managed to deal with their frustrations and feelings in a relatively reasonable manner may possibly be attributed to their measured level of self-actualization. The experimental group indicated a level of self-actualization above the norm on both the pre-test and post-test; however, the tendency of mean scores indicated that the experimental school-other group moved in the opposite direction of the experimental school-A group.

It may be stated that if such a move toward the normal mean were continued to the level of statistical significance, the experimental school-other group would have been judged negatively affected by the Institute experience. It can be stated that the experimental school-other group was less positively affected by the Institute than the experimental school-A group, which indicates some group and school effect, but not to the level of statistical significance.

The interaction group effect was supported by the tendency of all but the experimental school-other post-test profiles moving toward self-actualization. Therefore, it can be speculated that the Institute (treatment) probably had a negative effect on the experimental school-other group.

Since the small positive differences between the pre- and post-test mean scores on all but one set of profiles may be attributed to test sophistication gained from the pre-test administration, it may be assumed that the Institute (treatment) had no effect upon the experimental school-A group.
It would be hazardous to postulate the reasons for the trends between experimental school-A and experimental school-other groups. To do so would be over extending the evidence. Furthermore, it is difficult to determine specifically why the institute experience may have affected one school group in one way and another school group in a different manner. The reasons may have been found in the activities of the institute. However, the reasons also might have been lodged in the philosophies, values, attitudes, organizational designs, and/or staffing of the representative schools. Thus, the complexity of the task is unfeasible. The evidence does indicate that the school-A group was more self-actualized than the school-other group.

The fact that most of the experimental and control group members were measured as self-actualized on the pre- and post-tests of the POI tends to indicate that the sample may have not been representative of the population from which they came. This was noted as a possible outcome of the research design. Therefore, generalization of the findings to the larger population is usually restricted.

This investigation failed to produce statistically significant effects of a Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness upon the measured self-actualization of experienced teachers. However, it is possible that such cultural awareness inservice programs can provide a firm basis for achieving the cross-cultural teaching expertise whose absence is one of the primary plagues of desegregated schools.
Recommendations

The following recommendations are generated from the objective inventory and descriptive data, related literature and the investigator's opinions and observations.

Recommendations for programming

1. Although a planning committee representing the institute participants was formed, planning should provide for direct influence from Institute participants. Flexibility of scheduled events should remain a major planning concept.

2. Limiting the number of resource consultants and speakers to concentrate upon specific issues of cultural awareness in an intensive manner should diminish the "shot gun" effect of diminishing information dissemination and participation in activities.

3. Specific consultants, activities and materials ought to be organized and scheduled after general and specific goals are determined, thus providing a sequential and systematic pattern of goal achievement.

4. Identifying, appointing and operationalizing the Director and leadership of the summer school and institute should be done early in the planning so that recognized authority and responsibility may be exercised well before institute implementation.
5. Provisions for conflict resolution and forums for managing frustration and destructive emotions plus human relations training should continue as a major component of cultural awareness institutes.

6. Since teachers work with their entire personalities and since attitudes, biases, values and feelings are as important as the intellect in discovering and understanding hidden cultural differences, cultural awareness inservice programs that focus upon affective as well as cognitive curricula are necessary for the preparation of cross-cultural teachers.

Recommendations for further research

1. This investigation covered a time-span of approximately five weeks. Longitudinal studies are recommended that would investigate the teacher's self-actualization while teaching in an actual cross-cultural setting over a longer period of time.

2. Since this study involved a non-random sampling design that found participants self-actualized as a group, it is recommended that a random sampling design be used that would provide for generalization to the larger population.
3. Further research concerning the effect of cross-cultural teaching situations upon self-actualization should be conducted using another comparative instrument (e.g., the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory [MTAI], the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire, or the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey).

4. This study chose a specific personality theory to predict behavior. Other predictive data, concerning cross-cultural teaching, should be gathered using other personality theories.

5. Additional research needs to be undertaken to determine the attitudes of experienced teachers who do not participate in cultural awareness inservice programs. (e.g., The control school-other group which indicated non-self-actualizing, identified in this study.)

6. It is recommended that further research examine the subscales of the POI for possible effect in cross-cultural teaching situations.

7. It is recommended that research continue to examine methods and techniques that seek to change teacher behavioral characteristics to those best suited for cross-cultural teaching (e.g., The Systematic Self Observation Technique).
Adams, Mark. 1968. Leadership Training Institute for Preparing Teachers for School Staff Desegregation. Miami University, Coral Gables, Florida.
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I. SUMMER INSTITUTE BACKGROUND AND NEEDS

Background Information

Some eight years ago, the Board of Directors of the Portland Public Schools committed itself to carry out a policy of desegregation for Portland Public Schools. Portland Public Schools district-wide voluntary busing program involves some 2,000 youngsters from inner city schools. Area II has continued to support the commitment to achieve integrated education by sponsoring administration and staff inservice relative to cultural awareness and intergroup problem solving during the current year.

The Area II staff and Title IV team have researched current findings in the desegregation process in consultation with nationally known educators, including Dr. Lulamae Clemons, Director of PRIME (Program Research in Multi-Ethnic Education) at the University of California, Riverside, and Dr. Marie Fielder, from the Staff Development Center, University of California, Berkeley.

As a result Area II conducted a teacher training institute for elementary teachers in June of 1973. Plans for a similar teacher training institute for secondary teachers were begun for June and July of 1974.

Statement of Need

One of the most paramount needs in a desegregated school is staff training. Because desegregation is the first step in moving toward integration, it is critical that school faculties be prepared
to teach in a multi-cultural setting. Training in the area of intergroup relations, communication, minority group culture and history are necessary to provide teachers and administrators with intergroup understanding and skills for doing new things in new ways.

It is generally recognized that most teacher training institutions do not adequately prepare teachers to teach in a cross-cultural context. Thomas Carter, formerly a professor at the University of Texas, in his writings of 1967 regarding teacher training, clearly builds a case for radical changes needed in teacher education. With respect to teacher preparation, Carter says, "the severest weakness of teacher institutions is their failure to prepare teachers to understand a number of concepts related to culture, society, personality, and behavior." Carter outlines three major areas of deficiencies.

1. Many teachers are not prepared to understand the influence of culture on personality development, particularly as it applies to ethnically diverse students.

2. Teachers have little or no contact with knowledge of minority group culture and history.

3. Teachers are not prepared to use intergroup skills to foster intergroup understanding in the classroom.

Needs Assessment

Specific concerns identified by selected Area II administrators and teachers, Spring, 1972.
1. Many teachers do not relate well to students; there is a lack of effort to build positive human relationships, especially relationships with children from culturally diverse backgrounds.

2. Many teachers have had little or no contact with knowledge of minority culture and history.

3. Many of our students come from diverse ethnic and cultural background of which teachers are not acquainted.

4. Many teachers lack the skills for identifying needs of youngsters in intergroup classrooms.


1. Staff inservice programs are inadequate for the needs created by the Administrative Transfer Program. Many teachers and administrators were unable to develop the skills necessary for making the Administrative Transfer Program work successfully. They need assistance in developing community support for the program, in expanding the curriculum and in individualizing instruction to meet the needs of the new students.

2. A strong deficiency in the staffs of receiving schools is the absence of minority people. Administrators sought minority personnel for teaching and teacher aide positions, but were unable to fill them as desired because of the lack of available minority personnel.

3. ATP children feel they "don't belong" to the receiving school. Some children suggest that they are only guests at the new school. They feel this way because they are often unable to participate in after-school activities; there are but few ATP students in each school; and on occasion teachers have single out the transfer students as being different from regular neighborhood children.

Concerns identified by selected Area II teachers in receiving schools, Spring, 1973.

1. Initially, hostile attitudes on part of both indigenous and transfer students. Problems of double standard discipline.
2. General damage to morale of staff who had worked very hard to establish standards over period of years saw much of it demolished.

3. Hostility of parents, teachers in middle.

4. Hard for children to adjust to school environment which was not as well supplied (equipped) as the other school.

5. Overt behavior (defiance of authority, noisy, disruptive behavior, negative attitude toward academic tasks, disregard for rules, demand for more than fair share of personal attention and help) used as way to cope with need to feel important. (Outgrowth of poor self-image and low academic status.)
II. INSTITUTE ORGANIZATION

The Summer Institute for Cultural Awareness combined a summer school of some 150 high school students and a training institute for 40 high school teachers. The summer school and teacher training component took place simultaneously over a five week period.

Organizational Chart
The Summer School

The summer school occurred over a four week period with classroom instruction three hours each morning. Students received instruction in four basic areas:

1. Computation: Basic Mathematics
2. Communications: Reading
3. Communications: Writing
4. Electives: Orientation or Special Projects.

