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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the stability of Social sensitivity and its relation to verbal behavior. The "Modified Dymond Scale" was used as a measure of Social sensitivity. The Bales system of categorizing behavior was used to record the verbal behavior of the subjects.

Thirteen leaderless groups made up of 5 persons each, were used in Phase 1 of the investigation. Twelve leaderless groups made up of 4 and 5 persons, were used in Phase 2.

1. They behaved differently in their rating behavior. That is, they tended to rate every one on all the scales in the same manner as they rated themselves.

2. The subjects in this study tended to rate themselves the same when placed in new groups. Other studies report that subjects tend to change their self-ratings when placed in new groups.

3. The verbal behavior of the leaders was atypical when compared to other groups. Other studies indicate that leaders tend to have a higher proportion of verbal behavior categorized in the task area.

Such conditions are nearly ideal for facilitating
the phenomenon of response set (14) (19). Instead of rating others on their actual traits the subjects turn from external cues that are ambiguous and threatening to internal cues that are safer. Future studies utilizing the techniques outlined herein might find it extremely valuable to investigate the concept of response set.

One of the more important empirical findings of this study concerns the hypothesis that the ability to predict others' responses facilitates interaction. Previous writers (26) (29) have not been clear in defining how the predictions should be made. The predictions may be made on the basis of projection, or on the basis of Social sensitivity.

If one accepts the author's definition of rating others the same as self as projection and leadership as an index of adjustment, this study indicates that predicting others' behavior on the basis of projection, does not facilitate verbal interaction.
INTRODUCTION

For fifty years the term empathy has been used to explain many different phenomena, such as: religious ceremonies, the appreciation of objects of art and architecture, as well as one person's understanding of the feelings and thoughts of another person or group.

According to both Titchener (60) and Boring (15), Lipps' was the first to use the concept of empathy in proposing a theory in which motor mimicry or imitation was considered essential to the understanding of other people's behavior. Since the introduction of the concept of empathy other terms such as social awareness, sympathy, insight, and social sensitivity (21), have been used to explain much the same phenomena. All these terms have been used rather indiscriminately in describing the process of understanding other people's feelings and thoughts.

The original concept of empathy, or social sensitivity, as necessarily involving mimicry and muscular patterns has, in general, been dropped. A more recent definition, and the one used in this thesis is, the understanding of and the ability to predict another's behavior.
The use of social sensitivity as an intervening construct in explaining individual behavior, both normal and abnormal, has been pointed out by many authors, Freud (27), Adler (1), Sullivan (59), Moreno (48), Rogers (51), Fries (28), and Escalona (25).

In spite of its almost constant usage for fifty years, it was not until recently that any consistent attempts were made to define operationally and to quantify the concept of social sensitivity. Moreno (48) made some attempts to demonstrate role-taking, or social sensitivity, empirically, but made no attempt to quantify his observations. Sears (52), using the differences between predicted and actual ratings, attempted to quantify insight and projection in social situations, but did not follow up his original study. Cottrell and Dymond (18) are usually given credit for refocusing attention on the concept of social sensitivity and its relations to personality factors. It was not until Dymond (22) developed a relatively simple method of measurement, based on differences between predicted and actual ratings, that there were any consistent attempts at measuring social sensitivity.

The operational definition of social sensitivity as developed by Dymond (22) is the ability of one individual
to predict how other individuals rate themselves on a series of traits. Her method of obtaining the predictions of the ratings is as follows: A small group is allowed to interact for a short period of time. After the interaction period Dymond requires each subject to:

On six traits:

1. Rate himself in relation to the other members of the group.

2. Rate each other member in relation to himself.

3. Rate himself as he thinks each other member would rate him.

4. Rate each of the members of the group as he thinks they would rate themselves.

The index of a person's social sensitivity or empathic ability was based upon the accuracy with which he predicted how others would rate him, and how accurately they would rate themselves. The person's sensitivity score was derived from the sum of the deviations between an individual's predicted ratings of another subject and the other subject's actual rating.

In attempts to validate this type of scale Dymond (24) studied the relationship of the scores to (1) the empathy expressed in TAT stories, (2) ratings of
empathic ability made by independent judges, (3) by subjective reports made by subjects of their success in assuming the roles of others.

Dymond (22), reported a test-retest coefficient for reliability of .60, a split-half coefficient of .63, corrected for attenuation, and an average internal consistency, also corrected, of .82.

Bell (10), using a rating schedule similar to Dymond's reports a test-retest reliability of .55, and a split-half reliability coefficient of .80.

Hall (34), using a rating schedule similar to Bell's, reports an internal consistency coefficient of .88. Stolper (55), using the same technique reports an average internal consistency coefficient of .83.

While the reliability is not so high as might be desired, it appears that workable scales for measuring social sensitivity have been developed. However, it should be pointed out that inherent in the Dymond technique of measuring sensitivity there are many problems. It has long been recognized that the concept of empathy may be contaminated with other factors such as projection (12) (13) (30), identification (43) (30) similarity (12) (36), stereotype accuracy (30) (43), and response at (19) (43), which might give spurious results
in the research concerning \textit{measurement} of sensitivity.

The earliest attempts to clarify sensitivity involved differentiating it on a rational basis from other concepts, such as projection, etc., with which it might overlap and conflict. For example, Mead (47), points out that sympathy may be based upon the sensitivity process but may be differentiated from sensitivity by the degree of participation. Murphy (50), using a similar line of reasoning, also differentiated sensitivity from sympathy. Freud differentiated between identification and role playing (social sensitivity) by the degree of participation.

More recently attempts at refining the sensitivity measures by studying the influence of projection and similarity have taken a prominent place in research. Bender and Hastorf (12), have completed a series of studies demonstrating that projection is a contaminating factor in the \textit{measurement} of sensitivity. They conclude from their studies that projection appeared in the \textit{Index} of sensitivity, and later (36) (37), attempted to account for the amount by use of a refined sensitivity score. In a later study Hastorf and Bender (37) pointed out that the refined sensitivity score serves the purpose for which it intended but is contaminated by the response set of the individuals.
In a study designed to reproduce and evaluate the Hastorf and Bender study concerned with developing the refined sensitivity score, Dorsey and Bell (20), concluded that the refined sensitivity score may not be measuring sensitivity.

In reference to similarity, Gage (3), questions that a high sensitivity index derived from a high degree of assumed similarity is equal to one which arises from assuming dis-similarity, or that the processes are the same. Gage (30), Lindgren and Robinson (43), and Hastorf and Bender (37), present the problem of stereotype accuracy and response set in the responses to the various rating schedules. That is, subjects tend to respond to the questions according to a social norm, or set, of which they may or may not be aware.

