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ABSTRACT

This study was designed to instruct nursing supervisors in general semantics principles and to observe the effects upon their subordinates. The selected supervisors were chosen by random sample, and classes were arranged to provide a ten-hour intensive general semantics indoctrination. Classes convened for two hours each week for five consecutive weeks.

The objective of the study was to answer three specific questions.

Does supervisory knowledge of general semantics principles:
1. Benefit the supervisor-subordinate relationship?
2. Influence subordinate attitude toward hospital administration?
3. Affect the subordinates' opinion of his work environment?

Data were accumulated by semantic differential bi-polar adjective questionnaires issued to 210 hospital subordinates. Sixty-five employees were designated control group and were composed of subordinates whose supervisors were excluded from the general semantics course.

The questionnaires were administered: (1) Before the course in general semantics was taught, (2) Immediately after the course was taught, and (3) One month after the course was completed. Data coding and three way analysis of variance were performed.

It was concluded that in the short run no significant difference
between supervisor and subordinate attitudes was evident. Some belief existed that close work relationships may tend to negate immediate changes between supervisor and subordinate relationships. Perhaps in the long run, a prolonged general semantics instructional program may influence the mutual supervisor-subordinate atmosphere in a more positive manner.

However, it was determined that subordinate attitude toward hospital administration improved as did the opinion of the hospital work environment.

Using the collected and analyzed data it was found that a priori reasons existed to accept the implication that general semantics taught to hospital nursing supervisors may improve organizational climate.

Some conclusions involved the suggestion that management consider promoting general semantics as a permanent part of their organized training program. Also, it was perceived that normal personnel attrition, growth, new employees, et cetera, created an educational opportunity to be continued throughout the employee's tenure.

One of the important views adopted by this research is that applied general semantics principles will improve, to some extent, organizational environment.

A program of teaching general semantics principles to
organizational employees may serve to help alleviate miscommunication, if applied seriously and continuously.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

This dissertation is concerned with an experimental study of teaching general semantics to supervisory personnel and the observed effects upon subordinate employees. The subject trainees were nursing supervisors in a selected Texas hospital.

A primary objective of this study was to evaluate the effect of introducing the discipline of general semantics into an active organizational environment. Nursing supervisors were chosen in a random manner and subjected to classroom training through lectures, role playing exercises, and by directed class discussion. The general semantics sessions were structured and taught as a functional and applicable management resource.

The logic on which this study was initiated is based on the similarity between the Hawthorne studies and general semantics concepts. The Hawthorne studies, conducted between the years 1924 and 1932, have received the acclaim and acceptance of practicing managers and academicians since its inception.

General semantics concepts were formulated between the years 1924 and 1933. The movement approximates a time frame closely paralleling that of the Hawthorne studies. General semantics emphasizes relationships between language and behavior in a human environment which, in essence, follows a basic Hawthorne derivative. The Hawthorne
studies evolved as a discipline designed to promote a better understanding between people in a work environment.

The value of Hawthorne to this study, which is concerned with applied general semantics principles, is that general semantics may be used by management to improve organizational climate. This study represents an effort to evaluate the impact of a general semantics training program taught to responsible supervisory personnel in a selected organization.

The significance of this study is the unanswered question of general semantics values to the organizational environment. While accepting the obvious benefits of Hawthorne knowledge to the modern business world, the task of this study is to recognize and to use the concepts of general semantics as a promotable management resource. In this study, the utilization of general semantics as a tool of management may serve to establish it as a useful discipline to be used in the market place.

The Field of Investigation

The concept of general semantics was grounded in the same fertile time period that spawned the human relations movement. The Hawthorne studies of the middle 1920's to middle 1930's can be equated to the formulation of general semantics ideas developed by Count Alfred Habdank Korzybski during the same time frame. The Hawthorne studies recognize man as being socially oriented, while general semantics recognizes the relationship between language, thought, and human behavior.
The following background information supports the related historical evolution of the Hawthorne studies and general semantics concepts. In this chapter, the duality of the separate disciplines will be reviewed in historical context under the topic headings of "The Hawthorne Studies", and "The Formulation of General Semantics." The two primary thoughts will be merged later in the chapter under the topic heading, "An Emerging Concept."

A point of interest in the following discussion is in the separate, but similar, histories of both the Hawthorne studies and general semantics. The implications are that both disciplines may be valuable managerial tools, but that general semantics has yet to be discovered and applied.

The Hawthorne Studies

In November 1924, officials at the Hawthorne Plant of Western Electric Company initiated a series of experiments. The research, conducted at the Chicago works, was designed to study the relationship between physical environment and worker efficiency. Although the experiments fell short of answering the specific question of the relationship between environment and efficiency, the results helped to confirm a growing realization that more knowledge concerning problems involving human factors was needed.

From this study emerged the first truly objective proof of the positive correlation between productivity and employee participation
in the decision affecting him and his work.¹

The information gathered by Elton Mayo and his research staff indicated that there were non-economic motives, interests, and processes fundamental to explaining human behavior in organizations. Leon C. Megginson, for example, accurately stated that "... a business organization is in reality a social system."²

Hawthorne became the background for the human relations movement which evolved into the neoclassical theory of management thought. The neoclassical premise contrasted the social implications derived from Hawthorne to the Protestant ethic concepts of classical theory. Classical theory, generally accepted during the pre-Hawthorne period, recognized man primarily as an economic being. Neoclassical theory put human relations into proper management focus. C. S. George concluded that a basic value to management would be the knowledge that "... workers constituted a culture of their own that could be observed and analyzed."³

The study of organizations was generally dominated in the first quarter of the twentieth century by the interests and approaches


to the human relations school. Chester Barnard accepted the importance of individual value systems and pointed out their values to the total organization structure. He recognized human relationships in his organizational concept from which evolved the Acceptance Theory of Authority Principle. Barnard's theme was that people allowed themselves to be supervised, and he labeled the action, bottom-up-authority.  

The 1930's era was dominated by the human relations school of thought and eventually evolved into two separate aspects of viewing organization behavior which were the psychological and sociological concepts. The 1940's era was dominated by psychological and sociological values based on management thought derived from the Hawthorne study.

The human relations school of the 1930's to the late 1940's continued to gain academic and organizational momentum into the fifties. People-oriented ideas permeated management thought, as characterized by increased consciousness of human values. Katz and Kahn pointed out that an organization lives only so long as people are induced to be members and to perform as such. In 1957, Argyris stated that all human behavior in an organization may be affected by one or more individual, informal group, or formal organizational

---


factors. The human factor was isolated by Roethlisberger and Dickson as one of the most significant products of the Hawthorne experiments. Employees and their social relationships, both in the formal and informal organization, indicated that people occupy a particular position in the total social network. March and Simon suggested that management replace the classical description of the employee, as an instrument, with a new abstraction recognizing the wants, motives, and drives of organization members.

Drucker stated that a key to organization and personnel success is to be found when management provides all the necessary essentials for employee self-development. In keeping with the Hawthorne tradition, Herzberg referred to the inherent values of human nature, stating that man existed, not in a vacuum, but as a duality. Another writer spoke of the organization as having "social responsibility."

---


social interaction in a formal organization transforms the group into an entity which is greater than the sum of the individuals in the group.

Seiler emphasized the dynamic interplay of forces in a never ending systematic relationship. His thoughts concluded that everything is related to everything else in such a way that a change in any one thing produces a change in everything else. Seiler felt that each person is unique and that his uniqueness has continuity through time and across situations.11

The basic task of managers is to recognize "that management will make full use of the potential capacities of its human resources only when each person in an organization is a member of one or more effectively functioning work groups that have a high degree of group loyalty, effective skills of interaction, and high performance goals."12

The results isolated at Western Electric have been eagerly embraced by managers and academicians as a guide to better understand human relations in the organizational climate. The overall effect to management thought has been dramatic and swift. According to Business Week, general acceptance of the Hawthorne theories was almost


immediate.