Student participants were from diverse cultural and socio-economic backgrounds. The 150 students included a population of Title I candidates from a district wide target area as well as the feeder school population from Adams High School feeder schools. Specific schools from which students were recruited included King, Woodlawan, Faulion, Vernon and Kelly, all Area II Title I schools.

General student goals included three primary areas:

1. **Performance:** Students will be expected to attend and perform regularly in the total summer school program. They will work purposefully towards improvement in reading, math and writing/speech skills as identified by standardized or relative evaluative instruments.

2. **Evaluation:** Spring test results will be used in conjunction with a post test to evaluate students summer progress. The students will identify and begin making choices about the relationship between course offerings for the 1974-75 school year and proposed endeavors beyond high school. They will also work toward productive inter-
racial relationships and sensitivity to eliminate racial isolation and fear.

3. **Expectations:** All students will be expected to acquire an understanding about the relationship between math, reading and writing-speech communication skills as they relate to academic, social and world of work activities. They will be expected to improve mathematics, reading, and writing/speech abilities appropriate to their needs. Further they will be expected to attend promptly and regularly, and complete all assignments designed to facilitate improvement.

Each high school student attended one period per day in each of four instructional areas during four days per week. On the fifth day, each student experienced a full morning field activity related to the basic summer school components.

Content in reading and writing/speech components were based on previously acquired materials available in the existing Title I program. Materials included EDS and SRA learning materials as well as those developed both by Title I staff during the 1973-74 school year and the Summer Institute staff. Content in the math component was based on the recently developed curriculum of 1973-74 Title I math lab including Computer Assisted Instruction, and was supplemented by related materials and approaches via the Summer Institute. Instruction in the four components was provided students with an opportunity to receive individualized help as well as small and medium group experiences. The ratio of teachers to students was conducive to assessment of individualized needs.
The Teacher Institute

In addition to planning time for instruction, much of the afternoon activities related to teacher training. Seminar and discussion groups about human relations, cultural diversity and techniques for effective classroom instruction were scheduled regularly.

The general purposes of the Institute were as stated below:

1. To sensitize teachers and other professional staff members in multi-cultural schools to the unique problems of culturally different students.

2. To give Institute participants an increased, individual self-awareness of personal values as these relate to minority group and disadvantaged students to the end that greater objectivity toward understanding and acceptance of such students 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 resume work in their respective professional positions, will 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.

The general purposes of the Institute were achieved through the accomplishment of the following specific objectives, stated in terms of expected behavioral and concept changes:

1. Understand that language is a key to comprehending cultural diversity and cross-cultural communication.
2. 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.

3. 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.

4. Understanding the fallacy of the notion that the I.Q. is a kind of ironclad determinant of a student's future.

5. An understanding of the characteristics of the community and the nature, causes, and effects of culturally different students.

6. Insight into typical behavior patterns and attitudes of disadvantaged children and adults and ability to empathize with them.

7. Understanding the differences between the value systems of dominant cultures and subcultures and the implications of both in the classroom.

8. Knowledge of and ability to apply and develop instructional techniques appropriate to the needs of disadvantaged children in the fields of mathematics, science, social studies and art.

9. Skills in analyzing problems of teaching and learning in schools enrolling children, and skill in preparing original teaching materials and adapting existing materials to the needs of these children.

In order to recognize the importance of self-growth and include the Institute appraisal process as part of the program, the assessment plan for the teacher institute emphasized self-appraisal. The procedures included the setting of personal goals to be achieved, describing critical and important events, completing a standardized inventory and participation in self-observation:
1. Goals Identification. Participants identified in writing, personal goals to be achieved during the Institute. These goals served as self-assessment criteria for use at the end of the Institute.

2. Critical Incident. Participants were asked weekly to respond to four statements related to important perceptions.

A. Describe the best thing(s) that have happened to you today (this week).

B. Describe the worst thing(s) that have happened to you today (this week).

C. Describe how your needs can be better mer.

D. Describe what you have learned today (this week) that you are able to incorporate in your teaching.

Participants were also asked to rate the usefulness of various speakers and activities.

This information was used through a feed-back decision-making system, to adjust the direction of the Institute as well as to improve the effectiveness of the Institute activities. Data collecting sheets are located in Appendix .

3. Systematic Self-Observation (SSO). A presentation explaining the systematic self-observation procedures was given during the Institute pre-sessions. This unique system of self-appraisal was used by the teaching teams on a voluntary basis.

4. Standardized Criteria. The Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) was given Institute participants during the pre-sessions and again at the end of the Institute.

An Institute activity schedule is found in Appendix A.
### AREA II SUMMER INSTITUTE 1974
#### PORTLAND PUBLIC SCHOOLS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Charles Jordon &quot;Desegregation in Portland&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Myrna Wickstrom, LeRoy Patton &quot;Systematic Self-Observation&quot; (SSO)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Gladys McCoy, &quot;Culture of Poverty&quot; (evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Dr. Ernest Hartzog &quot;Problem Identification&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Dr. Eileen Shank, Myra Rose &quot;Institute Progress and Feedback&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:30</td>
<td>Dr. Marie Fielder &quot;Problem Resolution&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>James Brooks &quot;Racism #1&quot; Film: &quot;Black History, Lost, Strayed, Stolen&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>James Brooks &quot;Racism #2&quot; (Role Playing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Dr. Marie Fielder &quot;Home Team Process &amp; Planning&quot; (Curriculum Fair)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### JUNE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Dr. Marie Fielder &quot;Teaching in a Desegregated School&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Dr. Marie Fielder &quot;Goals and Student Subculture Group Identification&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:00</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00-2:00</td>
<td>Curriculum Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Dr. Marie Fielder &quot;Home Team Process &amp; Planning&quot; (evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00-6:00</td>
<td><em>Holiday</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>James Brooks &quot;Racism #2&quot; (Role Playing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Dr. Marie Fielder &quot;Home Team Process and Planning - Desegregation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Ben Talley (Curriculum Fair)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### JULY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>James Brooks &quot;Racism #1&quot; Film: &quot;Black History, Lost, Strayed, Stolen&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>James Brooks &quot;Racism #2&quot; (Role Playing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00-1:30</td>
<td>Team Planning, Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td>Dr. Marie Fielder &quot;Home Team Process and Planning - Desegregation&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00</td>
<td>Ben Talley (Curriculum Fair)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### WEEK REVIEW AND PLANNING

- "What do we change for Monday?"

#### FIELD TRIPS

- For all Instructional Teams

#### HOME TEAM PROCESS AND PLANNING

- (Curriculum Fair)

#### INSTITUTE OVERVIEW AND EVALUATION

- "Social Send Off"
III. STAFF

Permanent Staff

The following members of the Area II administrative and
teacher personnel provided direction for the institute and also
participated in program activities.

Dr. Eileen Shank, Director
Monroe High School
2508 NE Everett
Portland, Oregon 97232

Dr. Don James, Area II Superintendent
8020 NE Tillamook
Portland, Oregon 97213

SUPPORT TEAM

Ayers, Mr. Larry
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97331

Dobbins, Dr. Allen-
Area II
Portland, Oregon 97213

Forbes, Dr. Dean - Area II
2222 NE 92nd Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97220

Gatzmyer, Mr. Stan - Title I
Coordinator
8020 NE Tillamook
Portland, Oregon 97213

Hysmith, Mr. George - Area II
8020 NE Tillamook
Portland, Oregon 97213

Key, Ms. June - Adams High School
5700 NE 39th Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97211

Lee, Mr. Leslie - Area II
8020 NE Tillamook
Portland, Oregon 97213

Myers, Mr. Austin - Area II
8020 NE Tillamook
Portland, Oregon 97213

Patton, Mr. Leroy - Area II
8020 NE Tillamook
Portland, Oregon 97213

Rose, Mrs. Myra - Madison High School
2735 NE 82nd Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97213

Wickstrom, Mrs. Myrna - Area II
8020 NE Tillamook
Portland, Oregon 97213
AREA II HIGH SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Holt, Dr. Donald - Adams High School
5700 NE 39th Avenue
Portland, Oregon

Knouff, Mr. Wm. A. - Madison High School
2735 NE 82nd Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97220

Anderson, Mr. Harold H. - Benson High School
546 NE 12th
Portland, Oregon 97232

Petrequin, Dr. Gaynor - Marshall High School
3905 SE 91st Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97266

Shank, Dr. Eileen - Monroe High School
2508 NE Everett
Portland, Oregon 97232
AREA II SUMMER SCHOOL INSTITUTE

ORIENTATION:
*Grice, Michael Adams
Schmeckpeper, Gerald Marshall
Everett, Darrell Marshall
Lyons, Mrs. Lucile Monroe
Paxton, Paul Madison