The increasing number of studies dealing with empathic ability, or social sensitivity, gives some indication of the growing interest in this concept and suggests that it should be thoroughly explored. In a recent paper Luchins (44), pointed out the need for more research that was concerned with relating sensitivity to personality and other aspects of behavior. He also points out, along with Bell (9) and Ansbacher (2), that at present it is not known whether or not empathy is a
unitary trait, as it is being treated at present, or whether it is a multi-dimensional trait. Nor is it known whether the highly sensitive individual shows the same degree of sensitivity in all situations regardless of the individuals involved.

A series of studies has appeared that have attempted to show the relationship between sensitivity and different types of behavior. Bell and Hall (11), and Stolper (58), using a design similar to the one in Dymond's studies, investigated the relationship between leadership and sensitivity. All these studies report a low but consistent positive relationship between sensitivity and leadership. In all of these studies leadership was defined in terms of peer ratings.

Recently there have been attempts by Fiedler (26), Gage (29), and others (11) (58), to relate sensitivity or social perception to leadership in behavioral situations. Fiedler has found that the individual with a high degree of sensitivity who maintains a social, or physical distance with the individuals whom he is leading tends to make a better leader. Leadership ability was determined by raters outside the group structure. This study was carried out in a military setting which may impose serious limitations on generalizations from
the results.

Gilbert (32) and Jackson and Carr (41), have studied the relationship of social sensitivity to schizophrenia. Studies report no clear cut relationship but the relations were in the predicted direction.

Stolper (56) has investigated the relationship between sensitivity and various personality traits as measured by the Guilford-Zimmerman Scale, leadership, and the How Supervise Test. Her results indicate that there is a significant relationship between sensitivity and personality traits. Her findings corroborate those reported by Dymond (24).

Studies relating the sensitivity phenomena to gross behavior, such as leadership or psychiatric disorders, do not permit a very effective description as to how the empathic individual behaves. For example, it may be that leadership is a function of both group membership and the environmental setting. In interpreting the meaning of a correlation between sensitivity and leadership one finds it impossible to say whether the highly sensitive person's success as a leader is a function of the environment or of the personalities involved in interaction.

It would be desirable if the experimental design
permitted the direct interpretation that the sensitive person behaves in a particular fashion such as that he tends to ask a lot of questions, or to disagree with the other members of the group. On the basis of objective behavior categories one could then not only describe behavior related to social sensitivity but could also develop more meaningful intervening constructs as to how social sensitivity operates within a given person.

Following this line of reasoning it is the purpose of this study to investigate the relationship between social sensitivity and verbal behavior using a system of categorizing behavior suggested by Heinicke (38).
PROCEDURE

The present study was designed to investigate two areas. The first (Phase 1) was concerned with investigating the relationship of verbal behavior, and leadership, to empathic behavior. The second part of the study (Phase 2) was concerned with investigating the stability of these relationships in groups with varying membership.

EXPERIMENTAL ROOM: The room was attractively decorated, with adequate lighting and ventilation. One wall had a one-way mirror built into it. The opposite wall was draped with bleached burlap to aid in the acoustics. A large round table was located in the center of the room. Directly above this table a microphone was concealed in a light fixture. Five chairs were placed equidistant apart around the table. A small work table was placed in one corner of the room.

An observation booth which would accommodate two observers was located behind the one-way mirror. A speaker connected to the microphone was located in the booth.

SUBJECTS: The subjects for this study were 70 male members of undergraduate courses, taught during the
summer and fall semesters of 1954, at Louisiana State University. The subjects were chosen from the psychology courses on the basis of their availability.

**GROUP OPERATIONS:**

**Phase 1:** There were 13 groups in Phase 1. These were composed of five individuals drawn at random from the classes. It was not possible to control previous acquaintanceship, age, or marital status.

**Phase 2:** The subjects were selected for this phase on the basis of two conditions:

1. No subject should interact in a group with any person with whom he had appeared previously.

2. Availability.

As is common experience in group studies of this type the design had to be modified to meet the exigencies of the experiment due to subjects failing to keep appointments. As a result it was not always possible to completely balance each group in Phase 2 as planned.

**TASK:** Each group was escorted to the testing room by one of the two experimenters. The other experimenter was already located in the observation booth. The subjects were seated at a large round table. A small card with the name of a color printed on it was placed on the table in front of each subject. The color was to
identify the subjects during the testing session and facilitate interaction. The subjects were then told that this was a study in group dynamics and that the investigators were interested in how groups functioned.

Each group in Phase 1 was asked to discuss a short case history and write a short letter of advice to the person involved. The same case history was used for all groups in this phase. (See appendix for complete case history and instructions). Each group had 30 minutes to discuss the case, reach a decision, and write a letter of advice. The experimenters took no part in the discussion. The subjects were instructed not to refer the problem to anyone else such as a social worker, psychiatrist, psychologist, or minister, since experience has shown that some groups send the subject of the case history to such a professional person and thus shorten the period of interaction.

After 30 minutes testing booklets were passed out to the subjects; as the subjects completed one section of the test procedure they were given instructions for the following section.

The groups in Phase 2 were treated in an identical manner as those in Phase 1 except that a new case history was used. (See appendix). Although the cases were
different a previous study (3°) has shown that they elicit approximately equal amounts of interaction.

MEASUREMENTS:

In this study measurements of sensitivity, leadership, and verbal behavior were obtained. The different measurements will be discussed in the above order.

Sensitivity. For this investigation the measurement of sensitivity by the Stop Scale was used.

Ratings on the Stop Scale were made on six traits which were suggested by Fiske ( ).

The subjects were asked to make the following ratings:

A--Rate himself and each other member of the group.

B--Estimate how he thought each other member of the group would rate himself.

C--Estimate how each other member would rate the subject himself.

D--Estimate how the group, as a whole would rate each member, including himself.

An eight point scale was used in order to avoid as much as possible mid-point ratings. (See appendix for complete scale).
The following scores were derived directly from the ratings.

1. HORS: How Others Rate Self: This score was obtained by summing the deviations between each subject's prediction of how each other subject would rate themselves and how each other subject actually rated himself. For example, subject A rated himself and predicted how subject B, C, D, and E would rate themselves. A direct comparison was then made of subject A's predicted rating of B, (C, D, and E) and B's (C's, D's, and E's) actual rating. The sum of the deviations between A's predicted rating and the actual ratings was A's HORS score. The same procedure was followed for each subject. All the empathy scores were derived in an analogous fashion.