Within ten years, every practitioner in personnel management or human relations pointed to Mayo's work to support the contention that each individual's problems were so important to the effective operation of a firm that any manager worthy of the name must be concerned with personnel-human relations.13

George states that because:

. . . of Mayo's work, the industrial woods abound today with behavioral scientists, personnel counselors, industrial chaplains, sensitivity trainers, group dynamics, sociogram analysts, non-directive interviewers, role-playing instructors, critical incident teachers, and industrial psychologists . . .14

Information derived from Hawthorne has been a catalyst for management research, study, and evaluation for half a century. This action was achieved through the significant exposure and subsequent understanding of human attitudes and behavior, within the total organizational system. The Hawthorne studies presented management with a new approach to people-orientation at the organizational level and has had a significant impact on the organizational climate for over fifty years.

The Formulation of General Semantics

General semantics evolved from the published work of Count Alfred Korzybski over a thirteen year period. In 1921, Korzybski

---


14George, op. cit., p. 130.
published *Manhood of Humanity*, a treatise emphasizing man's relationship to his environment. A basic idea philosophized by Count Korzybski was that, through time binding, man's knowledge increased by geometric progression.\(^{15}\)

Korzybski acknowledged the fact that much of man's attainment, especially in natural sciences, were advances made according to the law of geometric progression. A major concern was that progress in human affairs advanced more in accordance with arithmetical progression.\(^{16}\) Korzybski saw a definite disparity between the social sciences and natural sciences evolving, which would create fundamental disturbances in the "equilibrium" of human affairs.\(^{17}\)

Korzybski determined that our language utilized an Aristotelian system of logic which allowed erroneous methods of thought to permeate

---


\(^{16}\)Korzybski equated scientific knowledge as advancing by geometric progression, while progress in human affairs followed arithmetic process. It was the hope of Korzybski that general semantics would prove to be the tool, that when applied, would help advance human affairs more in geometric rather than arithmetic progression. In *Manhood of Humanity*, Korzybski regarded this as critical to humanity.

- **Geometric Progression:** 1, 2, 4, 8, 16, 32, etc. The ratio of each term to the preceding one is the same throughout the sequence.
- **Arithmetic Progression:** 1, 5, 9, 13, 17, 25, etc. The ratio of each term is derived by adding to the preceding sum a constant.

\(^{17}\)Korzybski, *op. cit.*, p. 22.
our language. In 1933, Korzybski published, *Science and Sanity: An Introduction to Non-Aristotelian Systems and General Semantics*. This publication was the original written formulation and elaboration of the principles of general semantics. Korzybski identified the discipline of general semantics as follows:

General semantics is not any 'philosophy', or 'psychology', or 'logic', in the ordinary sense. It is a new extensional discipline which explains and trains us how to use our nervous systems most efficiently.\(^{18}\)

The central theme of general semantics is that language can deceive us if we fail to recognize the fact that words are the invention of man, and can be used to represent meaning in any way desired. Words are not things that exist in the physical world but are created in the minds of people.

During a speech before the American Mathematical Society in 1931, Korzybski spoke of "the restricted semantics school." It was during this speech that Count Korzybski recognized and identified the general theme of early semantics writers as contrasted to general semantics ideas. The basic difference was found in the concept of emphasis. General semantics does not pursue glamorized word study but is more associated with the study of pragmatics, which is concerned with the total behavior situation in which communication takes

---

place. Korzybski authored a scientific theory of how language works in situations involving human communication.\(^ {19}\) Count Korzybski defended the general semantics approach by comparing it to the empirical approach taken in biology or physics.\(^ {20}\)

Korzybski regarded contemporary science as having made a revolutionary departure from accepted scientific thought, especially those thoughts which were associated with Aristotle, Euclid, and Newton. Korzybski was aware that most of the pioneer thoughts of Euclid and Newton had been revised, but realized a break from Aristotelian language had not been attempted.\(^ {21}\)

Korzybski used the term Non-Aristotelian to describe the inadequacies of Aristotelian logic. The system of Non-Aristotelian thought pointed out that Aristotle's logical language rules are inadequate in modern society. The concept of Non-Aristotelian is not Anti-Aristotelian, but is a description of language inadequacy in describing the world we know today.\(^ {22}\) The combination of Aristotelian

---


\(^{21}\) Ibid., p. 228.

language heritage, and a generally accepted principle of failing to check fact and fiction statements, led Korzybski to seek a better method of structuring language and to provide a reasonable way of relating it, and ourselves, to reality.

Korzybski made what is considered to be a major break with traditional thought concerning the philosophy of language with his conception of general semantics. The major reason for this break was the realization by Korzybski of the observed progress made in the scientific domain contrasted with the progress made in the non-scientific domain. Korzybski attributed the observed disparity to the language structure of each domain. In scientific language, "the map is fairly representative of the territory." This is not so for non-scientific language.

Raymond V. Lesikar sums the concept of general semantics with the following observations of verbal and real world perceptions.

It is important . . . that we recognize the verbal world for what it is -- a world of words and not reality. Words are not the real world, just as a map is not the territory . . . . we sometimes confuse their relationship. We sometimes act on words which misrepresent reality as if they were reality. We let words take the place of reality. The result is miscommunication.23

An Emerging Concept

Human nature is a raw material in the hands of management and proper use of that raw material is essential to attainment of

organizational objectives. Recognizing human nature, and practicing the principles of human understanding, best guarantee a productive work environment.

A study completed by Leidecker and Hall determined that modern training programs are too often "done in a vacuum", and very little evaluation is accomplished in follow-up procedure. The research suggested that appropriate training programs might include seminars, job environment workshops, and role playing exercises.24

Maier and Solem developed evidence that audience role playing could be used in a favorable manner to improve or change the attitudes of employees.25 Management action evolving through human relations requires the application of behavioral science principles to promote human collaboration and solidarity within the social system of the business organization.26 Application of a human relations technique requires good communications in order to develop productive working relationships within an organization. However, accomplishing good communications is not an easy task. It is not just a matter of


establishing systems or using right words, but rather developing awareness and understanding between environment and people. As recognized by Bursk, "... communications is a matter not only of words but, even more, of day-to-day behavior."27

According to Korzybski, it is not the properties of entities, but the relation among entities, which constitute our major source of understanding.28 General semantics has as its primary purpose to make us aware of how our traditional use of language limits our ability to judge and perceive reality. Hayakawa pointed out that "A basic idea in general semantics is that the meaning of a word lies in our semantic reactions and not in the word itself."29 For example, the value of a dollar bill does not reside in the ink and paper which compose it, but in our social agreement to accept it as a symbol of value.

General semantics pays a particular attention to semantic reactions rather than to words. Human responses are made to symbols, signs, and symbol systems, including language. When people react to


a word, they are not reacting to a set of sounds, but to meaning with which a set of sounds has been symbolically endowed.

Human reaction patterns, our semantic habits, are internal and the most important residue of whatever years of education or mis-education we may have received from our parents' conduct toward us, from formal education, from movies, indeed from all our experiences.\(^{30}\)

Laura Lee pointed out:

The same word stands for a person or thing or activity day after day, although the thing it stands for may change, grow, transform. We do not name the process, the originality, the development, the flux. We speak in static terms and learn to perceive and think that way.\(^{31}\)

Many of life's conflicts can be avoided by being aware that we abstract and that different people abstract in different ways.

Rapoport determined that:

Words are abstractions made by things; reports are abstractions made of experience; inferences are abstractions made of descriptions. When people react to words as if they were things, to inferences as if they were descriptions, etc., they are confusing levels of abstraction. They are not using language to the best advantage and therefore not functioning at their human best.\(^{32}\)

We see things only as they are interpreted by our nervous

\(^{30}\)Ibíd., pp. 3-4.