PROGRAM:
*Birt, Signey Adams
Tontz, Charles E. Madison
Gruetter, Ellen Madison
Morris, Claudia Marshall
Martens, Kris Marshall
Zigler, John Marshall

MATH:
*Asson, Mary Adams
McNeil, Stuart Benson
Campbell, Lurene Marshall
Taylor, James Madison
Smethurst, William Marshall

*McGlotten, Cliff Adams
Veatch, Tom Benson
Wilson, Robert Benson
Betten, Larry Marshall
Greene, Chester Marshall

READING:
*Cook, Mrs. Betty Adams
Cronyn, Betty Monroe
Pesky, Vince Marshall
Watson, Violet Marshall
Hamann, Lynn Marshall

*Watson, Carolyn Adams
Ray, Mrs. Sherlee Benson
Benito, Dianne Marshall
Hamm, Iris Madison

WRITING:
*Saavedra, Vibiana Adams
Schukart, Mrs. Janice Madison
Hune, Donald Marshall
Bowman, Mrs. Dolly Monroe
Disney, Jean Madison
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Creasman, Sally</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trapp, Kenneth</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kanelis, Constantine</td>
<td>Madison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene, Mrs. Ida</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton, John &quot;Al&quot;</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Team Leaders
Consultants and Guest Speakers

1. Dr. Ernest Hartzog, Superintendent's Associate
   Office of Community and Staff Relations
   Portland Public Schools

   Dr. Hartzog has extensive background in the
   field of intergroup relations and planning.

2. Mr. Gilberto Anzaldua, Director, State Title I
   State Board of Education
   Salem, Oregon

   Mr. Anzaldua has done much work in the areas of
   staff development and inservice training in
   cultural awareness and intergroup problem solv-
   ing. He brings a rich background in Chicano
   history and culture.

3. Dr. Marie Fielder, State Department Center
   University of California
   Berkeley, California

   Dr. Fielder is a nationally known educator in
   the field of multi-ethnic education and inter-
   group planning and teacher training.

4. Dr. Eugene Breckenridge, Adm. Assist. to Superintendent
   Tacoma Public Schools
   Tacoma, Washington

5. Dr. Alexander Sergienko, Superintendent
   Tacoma Public Schools
   Tacoma, Washington

   Dr. Sergienko has provided outstanding leadership
   in providing multi-ethnic education programs in
   Tacoma, Washington.

6. Mr. James Brooks, Executive Director
   Urban League
   Portland, Oregon

7. Mr. Charles Mitchell, Director NW Reg. Gen. Assist. Center
   Campion Tower
   Seattle University
   Seattle, Washington
The General Assistant Center provides planning support and consultant support for districts involved in desegregating and intergrouping schools.

8. Ms. Claudia Thomas  
Northwest Reg. Gen. Assist. Center  
Campion Tower  
Seattle University  
Seattle, Washington

9. Commissioner Charles Jordan  
City Hall  
Portland, Oregon

10. Mrs. Gladys McCoy (Portland School Board Member)  
Portland, Oregon
Institute Planning Committee

The overall planning for the Summer Institute involved many faculty members from Area II High Schools. They contributed the information that culminated in the final Institute design prepared by the Area II Human Relations Planning Committee, whose names appear below:

Adams High  - Don Holt - Chairman
             Renee Bergman
             Audrey Haynes

Benson High  - Harold Anderson
             S. O. Borquiust
             Lee Larson

Madison High - Charles E. Johnson
              Bill Knouff
              Myra Rose

Marshall     - Bruce E. Richards
              John Cover

Monroe       - Eileen Shank
              Gwen Pierce
              Dolly Bourman

Area II      - Leslie W. Lee
              Allen Dobbins
              Myrna Wickstrom
              Leroy Patton
IV. METHODS

The Institute, a "short term" type, was designed to provide teachers from Marshall, Madison, Monroe, and Benson an awareness of growing up and living in an inner city, information about new curriculum materials and instructional strategies dealing with cultural pluralism, and the development of a "home team" plan for implementation in the fall.

The overall plan was to provide (1) a week of pre-sessions that would allow for "get acquainted" activities, consensus decision making orientations, introduction to what other school districts have done in the area of school desegregation; (2) then the focus was to concentrate upon instructional strategies and cultural pluralism; (3) then follow up with an action plan for returning to the "home school". The entire Institute was to concentrate upon teacher awareness of and sensitivity to culturally different students. This was to be done by providing participants with many opportunities to engage with professional assistance individually and in small groups, in meaningful analysis and evaluation of their personal feelings, attitudes, and ideas regarding ethnocentrism, stereotype, acculturation, discrimination, desegregation, integration, assimilation, culture, ethnicity and race in the areas of education and schooling.

In order to give appropriate background information to the participants, selected books, pamphlets, magazines, periodicals and assorted audiovisual materials were provided in the form of a
curriculum fair in the Adams High School library. The materials were available for participant use throughout the Institute.

All lectures and presentations were followed by discussions or question/answer sessions. The participants were thus given maximum opportunity to react to ideas and information provided by consultants.

Planned and unplanned social activities included dinners, luncheons, picnics and coffees during the Institute, important informal associations took place among participants on these occasions. Often these informal sessions provided opportunities for participants to question one another directly about immediate concerns generated by the Institute program.

The school action plans prepared by each home team reflects the continuation process that had begun in the Institute.
Resource Materials Available to Institute Participants: (These were located in the Adams High School Library)

a. Books:


b. Periodicals:

Psychology Today
Today's Education
b. Periodicals (cont.):

Learning, the Magazine for Creative Teaching
Integrated Education: A Report on Race and Schools
Arts and Activities
Ebony
Jet
Journal of Creative Behavior
Journal of Educational Psychology
Journal of Negro Education
Journal of Reading
Instructor

c. Audio-Visual:

"Cultural Conflict and the Traditional Curriculum"
"Eye of the Storm"
"What is Prejudice"
"Seeds of Hate"
"Confrontation" Series (School and Community, Rules and Regulations, Alienating Languages)
"The American Indian" A Study in Depth"
"Bill Cosby on Prejudice"
"Bill of Rights in Action"
"Bishop Turner - Black Nationalist"
"Black History - Lost, Stolen, or Strayed"
"Black Music in America - From Then Till Now"
"Chicano"
"Come Over to My House: I'm Going to be a Lion Head"
"Equality Under the Law - Lost Generation"
"Exploding Myths of Prejudice"
"Harlem Renaissance"
"Heritage in Black"
"Immigrants from America"
"Indian Artists of the Southwest"
"Inner City Dweller at Work"
"Latino: A Cultural Conflict"
"Martin Luther King - From Montgomery to Memphis"
"Mexican American"
"Mexican American: Invisible American"
"Minorities: Patterns of Change - What's a Minority"
"Minority Youth - Akira"
"Minorities from Europe"
"Minorities from Africa"
"Minorities: In the Name of Religion"
"No Handouts for Mrs. Hedpost"
"Orange and Green"
"Portrait in Black: A. Philip Randolph"
"Psychology Today: Social Psychology"
"Scholastic Black Culture"
c. Audio-Visual (cont.):

"Storm of Strangers"
"Strangers in Their Own Land"
"They Call me Names"
"We Are Black"
"Weapons of Gordon Parks"

d. Readings on Intercultural Understanding, Human Relations, and Intergroup Education were provided each participant.

e. Extensive Bibliographies compiled by Title IV were provided each participant on each of the following ethnic groups:

Asian-American
Black
Chicano
Caucasian
Native American
APPENDIX B
DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of pairs of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide which of the two paired statements most consistently applies to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If the first statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "a". (See Example Item 1 at right.) If the second statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "b". (See Example Item 2 at right.) If neither statement applies to you, or if they refer to something you don't know about, make no answer on the answer sheet. Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself and do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks in this booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

Before you begin the inventory, be sure you put your name, your sex, your age, and the other information called for in the space provided on the answer sheet.

NOW OPEN THE BOOKLET AND START WITH QUESTION 1.
1. a. I am bound by the principle of fairness.
   b. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.

2. a. When a friend does me a favor, I feel that I must return it.
   b. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.

3. a. I feel I must always tell the truth.
   b. I do not always tell the truth.

4. a. No matter how hard I try, my feelings are often hurt.
   b. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.

5. a. I feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
   b. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.

6. a. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
   b. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.

7. a. I am afraid to be myself.
   b. I am not afraid to be myself.

8. a. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
   b. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.

9. a. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
   b. I do not feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.

10. a. I live by values which are in agreement with others.
    b. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.