2. HORM: How Others Rate Me: This score was derived from the sum of the deviations between how each subject predicted every other member of the group would rate him and how the other subjects actually did rate him.

3. GPS: Group Score: Each subject's score was derived by computing the deviations between each subject's estimate of the group average rating for each
individual and the actual average ratings for each individual (obtained from A above).

4. TD: Total Empathy Score: This score was determined by summing the HORS, HORM, and GPS scores for each individual.

Leadership. The measurement of leadership was obtained by asking each subject to rank each member of the group from one to five as to leadership ability. Each subject's rating of himself was omitted and the resulting ranks were tabulated. The four ranks could total from four to twenty for any given subject. A score of four would indicate a high degree of leadership ability while a score of twenty would indicate low leadership ability.

Revised Bales Interaction Analysis. A system of categorizing behavior, first suggested by Bales (4) was used to investigate the dynamics of group behavior. Using this method Bales was able to place any verbal expression into one or more categories such as asking questions, giving information, etc. Analysis of the categories used gave a picture of how individuals functioned in a group situation. It was also possible
to relate the verbal behavior to socio-metric measurements such as leadership, and describe the verbal behavior related to the measurement under investigation. The Heinicke revision of the Bales technique (38), purports to simplify the system and increase its usefulness in certain types of investigations. Therefore it was used in this study. (See appendix for complete description).

The effective use of a system of categorizing behavior depends upon training of the observers. Since the categories are operationally defined training consists essentially in observers reaching a high degree of agreement in placing statements in particular categories. Following the Heinicke procedure, two observers were trained in the technique of categorizing behavior. Before this investigation was begun several pilot groups were run for training purposes. This early training consisted of scoring the groups while they were in session and at the same time making a tape recording of the group. After the session the two observers would play back the tape to check the scoring. This was continued until a high degree of agreement between the two observers was achieved.

Following a technique suggested by Heinicke (37),
several reliability checks were made on the groups in this investigation. This was done by summing the number of responses in each category and doing a Spearman Rank Order correlation between the two observers. The average correlation between observers in categorizing behavior was .81.

There was an investigation of the stability of social sensitivity and the relationship between social sensitivity and verbal behavior. Comparisons were made between the results of this study and results of similar studies in terms of (1) Stability of self ratings, (2) Relationship between social sensitivity and leadership, (3) The relation between verbal behavior and leadership. On the basis of the comparisons made it is apparent that the subjects in this study tended to behave differently in the following ways:

TREATMENT OF DATA: There are 18 variables involved in the first part of the investigation: HORM, HORH, GP, TD, Cat. 1, Cat. 2, Cat. 3, Cat. 4, Cat. 5, Cat. 6, Cat. 7, Cat. 8, Cat. 9, Cat. 10, Inst. (Instigated speech), Rec'd. (Speech received), TP, (Total participation, Inst. + Rec'd.) and Ldr. (Leadership).

The Pearson's Product-Moment correlation between
the variables was used as an index of the degree of relationship.

In scoring of sensitivity and leadership there was an inverse relationship between the size of the score and the trait as named, while the other behavior indices have a direct relationship to the amount of the trait involved. The correlation coefficients for sensitivity and leadership were reflected so that the sign of the correlation would indicate the usual relationship between the variables.

Categories 11 and 12 were not used often enough in the groups under investigation to permit correlation with the other variables; they were therefore omitted. As might be anticipated many of the categories were not used by particular subjects. In order to facilitate statistical handling of the data a constant of five was added to all the verbal scores.

In order to compare the results of this study with previous findings the verbal indices of the leaders, non-leaders, and mid-group were determined. This was done by ranking the leadership scores for each group in Phase 1. Those individuals ranking one were considered leaders, those ranking five were non-leaders, those whose scores fell in between these ranks were placed in the mid-group.
Differences between the groups were evaluated by the Chi-square technique.

The second part of the study was concerned with the stability of empathy and leadership. The stability was determined by comparing the relationship of variables in HORM, HOP, GPS, and TD, scores, obtained in Phase 1.

The same procedure was followed for leadership scores in Phase 2. Since the hypothesis was that the results of this investigation into the reliability of the measurements would not differ from previous studies a one-tail test of significance was felt to be appropriate. Since some of the groups in Phase 2 had only four (rather than five) members the empathy and leadership scores were corrected for the size of the group, empathy scores by using a formula suggested by Guilford (33), leadership scores by a method suggested by Hull (40).
RESULTS

The results of this study are reported in the following series of tables. In order to facilitate the interpretation of the tables some explanation is appropriate.

Table 1 describes the comparison of inter-correlations between the sub-tests of sensitivity measurement as reported by Stolper and those found in this study. It should be pointed out that the same rating schedule, and procedures were used in both studies.

Table 2 describes a comparison of inter-correlations between sub-tests of sensitivity measurements in Phase 1 and Phase 2. It should be noted that the differences between Phase 1 and Phase 2 indicate that sub-tests inter-correlations are not stable.

The results of the inter-correlation of the 17 variables investigated in this study are reported in Table 3. It should be kept in mind that in determining the sensitivity and leadership scores the arrangement is such that the higher the score the less the trait demonstrated by the individual. Thus all the correlations concerning leadership and sensitivity have had their signs changed so that they reflect the usual relationship between variables rather than scores.
TABLE I

COMPARISON OF INTER-CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SUB-TESTS OF SENSITIVITY MEASUREMENT AS REPORTED BY STOLPER AND THOSE FOUND IN THIS STUDY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-tests</th>
<th>Dorsey</th>
<th>Stolper</th>
<th>t's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HORM vs HORS</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORM vs GPS</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORM vs TOTAL</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORS vs GPS</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORS vs TOTAL</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>1.568*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS vs TOTAL</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>5.58**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 40 N = 72

*Significant at 6% (df = 110)
**Significant at 1% level (df = 110)
TABLE 2

COMPARISON OF INTER-CORRELATIONS BETWEEN SUB-TESTS OF SENSITIVITY MEASUREMENTS IN PHASE 1 AND PHASE 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-TESTS</th>
<th>PHASE 1</th>
<th>PHASE 2</th>
<th>t's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HORM vs HORs</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORM vs GPS</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.132</td>
<td>2.155*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORM vs TOTAL</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.303</td>
<td>3.71*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORs vs GPS</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.159</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORs vs TOTAL</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>1.70**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS vs TOTAL</td>
<td>.267</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at 1% level (df = 82)
** Significant at 5% level

PHASE 1 N = 40
PHASE 2 N = 44
| Table 3 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HORM</th>
<th>HORR</th>
<th>GPS</th>
<th>TD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Ext.</th>
<th>Rep.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HORM</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.54&lt;</td>
<td>.82&lt;</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HORR</td>
<td>.42&lt;</td>
<td>.59&lt;</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.40&lt;</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.35&lt;</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TD</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.35&lt;</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = 5% level of significance  
** = 1% level of significance
Table 4 describes a comparison of test-retest correlations between sensitivity scores in this study and those reported by Bell ( ). It should be noted that a one-tail test of significance was used in the comparisons.