\(^{32}\)Rapoport, op. cit., p. 155.
systems. Data about the outside world come to us through our senses; however, we have a narrow band of reception. Cherry stated that we can see with our experiences, as well as with our eyes.\textsuperscript{33} As stated by Wendell Johnson, "... the worlds we manage to get inside our heads are mostly worlds of words ... ."\textsuperscript{34}

General semantics focuses on human symbolic behavior and then studies its effect on human adjustment and social relations. There is very little evidence of studies completed in the precise academic environment involving the usefulness of general semantics as a management tool. Past research has been restricted to areas largely in the disciplines of speech-theatre, medical technology, and education.

Joseph Miraglia\textsuperscript{35} did research in the effects of oral communication training to on the job performance of supervisory nurses. The evaluations between nursing supervisors who took training were compared to those who did not take training in communication. Miraglia investigated (1) the on the job communication ability of supervisors, as perceived by subordinates, (2) communication knowledge, and


(3) supervisors' on-the-job ability as perceived by subordinates and superiors.

The experimental groups were given a course in face-to-face oral communication, consisting of 12 hours of instruction. The group met once a week for six weeks. The course was specifically adapted to the "expressed" communication needs related to on-the-job experiences of supervisors. At least 90 per cent of classtime was devoted to role playing and discussion.

Course enrollment was limited to groups of 7 to 15 supervisors. Subordinates' perceptions were obtained by use of questionnaire responses. A total of 364 subordinates made up the tested group in the hospitals.

After the training course was completed, the results indicated there was no significant difference in group communication ability and no significant difference in supervisory ability; however, there was a statistical difference noted in communication knowledge retained by the experimental group. Miraglia concluded there may be much overlap between supervisory effectiveness and communication skill.

In 1968, G. R. Martin evaluated the relationship between job satisfaction, and measured and expressed job interest by testing

---

selected Illinois hospital LPN personnel. He used four demographic variables: (1) age at entry into employment, (2) length of employment, (3) salary, and (4) marital status.

The results indicated that Illinois LPN's had a high level of job satisfaction. Martin utilized the Likert-type scale for partial respondent measurement. Other data were collected by personal interview.

H. C. Jain's study in 1970 was designed to test the assumption that the communication effectiveness of nursing supervisors was related to successful supervision. His program included four independent variables and one intervening variable. They were: (1) perceived communication attitudes, (2) frequency and amount of communication between supervisor and subordinate, (3) employee knowledge of hospital policies and procedures, (4) perceived employee communication satisfaction, and (5) the perceived use of formal channels of communication by non-supervisory workers. Ratings were based on supervisory skills, human relations, administrative and technical skills plus superiors' ratings on promotability.

One hundred twenty-two employees were tested by questionnaires and through personal interviews. Jain's conclusion was that nursing supervisory attitudes are related to successful supervision, to

---

subordinate workers' morale, and to performance.

Research studies about general semantics application to the management atmosphere seem to be almost nonexistent. For example, W. H. Cole, R. J. House, J. B. Duckworth, and L. A. Krech, 38 included communication and general semantics ideas and application in their research; however, a direct application to the managerial work climate has been largely ignored by researchers.

This study is designed to investigate, in more detail, the value of general semantics to the organizational work climate. The following discussion delineates the basic objectives of this research.

Objectives of the Research

The purpose of this study is to investigate the possibility of using the discipline of general semantics as a management guide to improve organizational relationships; also, that classroom exposure to a concentrated instructional program, emphasizing a number of

principles of general semantics, would enable nursing supervisors to function with greater effectiveness.

General semantics principles utilized for classroom presentation included Korzybski's structural differential, Hayakawa's abstraction ladder, review and understanding of the Aristotelian structure of language, Lesikar's filter of the mind concept, and intensional-extensional orientation lectures. (See the class activity log in Appendix C.) The values derived hypothesized that such exposure to general semantics would provide better supervisor-subordinate tolerances for each other through a better understanding of our words, our language, and their impact on the human nervous system.

The uses of general semantics are many; however, Stuart Chase adequately enumerated three valued objectives:

1. To help the individual evaluate his world.
2. To improve communication between individuals.
3. To help understand mental illness.  

Business organizations exist in a world of rapid change, and their managers are in constant search for methods to improve communication and human working relationships. General semantics ideas and methods have been engaged to help solve human personal problems, adopted in psychiatry to treat the mentally disturbed, used by professional teachers in the classroom, and applied sparingly to

organizational roles. During and after World War II, more than 7,000 mental patients were treated by applying the principles of general semantics. The work of Alfred Korzybski, and numerous group analysts, helped restore thousands of mentally shattered military men to sanity. Based on documented past successes, Chase stated that, "General semantics . . . becomes a living dynamic system, formulated in response to an expressed need."^41

When asked the question, "what is your most pressing organizational problem?", many managers will answer, "communications." In reality, communications is a high abstraction, difficult to understand, and almost impossible to define.

The successes that businessmen experience through application of Hawthorne knowledge is possible primarily because the concepts are understandable and practical. Hawthorne brought forth a philosophy about the human organism that enabled compatible programs to be derived and implemented. Hawthorne provided a successful blending of economic man and social man into an integrated, healthy, and productive work combination. Unlike the word "communication," the words "human relations" were designated and accepted by managers as action plans, which eventually evolved into such programs as job enrichment, job

^40Ibid., p. 266.
^41Ibid., p. 272.
enlargement, management by objectives, operations research, and many other related management techniques, all having a common heritage at Hawthorne.

Managers can equate human relations, and a devised human relations program, as a means to stimulate employee morale and to foster enthusiastic organizational participation. The human relations ideas and the spin-off programs are numerous, the acceptance widespread, and the theory feasible to apply at any organizational level. The basic value of the human relations concept to managers is in the flexible access to a workable program, ease in implementation, and acceptance by interested personnel.

Improving communication at the organizational level seems to face a paradoxical crossroads. On one hand, the need to improve communications is evident, but the solution to the problem seems vague. The treasures gleaned from Hawthorne seem to apply adequately to many organizational situations, but do not provide a means to improve human communication.

Management desires better organizational communication, and spends both time and dollars to investigate a logical way to integrate people, task, and work climate more effectively.

General semantics viewpoints recognize the difficulty faced by modern managers and advance a practical solution to promote better human communications. General semantics provides a framework which can help resolve the probable communication barriers facing the
participants in our industrial society by teaching human "understanding" in conjunction with human behavior. A student of general semantics may define communications as "the ability to participate in message sending and message receiving, with mutual understanding."^2

The general semantics classroom approach to teaching communications to management personnel involves and promotes a geometric mathematical progression possibility. Implementing the training program at supervisory level provides the basis for knowledge dissemination and practical application when applied at job level by a trained supervisor. The impact of teaching a few supervisors practical general semantics principles evolves geometrically when each supervisor practices general semantics techniques with his subordinates on a daily and continuing basis. This concept evolved into a basic hypothesis theory which may be stated as follows:

That subordinate attitudes can be evaluated by statistical comparison between subordinates whose supervisors participated in a general semantics course, and a control group whose supervisors did not participate in the offered course. Chapter III discusses the method of information collection in more detail.

A logical method used for a test of a difference is the null hypothesis . . . . If the probability associated with a chance difference is very low, say one to five in 100, the difference may be deemed to be 'real' in the sense that it may be explained by other than chance forces. In this case the hypothesis is rejected.^3

---

^2Definition evolved by general semantics class at Orange Memorial Hospital (Orange, Texas), April 15, 1975.

The null hypotheses under consideration in this study were:

1. That teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors will not improve subordinate attitude toward his supervisor.

2. That teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors will not improve subordinate attitude toward hospital administration.