11. a. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
    b. I am not concerned with self-improvement at all times.

12. a. I feel guilty when I am selfish.
    b. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.

13. a. I have no objection to getting angry.
    b. Anger is something I try to avoid.

14. a. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
    b. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.

15. a. I put others' interests before my own.
    b. I do not put others' interests before my own.

16. a. I sometimes feel embarrassed by compliments.
    b. I am not embarrassed by compliments.

17. a. I believe it is important to accept others as they are.
    b. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.

18. a. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
    b. I don't put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.

19. a. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.
    b. I have a right to expect the other person to appreciate what I give.

20. a. My moral values are dictated by society.
    b. My moral values are self-determined.

21. a. I do what others expect of me.
    b. I feel free to do what others expect of me.

22. a. I accept my weaknesses.
    b. I don't accept my weaknesses.

23. a. In order to grow emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.
    b. In order to grow emotionally, it is not necessary to know why I act as I do.

24. a. Sometimes I am cross when I am not feeling well.
    b. I am hardly ever cross.
25. a. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.
   b. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.

26. a. I am afraid of making mistakes.
   b. I am not afraid of making mistakes.

27. a. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
   b. I do not trust the decisions I make spontaneously.

   b. My feelings of self-worth do not depend on how much I accomplish.

29. a. I fear failure.
   b. I don't fear failure.

30. a. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.
   b. My moral values are not determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.

31. a. It is possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.
   b. It is not possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.

32. a. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.
   b. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.

33. a. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
   b. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.

34. a. Children should realize that they do not have the same rights and privileges as adults.
   b. It is not important to make an issue of rights and privileges.

35. a. I can "stick my neck out" in my relations with others.
   b. I avoid "sticking my neck out" in my relations with others.

36. a. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.
   b. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.

37. a. I find that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.
   b. I have not rejected any of the moral values I was taught.

38. a. I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.
   b. I do not live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.

39. a. I trust my ability to size up a situation.
   b. I do not trust my ability to size up a situation.

40. a. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
   b. I do not believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.

41. a. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
   b. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.

42. a. I am bothered by fears of being inadequate.
   b. I am not bothered by fears of being inadequate.

43. a. I believe that man is essentially good and can be trusted.
   b. I believe that man is essentially evil and cannot be trusted.

44. a. I live by the rules and standards of society.
   b. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.

45. a. I am bound by my duties and obligations to others.
   b. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.

46. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.
   b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.
47. a. There are times when just being silent is the best way I can express my feelings.
   b. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.

48. a. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
   b. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.

49. a. I like everyone I know.
   b. I do not like everyone I know.

50. a. Criticism threatens my self-esteem.
   b. Criticism does not threaten my self-esteem.

51. a. I believe that knowledge of what is right makes people act right.
   b. I do not believe that knowledge of what is right necessarily makes people act right.

52. a. I am afraid to be angry at those I love.
   b. I feel free to be angry at those I love.

53. a. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
   b. My basic responsibility is to be aware of others' needs.

54. a. Impress others is most important.
   b. Expressing myself is most important.

55. a. To feel right, I need always to please others.
   b. I can feel right without always having to please others.

56. a. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is right.
   b. I will not risk a friendship just to say or do what is right.

57. a. I feel bound to keep the promises I make.
   b. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.

58. a. I must avoid sorrow at all costs.
   b. It is not necessary for me to avoid sorrow.

59. a. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.
   b. I do not feel it necessary always to predict what will happen in the future.

60. a. It is important that others accept my point of view.
   b. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.

61. a. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.
   b. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.

62. a. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
   b. There are very few times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.

63. a. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
   b. I do not welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.

64. a. Appearances are all-important.
   b. Appearances are not terribly important.

65. a. I hardly ever gossip.
   b. I gossip a little at times.

66. a. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
   b. I do not feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.

67. a. I should always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
   b. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.

68. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
   b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
69. a. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.
   b. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.

70. a. I hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
    b. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.

71. a. I will continue to grow only by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.
    b. I will continue to grow best by being myself.

72. a. I accept inconsistencies within myself.
    b. I cannot accept inconsistencies within myself.

73. a. Man is naturally cooperative.
    b. Man is naturally antagonistic.

74. a. I don't mind laughing at a dirty joke.
    b. I hardly ever laugh at a dirty joke.

75. a. Happiness is a by-product in human relationships.
    b. Happiness is an end in human relationships.

76. a. I only feel free to show friendly feelings to strangers.
    b. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.

77. a. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fail.
    b. I try to be sincere and I am sincere.

78. a. Self-interest is natural.
    b. Self-interest is unnatural.

79. a. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.
    b. A neutral party cannot measure a happy relationship by observation.

80. a. For me, work and play are the same.
    b. For me, work and play are opposites.

81. a. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.
    b. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.

82. a. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
    b. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.

83. a. I like only masculine men and feminine women.
    b. I like men and women who show masculinity as well as femininity.

84. a. I actively attempt to avoid embarrassment whenever I can.
    b. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.

85. a. I blame my parents for a lot of my troubles.
    b. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.

86. a. I feel that a person should be silly only at the right time and place.
    b. I can be silly when I feel like it.

87. a. People should always repent their wrongdoings.
    b. People need not always repent their wrongdoings.

88. a. I worry about the future.
    b. I do not worry about the future.

89. a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.
    b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.

90. a. I prefer to save good things for future use.
    b. I prefer to use good things now.

91. a. People should always control their anger.
    b. People should express honestly-felt anger.
92. a. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensual.
   b. The truly spiritual man is never sensual.

93. a. I am able to express my feelings even when they sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
   b. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.

94. a. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel bubbling up within me.
   b. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.

95. a. I have had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
   b. I have never had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.

96. a. I am orthodoxly religious.
   b. I am not orthodoxly religious.

97. a. I am completely free of guilt.
   b. I am not completely free of guilt.

98. a. I have a problem in fusing sex and love.
   b. I have no problem in fusing sex and love.

99. a. I enjoy detachment and privacy.
   b. I do not enjoy detachment and privacy.

100. a. I feel dedicated to my work.
     b. I do not feel dedicated to my work.

101. a. I can express affection regardless of whether it is returned.
     b. I cannot express affection unless I am sure it will be returned.

102. a. Living for the future is as important as living for the moment.
     b. Only living for the moment is important.

103. a. It is better to be yourself.
     b. It is better to be popular.

104. a. Wishing and imagining can be bad.
     b. Wishing and imagining are always good.

105. a. I spend more time preparing to live.
     b. I spend more time actually living.

106. a. I am loved because I give love.
     b. I am loved because I am lovable.

107. a. When I really love myself, everybody will love me.
     b. When I really love myself, there will still be those who won't love me.

108. a. I can let other people control me.
     b. I can let other people control me if I am sure they will not continue to control me.

109. a. As they are, people sometimes annoy me.
     b. As they are, people do not annoy me.

110. a. Living for the future gives my life its primary meaning.
     b. Only when living for the future ties into living for the present does my life have meaning.

111. a. I follow diligently the motto, "Don't waste your time."
     b. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste your time."

112. a. What I have been in the past dictates the kind of person I will be.
     b. What I have been in the past does not necessarily dictate the kind of person I will be.

113. a. It is important to me how I live in the here and now.
     b. It is of little importance to me how I live in the here and now.

114. a. I have had an experience where life seemed just perfect.
     b. I have never had an experience where life seemed just perfect.

115. a. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to be good.
     b. Evil is an intrinsic part of human nature which fights good.
116. a. A person can completely change his essential nature.
    b. A person can never change his essential nature.

117. a. I am afraid to be tender.
    b. I am not afraid to be tender.

118. a. I am assertive and affirming.
    b. I am not assertive and affirming.

119. a. Women should be trusting and yielding.
    b. Women should not be trusting and yielding.

120. a. I see myself as others see me.
    b. I do not see myself as others see me.

121. a. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.
    b. A person who thinks about his greatest potential gets conceited.

122. a. Men should be assertive and affirming.
    b. Men should not be assertive and affirming.

123. a. I am able to risk being myself.
    b. I am not able to risk being myself.

124. a. I feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.
    b. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.

125. a. I suffer from memories.
    b. I do not suffer from memories.

126. a. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.
    b. Men and women must not be both yielding and assertive.

127. a. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.
    b. I do not like to participate actively in intense discussions.

128. a. I am self-sufficient.
    b. I am not self-sufficient.

129. a. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
    b. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.

130. a. I always play fair.
    b. Sometimes I cheat a little.

131. a. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.
    b. I never feel so angry that I want to destroy or hurt others.

132. a. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.
    b. I feel uncertain and insecure in my relationships with others.

133. a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
    b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.