Table 6 describes the degree of response set as indicated by correlations between various ratings by the same subject. The first correlation indicates the relationship between the manner in which each subject rated himself in Phase 1 and Phase 2.

The second correlation indicates the relationship between the manner in which the first subject in each group rated himself and the third member of his group in Phase 1. The third correlation indicates the same relationship in Phase 2. It should be noted that the same individual was doing the rating in both Phase 1 and Phase 2 but in each case he was rating a different person.

The fourth correlation indicates the relationship between how the third person in Phase 1 was rated by the first person in the group, and how the same person rated the third member of his group in Phase 2. It should be pointed out again that the same person was doing the rating and a different person was rated.
### Table 4

**Comparison of Test-R Test Correlations Between Sensitivity Scores in Phase 1 and Phase 2 and Those Reported by Bell**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-TEST</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Bell Correlation</th>
<th>t's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HORM</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>1.21***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOR5</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.486</td>
<td>1.54**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3PS</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>1.87*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 5% level of significance
** 6% level of significance
*** 11% level of significance

*df* = 82

Dorsey N = 40  
Bell N = 44
TABLE 6

RESPONSE SET AS INDICATED BY CORRELATIONS BETWEEN VARIOUS RATINGS BY THE SAME SUBJECT IN THIS STUDY AND STOLPERS' RATINGS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Dorsey Correlation</th>
<th>Stolper Correlation</th>
<th>t's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRM 1 vs IRM 2</td>
<td>.80**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW SUBJECTS RATED SELF AND 3rd MEMBER OF GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 1</td>
<td>.91**</td>
<td>.51**</td>
<td>6.34*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW SUBJECT RATED SELF AND 3rd MEMBER OF GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 2</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOW SUBJECT RATED 3rd MEMBER PHASE 1 vs 3rd MEMBER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHASE 2 (Different person)</td>
<td>.79*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant of 1% level

-N = 246

**N = 144
DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was two-fold: (1) To investigate the relationship between social sensitivity and various types of verbal behavior; (2) to investigate the stability of the sensitivity measurements.

Two of the basic problems of Science are (1) to establish testable hypotheses; (2) to develop adequate measuring instruments for testing the hypotheses. In order to do this the results of investigations using the same measuring instruments under similar conditions should be compared in order to check the reliability of the measuring instruments and the stability of relationships. In order to insure comparability of data this study was designed so that it repeated some aspects of previous investigations; then proceeded to its own specific area of interest.

The internal and external relationships in this study were compared with the internal and external relationships reported in previous studies. Immediate concern was with the inter-correlation of the various sub-tests which make up the measure of sensitivity.

An inspection of the inter-correlation between the variables which make up the sensitivity measurement
suggests that the sample in this study behaved differently from those used in previous studies (58) (10).

Table 1 indicates the inter-correlation of the sub-tests compromising the sensitivity measurements as reported by Stolper and those found in the present investigation. Student's t's were computed and indicated that there is a significant difference between two of the correlations. One of the t's is significant at the 1% level while another is significant at 5% level.

In view of the above differences a careful examination of the rating behavior of the subjects was made. A previous study (7) has indicated that subjects tend to change their self-ratings when moved to new groups. Table 5 indicates that the subjects in this study were highly consistent in their self-ratings when placed in new groups. The results of a previous study and those found in this study are compared by means of Student t.

An inspection of the rating schedules of the subjects in the present investigation indicates that there is a high degree of similarity between self-ratings and the ratings made of other individuals. In order to check this further a comparison was made of each individual's self-rating and the manner in which he rated
TABLE 5

COMPARISON BETWEEN TEST-RETEST CORRELATIONS OF SELF-RATINGS AND TEST-RETEST OF LEADERSHIP SCORES AND COMPARABLE RATINGS BY BELL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bosley</th>
<th>Bell</th>
<th>t's</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1 vs Item 2</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 1 vs Item 3</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>2.20*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at 1% level

df = 69

df = 69
the third member of his group. Table 6 indicates that there is a high degree of correlation. A comparison of the results of this correlation with a similar one carried out on Stolper's data indicated that there is a difference between the two sets of data that is significant at the 1% level of confidence.

Further investigation of the group under study revealed that the consistency of leadership position is different from that reported by Bell and French (8) in a previous investigation. (See Table 5).

The results thus far reported strongly suggest that the behavior of the sample used in this study is unlike that reported in other studies. Nevertheless if the ability to predict others' responses by any means, sensitivity or projection, facilitates group interaction the correlations should be important. The results of the correlations found in this investigation are reported in Table 5.

In view of the atypical nature of the sample used in this study, great care should be used in interpreting the results. The results indicate that the relationship between HORM and category 4 (Suggesting Solution) approaches significance. There is a significant relationship between HORS and category 7 (Agree) and category 10.
(Tension release). GPS is significantly related to category 5 (Giving orientation). The TD score is significantly related to category 8 (Disagree).

The few correlations that are significant or approach significance should be interpreted as indicating trends. Since over 100 correlations were computed these same relationships could have arisen by chance.

Since it is difficult to explain this pattern of significant relationship in a meaningful way, especially in view of previously reported evidence, there was a further investigation of the differences between the results of this study and the results reported in other studies.

In similar studies (37, 49, 5) other investigators have consistently reported differences in the verbal behavior of leaders and non-leaders. A Chi-square was computed comparing the proportion of frequencies that the leaders, non-leaders, and mid-groups used in the different categories. The resulting Chi-square of 10.35, df = 16, indicates that there are no significant differences among the groups. Another Chi-square was computed comparing leaders and non-leaders as to the type of verbal behavior expressed during the group discussion. Following Bales' suggestion, categories one through five were considered as task oriented, categories six through
ten were considered as socially or emotionally oriented. The resulting Chi-square of 24.03, df = 1, is significant at the .01 level of confidence. The difference between the two groups seem to indicate that the non-leaders were more concerned with task oriented behavior. This is contradictory to results reported in previous studies (37, 49).