3. That teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors will not improve subordinate attitude toward the hospital as a place of employment.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

This study included only the personnel employed at Orange Memorial Hospital located in Orange, Texas. Employees who had less than six month employment longevity, at the time of the study, were not utilized as part of the investigated universe.

The study was restricted both geographically and numerically and was subject to possible employee bias. However, the value of such an investigation, to test general semantics as a possible management training technique, justified the experimentation.

There are several limitations that may be concluded from the study design other than restricted funds and time factors. An obvious limitation may be isolated so as to include the perception of the subordinate to questionnaire language. Lesikar deals with this thought by referring to four definite areas of possible miscommunication. The first is by the sensory receptors missing sign detection; another through sensory limitations; a third by selective perceptions; and
lastly, through varying alertness and mental perception.44

A second limitation of this study must be suspect in the decision of the subordinate to answer the questionnaire in an accurate, honest fashion. Negative attitudes toward a survey may impose a threat to research findings. The questionnaire survey will have some sampling bias resulting from false or incorrect answers to questions. The value of this type of error is seldom known or measurable.

Another limitation may exist through translation of verbal and written academic material presented to supervisory personnel during classroom participation.

A fourth limitation is the constraint placed on the questionnaire conclusions influenced by the occupation of the respondents. The respondents selected for this study are confined to a specific hospital unit, and any conclusions reached would be coincidentally valid to related or non-related organizations.

CHAPTER II

THE TRAINING METHODOLOGY

A meeting with the Administrator at Orange Memorial Hospital (Orange, Texas) was scheduled one month before the first class meeting was conducted. The administrator approved both the proposed study and the use of training facilities. The training facilities were located on hospital property. The investigator, accompanied by the Nursing Training Coordinator, met with the Administrator to review the proposed study in detail. This meeting was used to design and structure the ground rules that hospital personnel and the investigator would follow during the life of the suggested program.

Study Overview

The study was not designed to re-direct formal organizational communications or to recommend that drastic or sweeping changes be made within the organizational structure. The suggested nature of the course was recognized primarily as a management teaching tool to be included as a part of the organizational training climate on a continuing basis.

Selected class members were not informed as to why they were attending the course activity. The only information given to the participating supervisors was that "the class activity may be useful to them as practicing supervisors."
One week before the class activity was to begin, a semantic differential questionnaire,\(^1\) composed of 21 scales using bi-polar adjectives, was administered to 210 subordinates. The subordinates tested composed the work force reporting to selected supervisor class members and to the subordinates of control group supervisors. Members of the subordinate group reporting to supervisors selected for class activity totaled 145 people. Of this total, 94 employees were assigned to the 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM shift, and 51 people worked the 12:00 AM to 8:00 AM shift. The control group subordinates numbered 65 people. The figures represent a census sample of hospital line supervised employees.

On March 18, 1975, formal class activity began. The classroom was located on Orange Memorial Hospital property in a separate building away from the influence of the main hospital complex. The room selected provided physical comfort and was well equipped with educational paraphernalia, such as overhead projector, blackboard, et cetera.

**Classroom Procedure**

Activity in the classroom was divided into two major areas of presentation. The routine evolved into sections of lecture and participation exercises, consisting of role playing and question-answer sessions. The entire class was involved in each exercise activity

\(^1\)See Appendix A for questionnaire sample.
assigned. The segmented routine was designed to maintain student attention and to include direct student participation into class activity. The question and answer session was included to help overcome possible lecture misunderstanding and to strengthen general semantics materials imparted.

**Lecture Design**

The approach taken by the researcher in teaching general semantics to hospital supervisors was more of a laboratory approach than platform speaking. The assumption made was that human interaction should replace the skills of the speaker whenever possible. The lecture communication was structured to stimulate student verbal activity and to prepare the participants for vigorous personal response. The premise was that students can learn more, and will retain more, by experiencing activities that are directly related to communications and to general semantics. While the lecture is effective as a teaching tool, it does reflect the experiences of other people. The researcher pre-determined that in order to improve both quality and quantity of the class learning experience, the lecture would be relegated downward in emphasis, and more attention would be given to group activity. This concept was evolved from role playing exercises emphasized later in this chapter.

**Review of Lecture References**

In recent years the study of general semantics has evolved to
an accepted academic discipline. Korzybski advocated the use of
general semantics to help man orient himself to experience a more
successful way of life. Since that time the literature has become
extensive.

A limitation placed on the lecture design was the need to
reduce the growing wealth of knowledge and subsequent publications
into a composite study that could be reasonably presented in a
ten-hour instructional program. Extensive research of the literature
reduced the background for lecture material to several well-known
authors and publications.

Specific literature included general semantics material published
by Lesikar, Morain, Hayakawa, Meyers and Meyers, Rapoport, Berman,

2Raymond V. Lesikar, Business Communications: Theory and
Application, rev. ed., Richard D. Irwin, Inc., Homewood, Ill., 1972,
pp. 1-87.

3Mary Morain, ed., Teaching General Semantics, International

4Samuel I. Hayakawa, Language In Thought and Action, 3rd ed.,

5Gail E. Meyers and Michaele Tolela Meyers, The Dynamics

6Anatol Rapoport, Science and The Goals of Man, Harper and
Brothers, N. Y., 1950.

7Sanford I. Berman, Why Do We Jump To Conclusions?; The Closed
Mind; How To Lessen Misunderstanding; Understanding and Being Understood,
and Korzybski. Using the selected literature, five lecture plans evolved.

1. General Semantics Overview.
2. Effective Listening.
3. Human Misunderstanding.
4. Understanding Your Environment.
5. Human Communication Workshop.

Each lecture, including the role playing, was designed to last one class period of two hours. To facilitate and provoke discussion and class enthusiasm, the class members were seated in a circular pattern to take advantage of the training potential.

The circle technique of grouping people into a communication pattern was adapted from the published work of Bavelas and Barrett. The authors identified the circle network as promoting rapid communication results with fewer mistakes.

Orange hospital research students were seated in the circular pattern arrangement and responded readily to class activity. The democratic, flexible structure of the circle seating technique was demonstrated to be effective under classroom conditions. Direct visual contact as well as direct oral contact was maintained with students


9See Appendix C: Class Activity Log.

through circular seating. The arrangement promoted efficiency during role playing exercises and question-answer sessions.

Bavelas and Barrett criticized the circle communication network as being "leaderless" and poor in "accuracy." However, this criticism was partially neutralized by using classroom teaching technique. The instructor assumed the role of leader, and communication accuracy was encouraged by verbal and written contact with participating class members.

**Role Playing Design**

The use of role playing exercises was introduced to help the student draw personal conclusions regarding meaning, perception, and semantic reactions.

Role playing is a non-lecture lesson designed to help students better understand and use the ideas expressed in previous lectures. Using the various educational paraphernalia, students were induced to sort out meaningful experiences relevant to each individual.\(^{11}\)

The use of role playing does more than ask what a person thinks about a situation; it suggests that the individual interact with a previously supplied situation. Each individual is acquainted with a personal education experience. According to Maier and Solem:

Audience role playing has a number of values which may be

---

\(^{11}\)Materials and classroom paraphernalia mail-ordered from International Society for General Semantics, P. O. Box 2469, San Francisco, California, 94126.
summarized as follows:

1. Persons in an audience are given an opportunity to learn by the method of participation.

2. The nature of attitudes and the way they influence opinions is demonstrated by means of data obtained from the audience.

3. The way attitudes influence opinions and generalize their effect is experienced both on an intellectual and on a feeling basis.

4. The ineffectiveness of facts and logic for changing attitudes is demonstrated both on an intellectual as well as on a feeling basis.12

Role playing emphasizes the relationship between communication and human behavior. Berlo determined that a person's behavior and the relationship between the talker and listener affects communication.13

The Orange Memorial Hospital classes were planned to include audience participation on a regular and continuing basis. With this in mind, role playing became a prominent part of the general semantics classroom activity.