134. a. I can accept my mistakes.
    b. I cannot accept my mistakes.

135. a. I find some people who are stupid and uninteresting.
    b. I never find any people who are stupid and uninteresting.

136. a. I regret my past.
    b. I do not regret my past.

137. a. Being myself is helpful to others.
    b. Just being myself is not helpful to others.

138. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.
    b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of bliss.
139. a. People have an instinct for evil.
   b. People do not have an instinct for evil.
140. a. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.
   b. For me, the future often seems hopeless.
141. a. People are both good and evil.
   b. People are not both good and evil.
142. a. My past is a stepping stone for the future.
   b. My past is a handicap to my future.
143. a. "Killing time" is a problem for me.
   b. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.
144. a. For me, past, present and future is in meaningful continuity.
   b. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.
145. a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.
   b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.
146. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.
   b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.
147. a. People are basically good.
   b. People are not basically good.
148. a. Honesty is always the best policy.
   b. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.
149. a. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.
   b. I feel uncomfortable with anything less than a perfect performance.
150. a. I can overcome any obstacles as long as I believe in myself.
   b. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.
APPENDIX C
This letter concerns a cooperative study involving the Oregon State University School of Education and Portland Public Schools Area II.

Your participation in this study project is very much appreciated. This is part of a study of education and human development being conducted in a variety of urban school districts. This particular portion is related to the Portland Area II Summer Institute. We have included both Institute participants and non-participants.

Enclosed is a copy of the Personal Orientation Inventory we are asking you to complete. An answer sheet is provided as well. As you fill out the answer sheet in response to the items in the booklet there may be times when you will be frustrated; for example, when some items seem repetitious or foolish, when some statements do not allow you to answer in exactly the way you wish to answer, or when some items will seem unnecessarily detailed and not obviously important. However, please bear with these frustrations and trust that there is good reason for each item and the way it is presented.

When you have completed the Inventory (please use a #2 pencil) place the booklet and answer sheet back into the envelope and return to the head secretary in your school by June 11.

We are asking you to further participate by completing a similar form of the Personal Orientation Inventory on approximately July 19 (this summer). The Inventory will be mailed to you at that time with a self-addressed, stamped return envelope. If your summer address is different from that in the school register or if you plan to be out of the city during the third week in July, please indicate (with a note) the nearest date and place that we can provide you with the material.

We are asking of you a rather demanding task, but we think you will find it interesting. In order for the results of this study to be useful, it is essential that we obtain the full cooperation of all participants. This involves doing our best to answer all statements as frankly and honestly as you possibly can.

The enclosed dollar bill doesn't match your present salary scale; however, we trust it to be a token of our thanks for your participation.

Best regards,

Larry Ayers
School of Education
Oregon State University
This letter concerns a concluding activity of the cooperative study, involving the Oregon State University School of Education and Portland Public Schools Area II, that was mentioned in a previous letter to you. The Summer School-Institute for teachers and students ended last week.

Enclosed is another copy of the Personal Orientation Inventory. We are asking you to complete it again. An answer sheet and a short questionnaire is included as well. As we mentioned before there may be times when you will be frustrated while completing the answer sheet; for example, when some items seem repetitious or foolish, when some statements do not allow you to answer in exactly the way you wish to answer, or when some items will seem unnecessarily detailed and not obviously important. However, please bear with these frustrations and trust that there is good reason for each item and the way it is presented.

When you have completed the Inventory (please use a #2 pencil) and the questionnaire, place the booklet, answer sheet and questionnaire in the enclosed self addressed, stamped envelope and mail it. Try to complete it during this week. It will be impossible to send the answer sheets to California for machine scoring until we have them all back.

We are asking of you a rather demanding task, but we think it will be interesting. Furthermore, if you are interested in the results we will provide an interpretation at your request (note item on questionnaire). Again we encourage your cooperation in responding to all statements as frankly and honestly as you possibly can.

Sorry we can't find another $75 in order to enclose a dollar bill for each participant, however, we do appreciate your help and interest.

Best regards,
Redacted for privacy

Larry Ayers
School of Education
Oregon State University

LA:lm
Enclosure

P.S. If you are not able to meet the timeline, finish the answer sheet and questionnaire and return the materials as soon as possible.
APPENDIX D
### Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory

**Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Mean Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Experimental Group School-A</th>
<th>DATE TESTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>SEX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TIME INDEPENDENT
Lives in the present

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>COMPETENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### TIME INTERDEPENDENT
Lives in the past or future

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### OTHER DIRECTED
Dependent, seeks support of others' views

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TIME</td>
<td>INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY
Has warm interpersonal relationships

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Scores

| TIME | INDEPENDENT |   |   |
|      |   |   |   |

| TIME | INTERDEPENDENT |   |   |
|      |   |   |   |

**Figure 2. Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory.**

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Mean Scores

**NAME:** Control Group School-A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME COMPONENT</th>
<th>INNER-DIRECTED, Impatient, Self-supportive</th>
<th>SELF-ACTUALIZING VALUE</th>
<th>EXISTENTIALLY Flexible in application of values</th>
<th>FEELING REACTIVITY</th>
<th>SELF-PERCEPTION</th>
<th>SYNERGISTIC</th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL SENSITIVITY</th>
<th>OTHER DIRECTED</th>
<th>OTHER DIRECTED Dependent, seeks support of others' views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T&lt;sub&gt;c&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>ADULT NORMS</td>
<td>-25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Score</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>150</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>-20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 2.** Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory.
## Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory

Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Mean Scores

**Control Group**: School - Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE TESTED</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### T1 - T2 (Time) Ratio:
- Self-Actualizing Average: T1/T2 = 1:8
- Your Ratio: T1/T2 = 1:

### O - 1 (Support) Ratio:
- Self-Actualizing Average: O1/T2 = 1:3
- Your Ratio: O1/T2 = 1:

### Valuing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>SELF-REJECTING</th>
<th>SYNERGISTIC</th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lives in the present</td>
<td>Lives in the past or future</td>
<td>Seeks support of others' views</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Feeling

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>SELF-REJECTING</th>
<th>SYNERGISTIC</th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lives in the present</td>
<td>Lives in the past or future</td>
<td>Seeks support of others' views</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Self-Perception

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>SELF-REJECTING</th>
<th>SYNERGISTIC</th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lives in the present</td>
<td>Lives in the past or future</td>
<td>Seeks support of others' views</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Synergistic Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>SELF-REJECTING</th>
<th>SYNERGISTIC</th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lives in the present</td>
<td>Lives in the past or future</td>
<td>Seeks support of others' views</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Interpersonal Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>SELF-REJECTING</th>
<th>SYNERGISTIC</th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lives in the present</td>
<td>Lives in the past or future</td>
<td>Seeks support of others' views</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ADULT NORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>COMPETENT</th>
<th>INDEPENDENT</th>
<th>SELF-REJECTING</th>
<th>SYNERGISTIC</th>
<th>INTERPERSONAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lives in the present</td>
<td>Lives in the past or future</td>
<td>Seeks support of others' views</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
<td>Seeks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 2. Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory.
## Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory

**Comparison of Pre- and Post-Test Mean Scores**

### Experimental Group: School - other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE TESTED</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Valuing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self-Actualizing</th>
<th>Valuing</th>
<th>Feeling</th>
<th>Self-Perception</th>
<th>Synergistic</th>
<th>Intercultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Values of self-actualizing people</td>
<td>Existential</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>Sensitivity to own needs and feelings</td>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>Feelings of self in terms of weaknesses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Time Competency

- T<sub>C</sub>: Self-Actualizing Average: T<sub>C</sub> = 1:8
- Your Ratio: T<sub>C</sub> = 1:?

### Relationship Competency

- O:1 (Support): Self-Actualizing Average: O:1 = 1:3
- Your Ratio: O:1 = 1:?