In view of the low reliability of the sensitivity measurement it was not considered fruitful to compute a correlation matrix for the data collected in Phase 2 of this investigation. Accordingly only macro-analysis was performed except that Phase 1 investigation was repeated in Phase 2.

A correlation was computed comparing the self-ratings of each individual with his rating of the third member of the group. The results are reported in Table 3. It should be pointed out that these results are comparable to the same type of analysis made in Phase 1, Table 3.

A Chi-square comparing the verbal behavior of the four and five man groups in Phase 2 was computed. The resulting Chi-square of 3.8334, df = 9, indicates that there is no significant difference between the two groups. Sales' (4) reports in a previous study that there is a
tendency for larger groups to have a significantly greater proportion of verbal behavior categorized in categories 1 and 4, while categories 7, and 3 tend to decrease. As indicated above, these results differ from those found in this study.

Apparently the subjects in this study behaved differently from previously reported investigations in the following ways:

1. They behaved differently in their rating behavior. That is, they tended to rate every one on all the scales in the same manner that they rated themselves.

2. The subjects in this study tended to rate themselves the same when placed in new groups. Other studies report that subjects tend to rate themselves differently when moved to new groups.

3. The verbal behavior of the leaders was atypical when compared to other groups. Other studies indicate that leaders tend to have a higher proportion of verbal behavior categorized in the task areas. The leaders in this study did not differ significantly from non-leaders.

Group size does not affect interaction pattern.

Inasmuch as such deviant results were not anticipated it is not possible to pinpoint the source of error variance. It is nonetheless appropriate that some attempt
be made to explain these findings. In view of Bass' (6) findings with the acquiescence test, and Tetzlaf's previous study (58) using the same verbal categories, with students of Southern University as subjects, the atypical results might at first glance be thought to be partially explained by regional differences in behavior. However, the differences in the inter-correlations between sub-tests of the sensitivity measure found here and those reported in other studies using Southern University students as subjects (58) (60) (32) mitigate against this hypothesis as a full explanation of the differences.

It is apparent that the subjects in the present investigation behaved differently from those in any other reported study. The instructions given the subjects, the task and external cues given the subjects were identical with phase used by Stolper, Hall and Heinicke and very similar to those used by Bales.

If we are to explain the unique behavior of the subjects in this study, we must think in terms of personality dynamics. Let us review the essential aspects of the situation. In general the subjects were presented with an ambiguous situation, under the stress that is always induced by leaderless group discussions. Further
stress was induced by the requirement that the subjects rate themselves and others and at the same time being aware of others rating them.

Such conditions are nearly ideal for facilitating the phenomenon of response set (14) (19). Instead of rating others on their actual traits the subjects turn from external cues that are ambiguous and threatening to internal cues that are safer. Future studies utilizing the techniques outlined herein might find it extremely valuable to investigate the concept of response set.

One of the more important empirical findings of this study concerns the hypothesis that the ability to predict others' responses facilitates interaction. Previous writers (25) (29) have not been clear in defining how the predictions should be made. The predictions may be made on the basis of projection, or on the basis of social sensitivity.

If one accepts the author's definition of rating others the same as self as projection and leadership as an index of adjustment, this study indicates that predicting others' behavior on the basis of projection does not facilitate interaction.
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate the stability of sensitivity and its relation to verbal behavior. The Stop Scale was used as a measure of Social Sensitivity. The Bales system of categorizing behavior was used to record the verbal behavior of the subjects.

Thirteen leaderless groups were used in Phase 1 of the investigation. Twelve leaderless groups were used in Phase 2.

1. They behaved differently in their rating behavior. That is, they tended to rate everyone on all the scales in the same manner that they rated themselves.

2. The subjects in this study tended to rate themselves the same when placed in new groups. Other studies report that subjects tend to change their self-ratings when placed in new groups.

3. The verbal behavior of the leaders was atypical when compared to other groups. Other studies indicate that leaders tend to have a higher proportion of verbal behavior categorized in the task area.

In hypothesizing possible reasons for the disparity between the results of this study and comparable investigations regional differences and response set concepts were discussed.
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CASE HISTORY

Phase I

ALLAN AND MARIAN

Allan and Marian had been happily married for several years before the war when Allan was drafted and sent overseas. They had made it a part of their marriage to tell each other everything and withhold nothing.

At first, while in England, Allan refused to go out on liberty and remained in the barracks. But the place was so empty on week-ends, that Allan could not stand it, so one time he went out with the boys and soon found himself at a dance. There he met a girl whom he liked very much. One thing led to another and soon he was spending his week-end liberties at her apartment. She knew he was married and fully expected him to return to his wife when the war was over, but she enjoyed his company and so she continued to live with him on week-ends.

But Allan could not bring himself to write about this affair to his wife; he felt he could make her understand if he told her himself. So he waited until the war was over and he returned home. After a time he started a discussion which led up to the subject, but his wife started talking about the horrible married men who were unfaithful to their wives and said she was glad he wasn't
one of them and that he always told her everything.

Then Allan began getting letters from the girl asking for food, as the rationing was very strict over there.

Allan felt very guilty and anxious every time he was with Marian. This secret between them was destroying his peace of mind and the former happiness he had found in marriage, yet he felt he did not dare tell Marian of his unfaithfulness. What should Allan do?
CASE HISTORY

Phase 2

FRANK

Frank is a quite intelligent boy of part Negro parents. He had a strong desire to become a doctor. Though his father clearly shows his Negro heritage, Frank and his mother can easily pass as white. Frank decides to try passing (as a white) without knowledge of his parents, for they are highly critical of Negroes who try to "pass". He applies for college and enters as a white student and never tells anyone there that he is part Negro. He is very popular at college and gets along well with both men and women students, is an officer in several clubs, and is a good student. He is happier than he has ever been before in his entire life. He is very deeply attached to his family, but since he has gone a great distance to college he can rarely see them. One day he gets a letter from his parents saying his father is taking his mother on a business trip near the college and they are looking forward to spending a weekend with Frank at the college. What should Frank do?
INSTRUCTIONS TO SUBJECTS

"As you know this is a discussion group. We are interested in discussion groups and how they work, how people in a group arrive at a solution to a problem. In a few minutes we are going to ask you to discuss a problem just as you would discuss it in your home, your dormitory, or your fraternity."

"You will notice the lettered cards in front of you on the chair. The letter on the card will be your name to everyone during the discussion."