Student Testing Procedures

The basic function of testing was to reinforce lecture and role playing activities. Testing was instituted as part of the course


requirement to promote feedback to prior instruction. Supervisor testing consumed approximately twenty per cent of classroom time.

After lecture presentation of new information, the student was expected to demonstrate comprehension of specific concepts when presented with an example or problem involving general semantics application.

The students were evaluated by the following techniques:

1. Applied use of general semantics terms (definitions).
2. Basic understanding of lecture literature.
3. Ability to choose from proposed hypothetical alternative situations using general semantics knowledge.
4. Student understanding of problem solving through general semantics principles.

Student testing procedure was synthesized into four methods:

1. **Question and Answer** - Researcher (Teacher) controls oral questions asked at random during class.
2. **Demonstration** - Student selected by researcher (Teacher) to present an individual impression of general semantics principles.
3. **Definition Drill** - Designed to develop general semantics skills and committing information to memory.
4. **Problem Solving** - Researcher (Teacher) leads the students with sequential techniques toward a known answer.

The activity of testing integrated general semantics knowledge into the organized class activity. As a result of careful student examinations, a pronounced change in dialogue occurred. General semantics terminology was accepted and integrated into the language usage pattern of the students. The class became general semantics oriented, and the language symbols became less restrictive.
Class Structure Procedure

One of the basic study challenges was to determine which group of hospital supervisors would attend the specialized courses and to settle the question of course dates and time logistics. This was accomplished in the following manner.

The study required a control group to be selected in a non-biased manner. Based on random method, the day shift supervisors (8:00 AM to 4:00 PM) and the late shift supervisors (12:00 AM to 8:00 AM) were selected to participate in the classroom training sessions. The evening shift (4:00 PM to 12:00 AM) was designated to be the control group. The supervisors who made up the class totaled 28 people, and the control group supervisors numbered 18 people. Based on the selection of class member supervisors and control group supervisors, the total employee population numbered 210 subordinates to be given three separate sets of questionnaires. See Chapter III for a more detailed questionnaire discussion.

The Administrator suggested that the study class be taught on Tuesdays from 3:30 PM to 5:30 PM. He arranged overtime pay for evening shift supervisors to attend class activity. Five class meetings were arranged to begin March 18, 1975, and to continue on successive Tuesdays through April 15, 1975. The schedule provided a total of ten classroom hours to be used for intensive general semantics study.

Total classroom hours were determined by mutual agreement between the researcher and hospital administration. The basic value
in structuring a practical short-term course in general semantics is in the relationship between time expended and business value derived. Time was of the essence because hospital management realized that communications problems did exist in their organizational environment. The conclusion drawn was that if a short, effective course in general semantics would help to partially solve communications problems, business values would be realized. The program combined a geometric progression teaching possibility with a specified teaching time frame.

Therefore, the decision to utilize a ten-hour, five-week class period was determined by immediate communications needs of the hospital, and not by the needs of the researcher.

The researcher and hospital administration did not anticipate that derived program results, either positive or negative, would experience time longevity. Natural attrition, shift changes, human nature, and many other variables constantly erode the organizational climate. Supervision, like the organization, is subjected to constant change. The introduction of general semantics into the hospital environment was not suggested as the complete solution to communications problems. Such problems continue to exist abundantly in the organizational climate. However, general semantics was visualized as a systematic process of influencing, in a positive manner, the continuing process of human social intercourse.
CHAPTER III

THE RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE DESIGN

The most significant aspect of the study was to determine the value of teaching general semantics to nursing supervisors and to test for subordinate attitude changes. A quantitative technique to measure subordinate judgments was vital to the success of the program. With this in mind, the concept of using a semantic differential questionnaire evolved and was considered relevant to the study as a measuring device.\(^1\) The following discussion details the significance of using the semantic differential in the questionnaire design.

The Semantic Differential

A semantic differential scale is not a specific test but a general technique of measurement that can be applied to a wide investigatory area. The authors of *The Measurement of Meaning* state that the semantic differential "... is a very general way of getting at a certain type of information, a highly generalizable technique of measurement which must be adapted to the requirement of each research problem to which it is applied."\(^2\)


\(^2\)Ibid., p. 76.
It was recognized that respondents would interpret each question differently; however, "... procedures of measurement with the semantic differential are explicit and can be replicated," according to the research of Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum.

The final semantic differential questionnaire derived consisted of twenty-one descriptive scales which, for analytical purposes, were pre-grouped under five sections:

3. **Oriented Activity Scales** - Measures directed work activity.

The purpose of the five variables was to establish a systematic approach to measure employees' judgment of their supervisor, their hospital administration, and their hospital environment. Using the twenty-one descriptive scales grouped under the five selected variables, a measuring device was conceived.

**Selection of Semantic Differential Scales**

Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum list a total of seventy-six semantic differential scales identified by categories of: evaluation,

---

3Ibid., p. 125.

4The final questionnaire evolved from the findings of two pre-test evaluations. Pre-test conclusions are discussed later in this chapter.

5Osgood, op. cit., pp. 53-61.
potency, et cetera. The initial set of semantic differential scales was selected by first reading the complete list of scales to 140 students enrolled in Management 2071 classes at Louisiana State University. The students were requested to mark the descriptive adjectives that best fit their impression of how to evaluate a supervisor, hospital administration, and hospital environment.

As a result of student selections of descriptive adjectives that "best fit" the measurement need, the resulting preliminary questionnaire consisted of (1) Eight evaluation scales, (2) Four potency scales, (3) Three oriented activity scales, (4) Four stability scales, and (5) Two receptivity scales, to measure supervisor impressions.

The scales used to measure hospital administration and hospital environment were restricted to evaluation scales only, and student choice of descriptive adjectives narrowed the bi-polar adjective selection to five scales under each measuring category. A total of twenty-one bi-polar adjective scales were selected to measure subordinate judgment of their supervisor. The evaluation scales included to measure employee judgment of their hospital administration and hospital environment totaled five scales for each category. Thirty-one

\[ ^{6}\text{Loc. cit.} \]

\[ ^{7}\text{Conducted February 3, 1975} \]
scales concluded the first questionnaire prepared for pre-test. On the prepared questionnaire, all positive bi-polar adjectives were placed on the left side of the questionnaire page and all negative bi-polar adjectives to the right side of the page.

Each semantic differential scale consisted of two opposing (polar) adjectives (good-bad), separated by a continuum divided into seven (7) segments. Each segment is assumed to represent one step in moving from the meaning of the adjective at one end of the continuum to the meaning at the opposite end of the continuum.

The selected bi-polar adjectives received a numerical evaluation of 1 to 7 for the least favorable scales location to the most favorable; the next favorable, a value of 2 to 6, et cetera.

**Pre-test At Our Lady of the Lake Hospital**

One of the two hospitals selected for questionnaire pre-test was Our Lady of the Lake Hospital in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. The hospital Assistant Administrator arranged for three separate groups of employees to meet in private quarters and to participate in the questionnaire pre-test during selected time periods.

**First Pre-test**

Fifteen selected individuals were administered the thirty-one

---

8Pre-test conducted by arrangement of Mr. Weston Devillier, Hospital Assistant Administrator.
scale bi-polar semantic differential questionnaire on March 6, 1975. This group (Group A) was one of three similar contingents forming a pre-test panel.

The first pre-test was administered to group A by the interviewer handing out questionnaires and then leaving the room. After a twenty-five minute absence, the interviewer returned to the room and collected the completed questionnaires. No instructions were given to group A. The group was required to rely completely on instructions included with the questionnaire.