### Time Competency Lives in the Present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incompe-</th>
<th>Directed</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Directed</th>
<th>Intercultural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Lives in the past or future | Independence, self-supportive | Values of self-actualizing people | Relationships, needs support of others' views | Feelings of self-actualizing people | Feelings of self in terms of weaknesses | Sympathy for others' views | Synergy | Sympathy | Self-Acceptance of self in terms of weaknesses | Unlack of self-worth | Unlack of self-worth with weaknesses | Acceptance of aggression | Acceptance of anger or aggression | Intercultural Consideration |}

### Figure 2

Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory.
## Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory

(Reproduced from POI Manual, p. 26)

Comparison of mean scores for self-actualized and non-self-actualized groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>DATE TESTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### AGE | SEX | OCCUPATION |
--- | --- | --- |

### Comparison of mean scores for NAME

#### SELF-ACTUALIZED

- **Age:**
- **Sex:**
- **Occupation:**

#### NON-Self-Actualized

- **Age:**
- **Sex:**
- **Occupation:**

### Time Competent

- Lives in the present

### Time Incompetent

- Lives in the past or future

### Inner Directed

- Independent, self-supportive

### Other Directed

- Dependent, seeks support of others’ views

### Value System

- Self-actualizing values

### Existential Reality

- Felt in application of values

### Feeling Reactivity

- Sensitivity to own needs and feelings

### Self-Perception

- Self-acceptance accepting of self in spite of weaknesses

### Synergistic Awareness

- Synergy Sense of life as meaningfully related

### Interpersonal Sensitivity

- Capacity for Intimate Contact: Has warm interpersonal relationships

### Tc | 1 | SAV | Ex | Fr | S | Sr | Sa | Nc | Sy | A | C |
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
80 | 115 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
70 | 100 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
60 | 90 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
50 | 80 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
40 | 70 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
30 | 60 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
20 | 50 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
10 | 40 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |
0 | 30 | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |

**Figure 2. Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory.**
### Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory

(Reproduced from POI Manual, p. 23)

**NAME**  "Pseudo-self-actualizing" Person

**DATE TESTED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OCCUPATION**

**TIME COMPETENT Lives in the present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (Ratio)</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:2</td>
<td>3:4</td>
<td>5:6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**1. Tc/Time (Ratio):**

- Self-actualizing Average: \( T_c = 1:8 \)
- Your Ratio: \( T_c = 1:10 \)

**2. O:1 (Support) Ratio:**

- Self-actualizing Average: \( O:1 = 1:3 \)
- Your Ratio: \( O:1 = 1:10 \)

### Values

- Self-actualizing Values: Values unique in application of values
- Existential Flexibility: Flexibility to own needs and feelings
- Sympathy: Sympathy for self or peers

### Feeling

- Feeling Reactivity: Reactions to own needs and feelings
- Self: Self-regard
- Self-acceptance: Accepting of self in spite of weaknesses

### Self-PERCEPTION

- Self-actualizing Value: Holds values of self-actualizing people
- Synergy: Sees opposites of life as meaningfully related
- Acceptance of Aggression: Accepts feelings of anger or aggression

### Synergistic Awareness

- Nature of Man: Constructive, Sees man as essentially good
- Acceptance of Intimate Contact: Has warm interpersonal relationships

### Interpersonal Sensitivity

- Adulthood Norms: 25

### Raw Scores

- 20
- 118
- 25
- 32
- 22
- 17
- 15
- 2
- 15
- 9
- 22
- 27

**Figure 2. Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory.**
PROFILE SHEET FOR THE PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY
(Reduced from POI Manual, p. 24)
College Samples Responding Under Normal Conditions and with
Instructions to "Make a Good Impression"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Competent</th>
<th>Inner-Directed</th>
<th>Independent</th>
<th>Self-Accepting</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Flexibility</th>
<th>Reactivity</th>
<th>Synergistic Awareness</th>
<th>Intercultural Sensitivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lives in the Past</td>
<td>Directs Values to Satisfy Own Needs and Feelings</td>
<td>Rigid in Application of Values</td>
<td>Reactions to Own Values</td>
<td>Spontaneity in Expressing Feelings</td>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>Acceptance of Self in Spite of Weaknesses</td>
<td>Synergy Senses Opposites of Life as Meaningfully Related</td>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact in Warm Interspersonal Relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADULT NORMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tc</th>
<th>SaV</th>
<th>Ex</th>
<th>Fr</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Sr</th>
<th>So</th>
<th>Nc</th>
<th>Sy</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TIME INCOMPETENT
Lives in the Past or Future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Directed</th>
<th>Dependent, Seeks Support of Others</th>
<th>Accepts Values of Self-Accepting People</th>
<th>High in Application of Values</th>
<th>Ineffective in Satisfying Own Needs and Feelings</th>
<th>Fearful of Expressing Feelings Behaviorally</th>
<th>Has Low Self-Esteem</th>
<th>Unable to Accept Self with Weaknesses</th>
<th>Sees Man as Essentially Evil</th>
<th>Denies Feelings of Anger or Aggression</th>
<th>Has Difficulty in Warm Interpersonal Relations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory.
Figure 2. Profile Sheet for the Personal Orientation Inventory.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Orientation Inventory</th>
<th></th>
<th>Results From Industrial Testing Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sum of Scores</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>1223</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>569</td>
<td>10469</td>
<td>17.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1230</td>
<td>50068</td>
<td>38.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2822</td>
<td>251618</td>
<td>38.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>13924</td>
<td>26.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>14103</td>
<td>26.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>8685</td>
<td>16.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>5491</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>5528</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>9629</td>
<td>17.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>378</td>
<td>4582</td>
<td>11.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>1670</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>9683</td>
<td>17.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>12229</td>
<td>19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY</td>
<td>RESULTS FROM EDUCATIONAL AND INDUSTRIAL TESTING SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLW CF SCORES</td>
<td>SUM OF SQUARES</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>559</td>
<td>11341</td>
<td>18.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1103</td>
<td>40477</td>
<td>34.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2939</td>
<td>276091</td>
<td>92.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>701</td>
<td>15503</td>
<td>21.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>708</td>
<td>16158</td>
<td>22.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>8892</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>5925</td>
<td>13.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>6043</td>
<td>13.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>11486</td>
<td>18.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>5426</td>
<td>12.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>10528</td>
<td>18.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>12209</td>
<td>19.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY</td>
<td>RESULTS FROM INDUSTRIAL TESTING SERVICE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SUM OF SQUARES</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>VARIANCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>140.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2956</td>
<td>92.38</td>
<td>141.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>21.41</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>15.94</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>427</td>
<td>13.34</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>434</td>
<td>13.56</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>18.88</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>12.97</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>7.84</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>19.22</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERSONAL</td>
<td>ORIENTATION</td>
<td>INVENTORY</td>
<td>RESULTS FROM INDUSTRIAL TESTING SERVICE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SLW OF SCORES</td>
<td>EDUCATIONAL AND SUM OF SQUARES</td>
<td>MEAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TI</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>1258</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TC</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>10274</td>
<td>17.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>46869</td>
<td>36.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>2880</td>
<td>263034</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAV</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>14510</td>
<td>21.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX</td>
<td>698</td>
<td>15708</td>
<td>21.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>8855</td>
<td>16.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>5310</td>
<td>12.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>5743</td>
<td>13.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>10761</td>
<td>18.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>4748</td>
<td>12.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1831</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>9854</td>
<td>17.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>12516</td>
<td>19.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Evaluation - Pre-Sessions

Please rate the usefulness to you of each of the components of the pre-sessions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Very Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 First Session (Activity)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Consensus decision-making process (Koener Report)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Second Session (Speakers)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 &quot;School Integration: Dr. Alexander Sergienko, Superintendent (elect), Tacoma Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 &quot;School Integration: Dr. Eugene Breckenridge, Director, Affirmative Action, Tacoma Public Schools</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Consensus decision-making process (day off or day on)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Third Session (Activity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Team Building GAC (Seattle): Charles Mitchell, Claudia Thomas</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Instructional Team Planning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.1 How the team planned and organized for instruction</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2.2 How the team is working together</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.0 Response Statements:

4.1 Describe the best thing(s) that have happened to you during the pre-sessions.

4.2 Describe how your needs can be better met.

4.3 Describe what you have learned during the pre-sessions that you will be able to incorporate in your teaching and/or team work.

4.4 Other comments:
AREA II
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Evaluation: Week One

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.0 Instructional Team Planning

1.1 How the team is planning and organizing for instruction

1.2 How the team is working together.

1.3 Systematic Self-Observation (SSO) presentation (LeRoy Patton, Myrna Wickstrom)

2.0 Guest Speaker

2.1 "Desegregation in Portland" Charles Jordan, City Commissioner.

3.0 Planning with Administrative team.

3.1 Afternoon large group meeting.

4.0 Response Statements

4.1 Describe the best thing(s) that have happened to you, yesterday and today, during the Summer Institute.
4.2 Describe how your needs can be better met.

4.3 Describe what you have learned, yesterday and today, that you will be able to incorporate in your teaching and/or team work.

4.4 Describe any individual "Nitty Gritty" needs you may have, for example: locker, lunch, restroom availability, class timing, planning time, smoke break, supplies, erasers, chalk, students (do you have enough), etc., "you name it" kind of things.