"Here is the problem for discussion." (The examiner distributes the case history.)

"Read the problem silently while I read it aloud."

"You are to get together as a group and decide upon a solution to______'s problem. You will have 30 minutes in which to discuss the problem and arrive upon a solution on the basis of the information which you have. I will tell you when you have five minutes left. In your solution do not refer the problem to anyone else such as, a psychiatrist, a counselor, or a psychologist. Do you have any questions?"

______________________

(After the discussion is concluded the test booklet is distributed with trait sheet.)
"Now, on the next pages, first rate yourself, then rate each of the other members of the group on the six traits listed. Note that the desirable end of the scale is not always in the same position. A description of each of the traits is given on the trait sheets which you now have." (The examiner reads examples of several traits).

"Each pair of factors described represents opposite ends of the rating scale of 1-9. Use those descriptions in all of your ratings, and be sure to rate each member of the group. The order in which you are to rate these individuals is indicated at the top of each page. The ratings are made by circling one of the numbers from 1-9."

(After the subjects complete first section of the booklet, the second section is distributed).

"Now, I'd like you to try to figure out how each other person in the group rated himself on these same six traits. Attempt to rate the individual indicated at the top of each sheet as he would rate himself. For example, how would A rate A, how would B rate B. You probably will not be completely accurate but do as well as you can, and rate each person for each trait."

(After the subjects complete second section of the booklet, the third section is distributed).
"On these pages I'd like you to try to figure out how each member of the group rated you on the six traits. For example, if your letter were C, then, how would A rate C, how would B rate C, etc. Do as well as you can, and rate each person for each trait."

(After the subjects complete third section of the booklet, the fourth section is distributed).

"Now, I'd like you to rate each individual in the group, including yourself, as you think the group would rate him or her. That is, what do you think the average rating of the group would be for each person, on each of the six traits? In other words, how do you think the group will rate A, how do you think the group will rate C, etc. You probably will not be completely accurate, but do as well as you can and rate each member."

"Now, I want you to rate each member of the group as to leadership ability. The ranks will go from 1, for the individual you most prefer to have as leader, to 5, for the individual you least prefer. List your preferences on the sheet labeled leadership according to color."
"MODIFIED DYMOND SCALE"

Name________________________________________ Color_______________________

How would you rate on:

I. Socially Adaptable Somewhat Adaptable Less Adaptable Socially Unadaptable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

II. Complete Moderate Little No Emotional Control Emotional Control Emotional Control
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

III. Non-conforming Conforming Conforming
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

IV. Intellectually Inquiring Somewhat Inquiring Less Inquiring Intellectually Uninquiring
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

V. Unconfident in Self-expression Somewhat Confident Confident in Self-expression
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

VI. Somewhat Predictable Less Predictable Unpredictable
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
TRAIT SHEET

I. SOCIAL ADAPTABILITY
   Cheerful, optimistic, enthusiastic
   Talkative, initiative in conversation
   Adventurous, ready for emergencies
   Adaptable, can modify behavior, compromise
   Peaceful, calm, serene

   NON-ADAP-TABILITY
   Depressed, does not easily smile or laugh
   Silent, appears occupied with thoughts
   Cautious, avoids the strange and new
   Rigid, lives by routine, and by own ideas
   Worrying, anxious, sensitive

II. EMOTIONAL CONTROL
    Unshakable poise, self-possessed
    under emotional irritation
    Self-sufficient, meets frustrations alone
    Peaceful, calm, serene
    Neither over nor under expressive

   NON-CONTROL
   Excitable, easily upset and embarrassed, blushes
   Dependent, seeks constant attention
   Sensitive, worries constantly
   Extremes of emotional expression, either disinterested or over-expressive

III. NON-CONFORMITY
    "Difficult", always raises objections, does not join in
    Frivolous, thoughtless, unaware of responsibilities
    Suspicious of others and their feelings toward him, feels persecuted
    Self-centered, selfish
    Not conscientious, just, honest, or unselfish

   CONFORMITY
   Cooperative, always, despite difficulties
   Accepts appropriate responsibilities of purpose
   Trustful, not suspicious, but not gullible
   Good-natured, easy-going, generous
   Conscientious, ideals of truthfulness, honesty, unselfishness
IV. INQUIRING INTELLECT
Broad interests, well-informed
Independent-minded, adopts definite
position, makes up own mind
Imagination: rich, vivid

UNINQUIRING INTELLECT
Narrow, simple interests, uninformed
Dependent-minded, accepts others
opinions, unsure of own
Lack of imagination, does not respond
to subtleties

V. UNCONFIDENT IN SELF-EXPRESSION
Submissive, retiring, lets people have
own way
Silent, introspective, occupied with
thoughts
Secretive, reserved, keeps feelings to
self
Extremes of overt interest in opposite
sex; either very marked or slight

CONFIDENT SELF-EXPRESSION
Assertive, boastful, tends to influence
associates
Talks a great deal to everyone
Frank, expressive
Neither marked slight nor marked over-
interest in opposite sex

VI. PREDICTABILITY
Consistent in day to day attitudes and
behavior

UNPREDICTABILITY
Unpredictable moods and impulses,
changes in attitudes and behavior
On this sheet of paper indicate the degree of leadership demonstrated by each member of the group. Do this by listing each member of the group on the lines below. Identify the group member by means of the colored scarf.

List the person you considered to have demonstrated the greatest amount of leadership 1st, the person who demonstrated the next greatest amount 2nd, etc. Be sure to include yourself.

1st ____________________
2nd ____________________
3rd ____________________
4th ____________________
5th ____________________
INTERACTION ANALYSIS

General considerations

In this set of categories, the basic frame of reference will be a very immediate one; as Bales says, we are here concerned with relating the present act to the immediately preceding and the immediately following act. The primary referent of the observer in empathizing shall be the intent of the actor or speaker. It will become obvious however that such interpretation is dependent on the context of the act and thus on the acts of the others. The same cues of scoring shall be in general: (1) The surface and immediate meaning of the statement; the observer need not try to keep the overall idea context in his mind; (2) The tone of the voice; and (3) Any accompanying gestures. These cues will be defined more exactly in the definitions.

Rather than use as the scoring unit the whole English sentence, it would seem psychologically more real to begin a new unit only when a shift in scoring is called for and when of course a new speaker begins.