Fifteen hospital members comprising group B were given the same questionnaire as group A. However, after handing out the questionnaires, the interviewer remained in the room and verbally encouraged questions. No instructions were volunteered.

Fifteen respondents of group C were given the questionnaire and asked to follow the leadership of the interviewer. The interviewer proceeded to read the instruction sheet to the respondents. After verbalization, the interviewer paused for questions concerning questionnaire procedure. All questions were answered and discussed at length.

After the question and answer session, the interviewer read each of the thirty-one bi-polar scales to the respondents in a slow methodical manner, pausing occasionally to answer individual questions. Each question was given individual attention by interviewer and the respondents. Interviewer time with group C was approximately three
times as lengthy as with group A and group B.

Results of the First Pre-test

Many similarities were obvious when reviewing the forty-five questionnaires received from groups A, B, and C after completion of the first pre-test. Some scales were left blank by group members. Other respondents penciled question marks in the scale blanks rather than an answer. On some questionnaires the positive side of the semantic differential scale (left side) was marked in positive order sequence. This observed pattern indicated that the respondent either failed to read the scales or was practicing self-preservation.

Based on the first questionnaire pre-test, three obvious questionnaire changes would have to be considered:

(1) Questionnaire design.
(2) Bi-polar adjective selection.
(3) Questionnaire administering technique.

First, as a matter of procedure, the bi-polar adjective selection should be reduced by eliminating scales that pre-test respondents did not answer, found confusing, or had questioned. Secondly, the bi-polar adjective scales would have to appear on the questionnaire in alternating sequence order of positive word on the left side of the page followed by a negative word, et cetera. Thirdly, a slotted, locked box should be provided to allow respondents to dispose of the questionnaire immediately after its completion. The locked box guarantees anonymity to the respondents participating in the study.
There was no indication that interviewer action during pre-test influenced questionnaire completion or accuracy. Differences between groups A, B, and C were negligible in nature with all three groups. The conclusion would indicate that no special handling of respondents during testing is required and that questionnaire instructions were satisfactory.

**Revised Questionnaire Form**

The revised questionnaire form evolved from a thirty-one scale instrument to one consisting of twenty-one total scales. The revised bi-polar adjective scale questionnaire included: (1) Five evaluation scales, (2) Three potency scales, (3) Two oriented activity scales, (4) Two stability scales, and (5) Two receptivity scales.

The fourteen scales were selected to measure supervisor traits as perceived by subordinates. Three evaluation scales to measure hospital administration were selected, and four evaluation scales to measure hospital environment evolved. (See Appendix A.)

**Pre-test at Doctors Memorial Hospital**

The second hospital selected for questionnaire pre-test was Doctors Memorial Hospital in Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Using the questionnaire derived from the first pre-test, including the adopted procedure revisions, a second pre-test was scheduled March 10, 1975, at Doctors Memorial Hospital. Twenty-five respondents were requested to participate in the research project. No
information was volunteered to the assembled group of hospital employees.

The respondents were given instructions pertinent to questionnaire completion. They were requested to carefully read the instruction sheet before proceeding. Respondents were assured that no one would see their completed questionnaire except the interviewer. The slotted, locked questionnaire box was placed in a prominent place in the room, and questionnaire recovery instructions were given to the respondents.

The time required to complete the semantic differential questionnaire consumed twelve minutes. Ten minutes were required to read the instruction sheet. Total questionnaire time consumed was twenty-two minutes.

**Results of the Second Pre-test**

Respondent confusion in answering the questionnaire was not evident as indicated by the observed significance that all bi-polar adjective scales were marked. This fact was further supported by the absence of respondent frustration that was revealed during the first pre-test by question marks and personal comments written on the questionnaire.

**Questionnaire Recommendation**

The pre-test results were conclusive that the revised questionnaire was applicable as a measuring device. The finalized questionnaire
was administered to line-oriented employees at the Orange Memorial Hospital test site during the following intervals of time:

1. Pre-course questionnaire - March 17, 1975.
2. First post-course questionnaire - April 15, 1975.

The bi-polar adjective semantic differential questionnaire provided a numerical evaluation of subordinate opinions within their employment climate using evaluation, potency, stability, receptivity, and aggressiveness scales of measurement.

The following chapter deals with the collected data and their evaluation and interpretation.
CHAPTER IV

DATA EVALUATION AND INTERPRETATION

The raw data were first transformed into numerical scores for processing by the Louisiana State University computer center. The data were derived from semantic differential bi-polar adjective questionnaires, previously marked by hospital subordinates. Each scale was divided into seven numerical segments which provided a basis for tabulation. (See Chapter III.) Questionnaire coding was performed on IBM code sheets as outlined below.

The bi-polar adjective questionnaire used to evaluate the first hypothesis contained five categories consisting of fourteen scales. The scales were selected to measure supervisor traits perceived by hospital subordinates. The categories included: (1) Five evaluation scales, (2) Three potency scales, (3) Two oriented activity scales, (4) Two stability scales, and (5) Two receptivity scales. The composite scores of the numerical totals of all fourteen bi-polar adjective scales were posted to IBM code sheets. The second and third hypotheses utilized a variation in scoring methodology as described in the following three paragraphs.

The second hypothesis was evaluated by using three bi-polar adjective scales to measure respondent attitude toward hospital

\[1\text{See Appendix A.}\]
administration. These scales were grouped under the category of evaluation. The decision to use only the evaluation factor was based on information gained through original bi-polar adjective pre-test. The pre-test determined that subordinates who marked the questionnaires would have little knowledge of hospital administration, other than by personal information. Traits such as potency, oriented activity, stability, and receptivity would tend to require more knowledgeable information about the administration. The factor evaluation represented a high correlation between questionnaire need and respondent capability.

The three bi-polar adjectives comprising the scales selected to evaluate the second hypothesis were inspected, composite scores were totaled, and the results posted to IBM code sheets.

The third hypothesis utilized the evaluation factor to measure the subordinate's attitude toward his work environment. Because of its general nature, the concept of environment warranted a clearly identifiable questionnaire category. Four bi-polar adjective scales were included for subordinate evaluation of employment environment. Total scores were collected from the four evaluation scales and the results posted to IBM code sheets.

Tabulation of the total computed data was accomplished by arrangement into appropriate Tables. Some commentary is necessary to interpret the Tables and to facilitate analysis understanding in this

---

2See Chapter III, Footnote 7.
chapter. Tables I through III relate to the first hypothesis; Tables IV through VI to the second hypothesis; and Tables VII through IX to the third hypothesis. The Tables are sub-divided into three major headings to compare significant data relationships. The major headings discussed below are: (1) The variable column, (2) The means column, and (3) The probability of F column.

The Variable Column

The first three Tables presented in this chapter are directly related to the first hypothesis and columnize the five pertinent variables: evaluation, potency, oriented activity, stability, and receptivity. The five listed variables represent a total of fourteen bi-polar adjective scales that were marked by questionnaire respondents.

Tables IV through VI include only the evaluation variable. This set of Tables is directly related to the second hypothesis, and the data are representative of the scores from three bi-polar adjective scales marked by hospital respondents.

Tables VII through IX involve the third hypothesis. Using the evaluation variable, respondents marked four bi-polar adjective scales.

Other related data were collected and grouped under the Table categories listed below.

The Means Column

The means column is divided into two separate listings: (1) The control group and (2) The class group.
Control group data represent the questionnaire scores returned by hospital subordinates whose supervisors did not participate in general semantics classes.

The class group data listing identifies questionnaire scores returned by hospital subordinates whose supervisors attended the general semantics course activity.

The specific numerical difference between the means of the control group and the means of the class group is of special significance to this study. Questionnaire bi-polar scales were evaluated numerically (1 through 7) and were marked by those respondents whose supervisors attended general semantics classes (the class group) as well as those respondents whose supervisors did not attend (the control group). Numerical movement between the means of the control group and the means of the class group was vital to data interpretation.