4.5 Other Comments:
AREA II
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Evaluation: Week Two

Not Useful Useful

1.0 Instructional Team

1.1 How the team is planning and organizing for instruction. 1 2 3 4

1.2 How the team is working together. 1 2 3 4

1.3 How the team is meeting the perceived needs of students. 1 2 3 4

2.0 Guest resource person(s)

2.1 Presentation and panel "The Culture of Poverty"
Mrs. Gladys McCoy
Portland School Board 1 2 3 4

2.2 Group problem solving conducted by Mrs. Gladys McCoy (Thursday, June 20). 1 2 3 4

2.3 Group session concerning issue (problem) identification.
Dr. Ernest Hartzog, Superintendent Associate (June 24) 1 2 3 4

2.4 Group session concerning issue (problem) resolution
Dr. Eileen Shank
Mrs. Myra Rose (Tuesday, June 25) 1 2 3 4

2.5 Group session
Dr. Marie Fielder
University of California Berkeley (Tuesday, June 25) 1 2 3 4
2.6 Film - "Five on the Black Hand Side" (Wednesday, June 26)

2.7 Group Session (following film) Dr. Marie Fielder (Wednesday, June 26)

3.0 Response Statements

3.1 Describe the best thing(s) that have happened to you during this week of the Summer School-Institute.

3.2 Describe how your needs can be better met.

3.3 Describe what you have learned thus far in the Summer School-Institute that you will be able to incorporate in your teaching and/or team work.

3.4 Describe any "Nitty Gritty" concerns you may have.

3.5 Describe or explain any issues that are important to you that have not been dealt with appropriately.

3.6 Describe what you would change in the Summer School-Institute in order to improve it (either the morning or afternoon sessions).
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Evaluation: Week Three

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Instructional Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 How the team is planning and organizing for instruction.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 How the team is working together.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Guest resource person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Group Session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Goal and student subculture group identification and discussion&quot;</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Marie Fielder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tuesday, July 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 (See third page)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0 Home Team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 How the home team is planning and organizing for returning to school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 How the home team is working together.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Curriculum Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 How have the materials in the library been meeting your expectations and needs.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Communication and Student Discipline.

6.1 There is open and clear communication:

6.1.1 Between instructional team members  

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4

6.1.2 Between Institute administrators and faculty.

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4

6.1.3 Between faculty and students.

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4

6.2 There is student discipline that:

6.2.1 Is maintained only by teachers

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4

6.2.2 Is maintained only by administrators.

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4

6.2.3 Is maintained cooperatively by teachers and administrators.

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4

6.2.4 Is not maintained by anyone as you think it ought to be.

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4

6.3 You handle student discipline differently in your home school setting than you do in the summer school.

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4

6.4 Student behavioral expectations are clearly understood by the faculty in the summer school.

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4

6.5 There are no double standards used in disciplining students in the summer school.

Disagree Agree
1 2 3 4
3.0 Response Statements

3.1 Describe the best thing(s) that have happened to you during this week of the Summer School - Institute.

3.2 Describe how your needs can be better met.

3.3 Describe what you have learned thus far in the Summer School - Institute that you will be able to incorporate in your teaching and/or team work.

3.4 Describe the most "critical" and important thing to you right now.
### Evaluation: Week Four

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Useful</th>
<th>Useful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.0 Instructional Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 How the team is planning and organizing.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 How the team is working together.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.0 Guest Resource Person</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Group Session &quot;Home team planning - Desegregation: Marie Fielder (Wednesday, July 3)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Group Session &quot;Racism&quot; James Brooks</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Group Session conducted by Ben Talley.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.0 (See Next Page)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.0 Home Team</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 How the Home Team is planning and organizing for returning to school.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 How the Home Team is working together.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.0 Response Statements:

3.1 Describe the best thing(s) that have happened to you during this week of the Summer School - Institute.

3.2 Describe how your needs can be better met.

3.3 Describe what you have learned thus far in the Summer School - Institute that you will be able to incorporate in your teaching and/or team work.

3.4 Describe the most "critical" and important thing to you right now.
ANALYZING INSTRUCTIONAL TEAM EFFECTIVENESS

Analyze your instructional team by rating it on a scale from 1 to 4 (4 being what you would consider to be ideal) with respect to each of the variables.

1. **Degree of Mutual Trust**
   - High Suspicion (1)(2)(3)(4) High Trust

2. **Degree of Mutual Support**
   - Every Man for Himself (1)(2)(3)(4) Genuine Concern for Each Other

3. **Communications**
   - Guarded, Cautious (1)(2)(3)(4) Open, Authentic

4. **Team Objectives**
   - Not Understood By Team (1)(2)(3)(4) Clearly Understood By Team
   - Team is Negative Toward Objectives (1)(2)(3)(4) Team is Committed to Objectives

5. **Handling Conflicts Within Team**
   - We Deny, Avoid, or Suppress Conflicts (1)(2)(3)(4) We Surface Conflicts and "Work Them Through"

6. **Utilization of Member Resources**
   - Our Abilities, Knowledge, and Experiences are not Utilized by the Team (1)(2)(3)(4) Our Abilities, Knowledge and Experiences are Fully Utilized by the Team

7. **Control Methods**
   - Control is Imposed on Us (1)(2)(3)(4) We Control Ourselves
8. Organizational Environment

| Restrictive; | Free; Supportive; |
| Pressure toward | Respect for Individual Differences |
| Conformity | |

(1)____(2)____(3)____(4)

It is important to receive information from you regarding your impressions of the effectiveness of the instructional teams.
PERSONAL GOALS

1. To make a realistic self-appraisal of my attitudes as they relate to my effectiveness in teaching students with racial and cultural differences. 
   Not At All Moderately Totally 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. To become more effective in dealing with problems arising from cultural and racial differences. 
   Not At All Moderately Totally 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Improve skills in analyzing problems of minority students. 
   Not At All Moderately Totally 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. To learn of additional techniques that are effective in teaching in a multi-racial classroom. 
   Not At All Moderately Totally 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

---

1. Since this is my first experience with an interracial group, I hope to be able to better understand the needs of such grouping. 
   Not At All Moderately Totally 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I want to gain insight from group planning and team teaching. 
   Not At All Moderately Totally 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. The opportunity to work with black teachers should shed some light on how to work with black students. 
   Not At All Moderately Totally ; ; ; ; 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Overall, I hope to gain in any way; I know that I can't lose. 
   Not At All Moderately Totally 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

---
1. The growth of all persons involved in the training of young minds and especially minority students.  

2. A program or curriculum that deals with the Black child in the urban school.  

3. Why teachers are not using the most effective methods and techniques available.  

4. Exercises in communication—development of expectations or eliciting expectations—cross racial and culture communication.  

5. To create a situation whereby people are listening to absorb, rather than to criticize.  

1. To become a more effective teacher in a multi-racial school.  

2. To develop individualized instruction packets so I may meet the needs of each and every student.  

3. To become more sensitive and aware of underprivileged students problems.  

4. To develop self-awareness and become more objective toward understanding the different minorities and underprivileged problems and culture.  

5. To be trained to a certain degree in the problems and culture of the culturally disadvantaged and go back to my own high school and work with the teachers there about these problems.
1. Develop a better understanding of the special needs of the black student and the teacher's role in promoting effective integrated education. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. Develop skills in new group techniques. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. Establish new relationships with teachers from other disciplines and other institutions of higher learning. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. Extend my realm of teaching experience by working in areas other than my specific discipline. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

1. To use SSO personally and in class to focus on change of teacher behavior. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. To use values clarification techniques with students to see if some interest in school can be generated. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. To help team members to recognize what creates tension in themselves. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. To focus on alternative ways of dealing with discipline and teaching strategies. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
SUMMER INSTITUTE GOALS, AND OBJECTIVES

1.0 The general purposes of the Institute are as stated below:

1.1 To sensitize teachers and other professional staff members in multi-cultural schools to the unique problems of culturally different students.

1.2 To give Institute participants an increased, individual self-awareness of personal values as these relate to minority group and disadvantaged students to the end that greater objectivity toward understanding and acceptance of such students might result.

1.3 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.

1.4 To train individuals who, when they resume work in their respective professional positions, will 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.

2.0 The general purposes of the Institute should be achieved through the accomplishment of the following specific objectives, stated in terms of expected behavioral and concept changes:

2.1 Understand that language is a key to comprehending cultural diversity and cross-cultural communication.

2.2 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.

2.3 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.

2.4 Understanding the fallacy of the notion that the I.Q. is a kind of ironclad determinant of a student's future.

2.5 An understanding of the characteristics of the community and the nature, causes, and effects of culturally different students.
2.6 Insight into typical behavior patterns and attitudes of disadvantaged children and adults and ability to empathize with them.

2.7 Understanding the differences between the value systems of dominant cultures and subcultures and the implications of both in the classroom.