As for the problem of who-to-whom scoring, the meaning of the statement in context should be the primary guide. Usually also the speaker turns to, or looks at the
receiver. Another cue is the person who last spoke; he is very likely to be the next receiver. There will be cases where the initiator will be responding to the speech of one person, perhaps objecting to what he said, but will actually be looking at somebody else, from whom he expects the next response, or whose reactions he wants to get. In this case one score should be recorded for the objection to the first person, and another score should be recorded for the look seeking for the approval or opinion of the second. If the speaker changes the direction in the middle of a participation unit (one speech), the score should be noted again with the new direction. In cases where the act is addressed to more than two persons, use the symbol 0. Where more than two persons act at once also use 0; e.g., when all laugh use 0-0; when all agree with 1 use 0-1. In cases where a communication is addressed by one member to another, but the interaction refers to a third as the receiver, especially when some emotional animus of the remark is directed toward the third, score the remark 1-3, omitting the second person. For example, if person 1 says to person 2, "I think person three's remarks are stupid", the interaction is scored 1-3 in category 11. In cases where number 1 whispers or speaks aside to member 2 when the rest of the group is working on a problem and the Observer is unable to determine the content of the act, he scores the act 1-0 in category 17. If
person 2 answers, he is scored 2-0 in category 1 also.
If in an ordinary interaction between 1 and 2, person 1 makes an emotionally weighted remark about an absent person, the interaction is scored 1-x in the appropriate category, and the fact that the immediate communication is with person 2 is ignored. For purposes of the present experiments, the following numbers will be used:

1. yellow
2. green (The costs are in order of size.)
3. red
4. purple
5. blue

Resume of Category List A

A. Task Area

1. Asks question, seeks knowledge in a neutral manner.
2. Gives information, facts.
3. Gives opinion, evaluation, analy is, feeling.
4. Suggests solution.
5. Gives orientation, repeats, clarifies.
6. Requests activity.

B. Social-Emotional Area

7. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies.
Examples: "How old did we decide John was?"

"What do the instructions say about this?"

The subject may also ask in a non-threatening, non-directive manner, "or an expression of opinion, feeling, or integration.

Examples: "Do you agree with that?" (With no implications of either controlling (6), or asking for help (0)

"Why do you feel that way?"

"How do you interpret that?"

Finally the subject may ask for a solution or direction as to ways and means in an emotionally neutral fashion.

Examples: "What should we do next?"

"I wonder how Charles is going to get rid of this?"

"What can we do about this?"

It should be noted that statements even though in question form may have other intents. "Don't you think we ought to do this?" will probably be scored as (6); "What have we got so far" will probably be scored as (5); and "Do you think this should be interpreted this way?" will probably be scored as (3). Where the observer is in
doubt as to whether the intent is simply to question or some other intent, it is better to score the other intent.

2. **Gives information, facts**

The subject presents without inference or interpretation a factual report concerning himself, the group, or some element of the situation. This should be distinguished from giving facts with the intent of orienting (O), giving opinion (I), or when used directly in an emotional context. When, however, the person first disagrees and then goes on to give facts to support his disagreement, the facts are scored as (O), not (O). Examples: "It says here that Charles was fifteen years old."

"I don't think so, (O) because here it says that — (2)."

"I have been in the Navy."

3. **Gives opinion, evaluation, analysis, feeling**

The subject makes some kind of inferential or evaluative statement in a relatively objective fashion. This may include expressions of aspirations, wishes, or obligations; feelings, opinions, hypotheses or insights concerning the self, other individuals or the group, or the nature of the problem situation. Attempts to
explore further or test such interpretations are included, so long as they are emotionally neutral and inferential. If another person disagrees during this process and the subject continues, his continuation of the same argument is scored (g) initially. If the other person agrees, the subject's continuation is scored as (7). If a person first agrees or disagrees, and then goes on to say why in his judgment his position is correct, the supporting opinions are scored (7), not (7) or (8).

Examples:

"I wish we had more information on this."

"I think we ought to be fair about that."

"This sounds to me like a problem we discussed in class—oh now I remember."

"I suspect this would result in ——."

"Charles' trouble seems to be that ——."

"From the description I should judge he was 20 years."

"If he has these beliefs, he should certainly stick to them."

"I don't think so (8), because in my opinion." (3)
4. **Suggests solution**

Subjects gives suggestion as to how problem should be solved, e.g. in a discussion problem what Charles should do, or how his problem should be resolved. Distinguish from (6) which is concerned with what the group or some member of it should do. Should also be distinguished from (7) in that it is concerned with definite proposals for solution of the problem.

Examples:  "I think that Charles should do this."

"Charles ought to go to a clinical psychologist."

"He ought to either go see a priest or a psychologist."

Note: If any of the above examples should appear again in similar form later on in the discussion, they will again be scored as (4).

5. **Gives orientation, repeats, clarifies**

Summarizing: Any attempt to bring various previous contributions together; a synthesis of what the group has accomplished in order to terminate a phase of, or the total problem solving process. May be in oral or written form.

Examples:  "We have three things."
"I guess that takes care of that."

"What we have been saying seems to add up to this."

"Here's what I put down in regard to that."

Showing relevance: Any indication of how a present contribution relates to the group task. Any effort to enlighten other members concerning problem now being discussed, or show what is needed at the moment.

Examples: "I think that is related to Green's point."

"We are discussing that now."

"Now we are speculating."

"Aren't we getting off the track a bit?" (no implication of attack.)

Giving further perspective: Indicating the general direction in which the group is going. Outlining a problem and the steps which seem to be involved in reaching it, or any indication of what steps are still left once the discussion has already proceeded.

Examples: "Here's the situation."

"I think we can do this in two steps."

"I think that is what we are supposed to do."

"We'll get to that later."

"I think that is the next thing we ought to solve."
This category also includes any repetition or clarification which attempts to facilitate the flow of communication; usually made in answer to a request for such; e.g., "What did you say?" or "I don't quite get that, please explain," are the kind of requests which are likely to draw forth the above.

Orientation is likely to be confused with (c); in case of conflict score orientation first.

6. Requests activity, suggestions action

Any request for action on the part of others, or offer to take action oneself. Does not include asking another who has not been participating, to participate (1); nor does it include asking another to give opinion, information, possible solution (4). It is more directly concerned with the speeding up and controlling the group process, and is likely to be directed at the group as a whole. It includes also such activities as conciliating and comprising if given in the form suggested by the examples below. Also active asking for agreement when done to facilitate the process and when directed at the group should be scored here.

Examples: "Well, do you want me to read this?"

"Why don't we go around the room?"

"I think it would be a good idea if we
"Let's not argue."