A numerical increase in the means of the class group, when compared by the means of the control group, would indicate a positive movement exerted on the means by an outside influence. If no numerical difference is noted between the two means, it may be assumed that the control group and the class group were impervious to outside influences. A supporting calculation may be derived from the probability of F figure.

The Probability of F Column

The third column in the Tables found in this chapter is the probability of F Column. Tabulated information in this column collaborates the data inspected in the means column. A second value
attributed to the probability of F column is the convenience provided for quick inspection and interpretation of pertinent data.

The probability of F column data are significant only at certain confidence levels, as indicated: 3

1. One can be 90 per cent confident the two means of a variable are different if the probability is less than .10.

2. One can be 95 per cent confident the two means of a variable are different if the probability is less than .05.

3. One can be 99 per cent confident the two means of a variable are different if the probability is less than .01.

Data tabulated into Tables in this chapter were compiled from respondent scoring on questionnaires administered: (1) Before the course in general semantics was taught, (2) Immediately after the course was taught, and (3) One month after the course was taught.

The selection and analysis of viable statistical information was processed in conjunction with the Department of Experimental Statistics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

The following section interprets the use of statistical data applied to the designated hypothesis statements using computed means and probability of F information as evaluation tools.

Analysis of Results

The value derived in teaching an acceptable conclusion is in

---

establishing one or more hypotheses. This research utilized three null hypothesis statements to be tested and evaluated.

The process of data evaluation within this report is by use of three way analysis of variance.

Evaluation of each hypothesis investigated by this report is based on the significance of the variation between the means of the control group and the means of the class group. The probability of F statistic, derived from the F-test, is used to interpret the significance of the variation between control group and class group means. The selected hypotheses were tested using the following statistical limits.

Level of Hypotheses Testing

It is necessary for the researcher to state the level at which the hypotheses will be tested. For this study, two sigma limits (95.45) are set. Using two standard deviations, 95.45 per cent of all observations should fall within these limits under normal conditions. Therefore, \(1 - .9545 = .0455\), or about 5 observations in 100 will fall outside the limits under normal conditions.

When a hypothesis is rejected at the five per cent level, there are approximately five chances in one hundred that the hypothesis will be rejected when it is actually true.

\(^4\text{Loc. cit.}\)
In seeking to determine the value of teaching a course in general semantics to selected supervisors and to determine its effect on their subordinates, it was necessary to isolate measurable factors directly related to supervisor-subordinate relationships. Therefore, in each hypothesis evaluation, the pertinent variables were isolated and inspected for significance. Statistical evaluation of the hypothesis statements are discussed in the following section.

**The First Hypothesis**

The first null hypothesis stated: "That teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors will not improve subordinate attitude toward his supervisor." Using the .05 level of significance, the first null hypothesis had to be accepted. Therefore, the working hypothesis had to be rejected, which was: "That in the short run, teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors does improve the relationship between the subordinate and the supervisor."

As can be observed in Table I, the probability that the difference observed in the evaluation variable was a result of chance was .64. There was a 64 per cent probability that the difference between the means of the evaluation variable was a result of chance.

Table I information was compiled from before course questionnaire scores, and it would not be expected to find observed differences between control means and class means at this point.
TABLE I

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE OF DATA RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS NUMBER ONE USING BEFORE COURSE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>27.63</td>
<td>28.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>14.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriented Activity</td>
<td>11.41</td>
<td>11.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>11.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptivity</td>
<td>11.52</td>
<td>11.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A.

Variation between the means tabulated in Table I and the information scored immediately after course work, and one month later, would be suspect for close evaluation. The results of the second and third questionnaires are tabulated in the following Tables.

Inspection of the variables listed in Table II reflects the scores of respondents taken immediately after course work was completed. This Table illustrates that apparent differences between the control group means and the class group means were due to chance. Observation of the probability of F statistics concerning the variable evaluation, illustrates that 91 per cent of the variable difference is due to chance. The four remaining variables follow the pattern.

The probability of F statistics in Table II tend to support the acceptance of the first hypothesis. This conclusion is supported in the following Table.
### TABLE II

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE OF DATA RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS NUMBER ONE USING IMMEDIATELY AFTER COURSE SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>29.10</td>
<td>29.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency</td>
<td>14.67</td>
<td>14.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriented Activity</td>
<td>11.84</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>11.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptivity</td>
<td>11.76</td>
<td>12.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A.

Table III (below) relates the data from questionnaires scored one month after the course in general semantics was taught. As can be seen in Table III, the possibility that difference between means of the variables is once again substantiated by the probability of F statistic as being due to chance.

### TABLE III

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE OF DATA RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS NUMBER ONE USING ONE MONTH AFTER COURSE SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>29.20</td>
<td>28.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potency</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>14.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oriented Activity</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability</td>
<td>11.43</td>
<td>11.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptivity</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>12.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A.
Inspection of each variable in Tables I, II, and III, in relation to the probability of F column reflects the difference between the means to all listed variables is due to chance. The compiled and analyzed data would indicate there was not causation associated with the variables that were tabulated to evaluate the first hypothesis.

**The Second Hypothesis**

The second null hypothesis stated: "That teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors will not improve subordinate attitude toward hospital administration." Using the .05 level of significance, the second null hypothesis had to be rejected. Therefore, by default, the working hypothesis had to be accepted, which was: "At least to some extent, teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors does affect subordinate attitude toward hospital administration."

Table IV, below, is representative of the data collected before the course in general semantics was taught to hospital line supervisors.

**TABLE IV**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE OF DATA RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS NUMBER TWO USING BEFORE COURSE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>15.16</td>
<td>15.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A.
Inspection of the evaluation variable in the above Table indicates the difference between the control group and the class group mean is 65 per cent due to chance. The value of the data in Table IV, to this report analysis, is based on its comparison to the probability of \( F \) statistics recorded in the following Tables and discussed below.

Of significant importance to the second hypothesis is the probability of \( F \) figure tabulated in Table V. Observation of the control group mean and the class group mean offers a measurable significant difference between the means at the .05 level, as pointed out in the following Table.

### TABLE V

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE OF DATA RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS NUMBER TWO USING IMMEDIATELY AFTER COURSE SCORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>15.24</td>
<td>16.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A.

*There is a 95 percent confidence level that there was a causation associated with the variable.

At the 5 per cent level of significance the probability of \( F \) figure in Table V indicates that one may be 95 per cent confident there was a causation associated with the variable.

Using the tabulated probability of \( F \) confidence level concerning
the immediately after course scores, one may substantiate that a measurable difference between the control group mean and the class group mean exists.

Table VI, below, using questionnaire data collected one month after general semantics course activity also supports rejection of the second hypothesis statement at the .05 level and therefore accepts the working hypothesis.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE OF DATA RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS NUMBER TWO USING ONE MONTH AFTER COURSE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>15.41</td>
<td>16.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| *There is a 95 percent confidence level that there was a causation associated with the variable.|

The probability of F statistic in Tables V and VI indicate about 5 percent of the difference between the control group means and the class group means is due to chance. Causation at this confidence level would indicate that general semantics taught to line supervisors did have an effect on the subordinates' impression of their hospital administration.
The Third Hypothesis

The third null hypothesis stated: "That teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors will not improve subordinate attitude toward the hospital as a place of employment." Based on the .05 level of significance, the third null hypothesis had to be rejected. By accepting the statistical evidence as sufficient to disprove the null hypothesis, the working hypothesis had to be accepted, which was: "That to some degree, teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors does improve subordinate attitude toward their work environment."

The probability of F shown in Table VII, below, records a tabulation of 16 in 100 that the difference between the control group mean and the class group mean are due to chance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE VII</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE OF DATA RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS NUMBER THREE USING BEFORE COURSE SCORES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>20.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A.