2.8 Knowledge of and ability to apply and develop instructional techniques appropriate to the needs of disadvantaged children in the fields of mathematics, science, social studies and art.

2.9 Skill in analyzing problems of teaching and learning in schools enrolling children, and skill in preparing original teaching materials and adapting existing materials to the needs of these children.
APPENDIX H
A. **Goal:**

To develop more sensitivity among the faculty toward the unique differences of minority groups within the school.

B. **DEVELOPMENT OF GOAL:**

**Difficulties:**

1. Faculty
   a. Division of faculty
   b. Heavy load of faculty
   c. Lack of awareness by many members
   d. Average age of faculty

2. Public
   a. Benson "image"
      
      Short hair
      "Sir and Mam"
      Courtesy at all times
      Strict discipline expected

3. Nature of school
   a. Skill oriented
   b. Safety features
   c. Diversity of residence of students
   d. Pressure of industry

C. **INITIAL STEP TOWARD ACCOMPLISHMENT OF GOAL:**

1. Development of social interaction among faculty.

2. Consultant assistance

3. Student involvement with faculty
   a. Committees
   b. Panels
   c. Task Force groups
   d. Field trips
MADISON HIGH SCHOOL

ACTION PLANS

Area II High School Summer Institute

July 11, 1974

1. Teachers will meet, confer, and share experiences of this Institute at dinner meetings, afternoon meetings, class level meetings, etc.

2. A program to involve Madison teachers in activities which will lead to more effective teaching of a multi-cultural student body will be planned and participated in by teachers during monthly faculty meetings.

3. Freshmen teachers will be invited to participate in an informal freshman student orientation.

4. Individual student successes in a variety of areas will be made known to the whole school community.

5. Madison teachers will visit other schools to observe a variety of teaching situations in multi-ethnic classrooms.

6. Some Madison parent-staff meetings will be held in administrative transfer neighborhood schools.

7. Student free and reduced price meal tickets will be distributed in a more tactful manner.

8. Individual Tri-Met transportation for Administrative Transfer students will be investigated.
MARSHALL HIGH ACTION PLAN

Following a problem-solving approach the Marshall staff members involved in the Institute developed material presented here.

Members participating: Violet Watson, Darrel Everett, Bill Smethurst, Ken Trapp, Kacey Fuller, Larry Betten, Claudia Morris, Chet Greene, Laurence Campbell, Vince Pesky, Kris Martens, Lynn Hamann, Don Hune, Dianne Benito, Jerry Schmeckpepper.

NEED: Students need to feel good about themselves and their school.

PROBLEM: How do we help students feel good about themselves and their school?

ANALYSIS: Students achieve good feelings through the areas of belonging, achievement and recognition;
Some students are goal-less;
Every student should be good at something;
Goals should be student set and met;
Maybe students see things different than teachers;
Students should feel that what they are doing is important;
There are some things more important than basic skills;
Can you have a good image of oneself in just one area?
Is there a carryover from one experience to another?
Faculty should be aware of where students are at (not location);
Successful experiences are necessary;
We must be sensitive to student feelings.

CRITERIA AND RESTRAINTS:

Students must be involved;
Inservice should be used because it is non-voluntary;
Should involve parents;
Should involve the human relations committee;
Solutions must be evaluatory;
Activities should deal with shaping and/or molding attitudes in the Marshall family;
There must be avenues for student input which is constant and effective;
Must operate within the personnel we have;
Should be continuance operation.

POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

Committee 2 There should be a student-staff group that would work with student problems as they arise. Informational, grievance, referral, visible.
*Strengthen the student council.
Committee 2  Develop a mechanism for securing competent students to serve on committees.  
There should be a special time set aside when the 70% who remain faceless could be heard.  
Invite Marie Fielder to speak to the staff.  
There should be a student interview.  
*Extend the summer institute throughout the school year.  

Committee 4  Develop a mechanism for recognizing students other than those already being recognized.  
Strengthen the open forum concept of school government.  
Mini-courses.  
*S School paper.  

Committee 4  Have an improve the school day.  
Committee 4  Have an all-school field day.  
*Strengthen and revise the assembly program.  
Strengthen the intra-mural program.  

Committee 1  More faculty get-togethers.  

Committee 4  Develop a system for welcoming back students who have been absent.  

Committee 3  Each staff member invite and escort a parent or parents to a school function.  
Have Saturday get-togethers, staff and students.  
*Invite a dynamic speaker to direct the attention of the staff to the improvement of the school.  
Before school starts.  

Committee 2  Faculty meetings devoted to basic philosophies.  
Committee 3  Sessions needed to sensitize the staff to the feelings of student feelings.  
Committee 2  Committee to develop a list of things teachers should and should not do in class.  
*Develop teacher awareness by use of the video-tape technique.  

Committee 1  Have a student leadership workshop.  
Committee 1  Have staff-student retreat.  
Have an activity card for all activities.  Carte Blanche.  

Committee 3  Improvement of the local community and helping the elderly.  
Welcome wagon for new students.  
*Visitation with parents of ATS.  
Food drive.  

CHOOSING THE SOLUTIONS:  

Those solutions marked with an asterisk are those that are in the process of implementation. Those solutions which are underlined are those which the group decided to focus its attention to.
IMPLEMENTING SOLUTIONS:

The group was divided into the following sub-committees, each with specific areas of responsibility.

Committee 1  
Violet Watson, Leader  
Darrel Everett  
Bill Smethurst  
Ken Trapp  
Grace Clark

Committee 2  
Larry Betten, Leader  
Claudia Morris  
Kacey Fuller  
Chet Greene  
Dr. Petrequin

Committee 3  
Laurene Campbell, Leader  
Vince Pesky  
Kris Martens  
Lynn Hamann

Committee 4  
Don Hune, Leader  
Dianne Benito  
Jerry Schmeckpepper  
Dean Miller

Student-staff workshop, retreat  
Faculty get-togethers

Student group student problems  
Students to serve on committees

Faculty meetings for philosophies  
Things teachers should, should not do

Staff Sensitizing  
Escorting parents to functions  
 Improvement of community

Improve the school field day  
Student recognition  
Welcoming back absent students

Submitted July, 1974  
by Chet Greene
MONROE HIGH SCHOOL
TENTATIVE ACTION PLAN
TO
STRATEGIZE HOME TEAM RE-ENTRY

WORKSHOP GOAL

How can we develop the skills, understandings and appreciation of learning, to learn from differences as a step to teaching a pluralistic population in a school which is itself a community for democratic learning?

MONROE HIGH SCHOOL GOALS

1. To be aware of our own values and prejudices as well as those of others and not to discriminate against those whose values differ from our own.
2. To educate our students successfully so that they will enjoy learning and teachers will enjoy teaching.

ISSUES

1. How can we help our staff become aware
   - of their individual prejudices;
   - of the students prejudices;
   - of the integration issue;
   - of the values they have which affect and influence other staff members and students;
   - of the influence the O.O.G.'s (staff and students) have on the total population of the school.

ACTIVITIES

- Movies, films, role play;
- Small group discussions;
- Faculty dinners, task forces, committees;
- Curriculum fair using multi-ethnic literature, art and/or food, connected with a cultural awareness month or Monroe Expo '75;
- Mini classes in reading techniques for all disciplines;
- Exchange visits to other schools and sharing of experiences by staff;
- Luncheons once a month for parents and community people.

RESOURCES AVAILABLE

1. The Institute
2. Area II Staff
3. Teachers, students, counselors, program chairman
4. Monroe Advisory and Involvement committee
5. Internal and external consultants
6. PCO, Mini-Grants
7. Administration Building, Curriculum Library, A.V. Department
8. Community organizations, i.e., Urban League
9. Community leaders, i.e., Charles Jordan, Gladys McCoy.

IMPLEMENTATION

1. Released time
2. Area II support
3. Monroe Administrators directive and support
4. Monroe Institute team support
5. Funding (PCO., etc.)
6. Consultants
APPENDIX I
Categorized personal goals by school, number of ratings in each category and percent of goals in each category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Totally</th>
<th>Total Percent of all goals in category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Teaching and understanding culturally different students.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Group planning and team teaching.</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. General self-awareness</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Teaching strategies</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Communication with minority group members</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Teaching subject matter</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Alternative ways of dealing with student discipline</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Using information gained in institute for use in the &quot;home school&quot;</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Other - (goals concerning Other a wide range of interests)</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total percent of all goals rated                                         | Other  | 3%         | 7.5%       | 8.5%    | 11.5%     | 16.4%   | 14.5%   | 6%   | 100% |
|                                                                          | A      | 0%         | .6%        | 2%      | 6%        | 10%     | 11.5%   | 2.5% | 100% |