"Exactly what is our problem? (as if to say, "Let's focus on the problem.")"

"Let me do that."

"Let's try to pull these things together" (in the sense of asking for summary giving.)

"Start out with you."

"Take a stand one way or the other."

"Can we agree on this?"

B. Social-Emotional Area

7. Agrees, shows passive acceptance, understands, concurs, complies

Any statement or gesture the intent of which is to say "go ahead" or "I'm willing to go along" - the green light so to speak. Any sign of understanding either by direct statement, "Oh, I see," or by repeating or clarifying a previous statement in a positive tone: "You mean - ." Also includes giving additional evidence to support a previous statement: "I've seen the same thing happen many times." In other words, giving a fact or an opinion which expresses agreement (without direct statement) is scored agreement. Further
facts or opinions in the same speech are scored as such.

Examples: "That's correct," or "Yah," or "that's okay" on reaction to categories two through five.
"Let's do that," or "Okay." in reaction to six.

3. **Disagrees:** shows passive rejection

Any statement the intent of which is to say "stop", or "I'm not willing to go along" - the red light. The milder degrees of disagreement, disbelief, astonishment, or incredulity, and all the milder forms of argumentation. The rule concerning facts or opinions stated in category (2) holds in parallel fashion for disagreement.

Examples: "According to a book I read it is really ——" in reaction to (2).
"It seems to me that another interpretation is better in reaction to (3).
"Is that really going to solve anything though?" in reaction to (4).
"I don't think that summary is complete." in reaction to (5).
"Well, do we have to do that." in reaction to (6).
9. **Shows tension, insecurity, defference, asks for help.**

Cues for scoring tension are: Rapid excited repetition, stuttering unless habitual, excess qualification, very incoherent statements especially when person has been attacked. In general tension is most likely to occur in an argumentative context.

This category also includes the various forms of defference: From such tentative indications as "I don’t know about this," to such active twining in as "Yes I can see where I was wrong". It may also occur in certain very self-disparaging forms: "I ought to be kicked for doing something like that." or "I am making up for my past sins."

Asking for help is included also. It should be distinguished from active attempts to control such as: "May I read this?" or "Can we agree on this?" It should also be distinguished from asking for opinion when the latter is done in a rather neutral and matter-of-fact way. Then the following are said in a somewhat pleading tone, they can be considered asking for help: "Don’t you
agree with me?" and "Could I say something please?"

Laughter is also scored as tension when no one has told a joke, and when the observer has other reasons to feel that the actor is probably tense.

10. Shows tension release, jokes laughs, shows satisfaction

Any laughter or statement which arouses laughter except as noted under (9). Often an attempt to ease over a conflict situation. If the element of aggression is stronger than the element of friendliness, score under (11).

Example: 1-2 "I guess that takes care of Charles - so Charles walks in," (general laughter) Score 1-2 under cat. 10; and 0-0 under 10.

11. Shows antagonism, deflates other's status, defends or asserts self, denies help.

Explicit attacks on the other's ego: not a mere "stop". Includes any jokes, controls, or rejection which have a pronounced aggressive component. Any act indicating self-satisfaction, pompousness, or smugness; any indication that the actor is shocked, disgusted, or insulted. Any indication of vengeance, or envy. Any depreciation or indication of other's
Inferiority; any criticism. Also damning, slandering, tricking, and combative behavior. Includes also such signs of formativty as unwillingness to recognize another's presence, playing "hard to get", and being in general rather exclusive and cool: "Oh, you damn peasants." In short any indications of aggression.

Examples: "You look like Barney Google."

"I think you're all wet."

"You're a dope."

"I disagree with you."

"You had better do this or else."

"Well, I am an anthropology student, and I ought to know."

"I don't see how you can possibly do a thing like that."

13. Shows solidarity, raises other's status, gives help, reward.

The intent of the statement is to say "You're okay", or "I like you" rather than just "go ahead". Any strong approval of another. Also includes the everyday cordial-thanking, befriending, talking about the weather. Any attempt to be courteous, diplomatic, and allay conflict. In short any act
of friendliness or attempts to restore friendliness.

Examples: "That's a very good idea."
"I think you're absolutely right."
"I think Red had a good idea."
"I think Blue has given the best solution."

This category also includes any positive reactions to a request for help.

Examples: ("Could I say something please?") "Yes, go ahead."
("Do you agree with me?") "Yes, absolutely."

Finally any active attempt to draw another person out who has not been speaking very much, can be interpreted as a solidarity building act. Should be distinguished from requesting activity and asking opinion.

Example: "Red, what do you think about this?"

17. Goes out of Field

Every time the red light goes on, the observer should take a check to see if any person is no longer actively participating. Cues are as follows:
No verbal contributions; slouching, yawning, closing eyes, daydreaming, no attempt to follow discussion by looking at the speakers; doodling very intently or playing with some gadget; mumbling to self or another member; active withdrawal such as: I quit.
| Subject | Group Number | Group Size | HPRM | HPRS | GPS | TD | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total Inst. | Total Spoke | Total Part. | Ltr. |
|---------|--------------|------------|------|------|-----|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|-----------|-------------|-------------|-----------|
| 61      | Phase 1-13   | Phase 1-5  | 28   | 32   | 26  | 86 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18          | 20          | 20         | 11        |
| 62      | 2-6          | 2-5        | 43   | 27   | 32  | 102| 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18          | 20          | 20         | 4         |
| 63      | 2-1          | 2-5        | 41   | 25   | 15  | 62 | 1 | 1 | 15| 2 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 39          | 39          | 76         | 7         |
| 64      | 1-13         | 1-5        | 46   | 33   | 36  | 115| 1 | 1 | 8  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 20         | 23          | 16         | 13        |
| 65      | 2-2          | 2-4        | 47   | 40   | 35  | 122| 1 | 1 | 8  | 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 20         | 23          | 16         | 13        |
| 66      | 2-9          | 2-5        | 38   | 26   | 25  | 89 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 34          | 24          | 46         | 11        |
| 67      | 1-1          | 1-5        | 40   | 33   | 36  | 115| 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 33          | 30          | 63         | 7         |
| 68      | 2-3          | 2-5        | 39   | 22   | 23  | 73 | 2 | 2 | 11 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 33          | 30          | 63         | 7         |
| 69      | 2-7          | 2-4        | 39   | 42   | 31  | 101| 2 | 3 | 19 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 3 | 45          | 47          | 92         | 9         |

Inst. = Instigated Speech
Recd. = Speech received
Part. = Amount of participation (Inst. + Recd.)
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