Since data in the above Table were taken from before course scores, interpretation of mean values must be used in conjunction with related statistical factors which are discussed below.

In Table VIII, the .04 probability of F value confirms the
decision to reject the third null hypothesis statement using immediately after course data. The test of significance concluded only 4 times in 100 would the difference between the means be a result of chance, as pointed out in the following graphic aid.

TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE OF DATA RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS NUMBER THREE USING IMMEDIATELY AFTER COURSE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>19.69</td>
<td>21.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A.

*There is a 95 percent confidence level that there was a causation associated with the variable.

One month after course data (below) coincide with data compiled in Table VIII, which is concerned with immediately after course tabulations. Further exploration of the information gained through questionnaire scoring, completed one month after the general semantics course was taught, follows.

In Table IX, data continuity with the above statistical analysis is indicated by an F probability of .04, as seen in the last column in the following illustration.
TABLE IX

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE TABLE OF DATA RELATED TO HYPOTHESIS NUMBER THREE USING ONE MONTH AFTER COURSE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Probability of F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Control</td>
<td>Class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>20.66</td>
<td>22.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Appendix A.

*There is a 95 percent confidence level that there was a causation associated with the variable.

Using one month after course scores, the observed variation between the control mean and class mean in the Table above conforms with the accepted two sigma limits established for testing hypotheses.

Data compiled in Tables VIII and IX point out a 95 percent confidence level that there was a causation associated with the variable. Based on the statistical evidence there is a priori reason to accept the concept that teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors does have an effect on the subordinates' environmental attitudes.

Summary

Using the .05 level of significance, the first hypothesis was accepted; therefore, the working hypothesis had to be rejected. The second and third hypotheses were rejected and, by default, the working hypotheses had to be accepted.

The first hypothesis concerned the relationship between the
supervisor and the subordinate. Collected and analyzed data failed to substantiate an improvement in their mutual relationship as a result of teaching general semantics courses to selected line supervisors. A lingering question remains as to possible reasons for the impasse. Perhaps an explanation may be the unanimity existing between hospital personnel. The personal habits, opinions, attitudes, and beliefs of the hospital employees are reinforced by daily contact over extended periods of time with their co-workers.

Teaching general semantics to hospital line supervisors may, in the long run, have a definite impact on the attitude of the subordinate toward his supervisor. However, in the short run, the rejection of the first working hypothesis may reflect the backlog of time expended in the existing and continuing supervisor and subordinate relationship.

Another logical conclusion to be considered is that, perhaps, the supervisor and subordinate are privileged to work in a mutually harmonious environment. If this be fact, the first working hypothesis may have been victimized by an organization whose employees are experiencing self-actualization.

Acceptance of the second working hypothesis involves a logical semantic reaction conclusion. Many hospital employees are not personally familiar with hospital administration, especially those assigned to the evening and late work shifts.

Information about top management is usually gained through
house organs, bulletin board news, and other official or non-official communication channels. Assuming that subordinate knowledge of top management is limited by a lack of verbal or non-verbal contact, any introduction of favorable communication about hospital administration by an intermediary would tend to influence the subordinate. If the intermediary were trained in the principles of general semantics, the response of the subordinate could be positive in nature. Acceptance of the second working hypothesis may embrace such reasoning as just concluded.

The final working hypothesis accepted was concerned with subordinates' attitudes toward their work environment. It was determined that after teaching general semantics principles to selected line supervisors, subordinate satisfaction with the hospital, as a place of employment, improved.

Acceptance of the third working hypothesis illustrates an important applied general semantics concept:

Supervisors with a working knowledge about general semantics principles, may utilize the discipline to influence the daily work environment of their subordinates.

Introduction of general semantics principles into the work environment may overcome some negative aspects of personal histories existing between supervisor and subordinate. Acceptance and practice of general semantics may serve to make a more compatible and improved organizational work climate.

Conclusions and recommendations resulting from this investigation
are discussed in Chapter V.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions. An important facet of this study was to obtain information which would contribute to the body of knowledge already accumulated in general semantics and communications. This research may yield to management a better understanding of human interaction at the organizational level. General semantics principles embraced by business leaders may serve as a penetrating and orderly discipline to help solve the communications challenge.

In the last fifty years decision makers have witnessed the truly dynamic growth of a vital segment of business—the function of administrative communication and management. Above all, the importance and complexity of modern business communications have been challenged by management as both essential and problematic.

However, the administration of any organization can be accomplished only through its ability to communicate. Thus, the effectiveness of communications within an organization may be discerned as an indication of the efficiency of management. The administrator's ability to function effectively—to think and to reason, to perceive, understand, and to evaluate, et cetera,—is limited or facilitated by the existing communications network.

Communication occurring within the organization is far more than just a technique of management. Without communications,
organized behavior would cease to exist. Communication is basic to the success of a dynamic organization.

If meaningful communication is to occur between organizational members, they must have common symbols with which to communicate. General semantics principles provide a means of tacit agreement between individuals as to the meanings applied to their communication symbols. All communication, intended or otherwise, is potentially informative. Such communication is informative to the receiver, however, only to the extent that the information is available, intelligible, and useful.

General semantics offers the organization a methodology to cope with the modern communications challenge. Rather than to suspect possible miscommunication at the organizational level, it is better that management anticipate communication problems and make an attempt to cope with the challenge. One method of coping with communications difficulties is to establish training programs.

Organizational training of employees is not a new idea of management, but a needed and useful program to improve personnel effectiveness. However, most training programs are concerned only with job indoctrination or job improvement.

This research does not quarrel with job training, but it does suggest that management consider a further step.

If management will accept the fact that miscommunication does exist within its organization, the next logical step is to train employees to guard against making needless communication errors. A
program of teaching general semantics principles to organizational employees may serve to help alleviate miscommunication, if applied seriously and continuously.

A short range program may prove beneficial in some communication facets of the organization. However, the results may tend to erode quickly. Better and more beneficial results may be obtained if a general semantics training program is granted the status of a continuing educational process.

To be effective, general semantics should be included as part of the job indoctrination and job training of each employee and continued throughout his tenure.

Knowledge of general semantics principles does have residual value. However, a dynamic organization will experience growth, attrition, transfers, et cetera, which create an educational vacuum that requires continuous long range program planning.

This research has pointed out the value of general semantics to management by accepting the following concepts:

1. That teaching general semantics to supervisors working in a line capacity would influence their subordinates to experience a better attitude toward top management, and

2. That after a course in general semantics was taught to practicing nursing supervisors, their subordinates expressed a better attitude toward the hospital as a place of employment.

One of the important views adopted by this research is that applied general semantics principles will improve human relationships
and will provide a geometric progression opportunity for communications. (See Chapter I.)

The following recommendations include a challenge that further research in this vital area be pursued vigorously.

Recommendations. Initial exploratory research pointed to a general belief that introducing the teaching of general semantics principles into the business environment should be investigated. There is little known previous work in this precise area; therefore, this research is exploratory in nature, as opposed to conclusive. Confrontation with this report will, perhaps, develop hypotheses that can be proved or disproved by future related research. That hope is reflected in the following recommendations for further study:

1. A similar experiment which would include occupational groups, other than medical hospitals. The practice of general semantics principles are not restricted to specific situations, but may be employed with any human oriented organization.

2. A similar experiment, using the classroom teaching technique, allowing more time involvement. A suggestion would include teaching the general semantics program several times with specified time intervals between classes.

3. Finally, a repeat experiment using similar circumstances and techniques.

Further academic exploration may expose general semantics as a valid organizational training process. This research is directed toward that objective.
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APPENDIX A

HOSPITAL SUBORDINATE QUESTIONNAIRE

CONFIDENTIAL

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ANYWHERE

INSTRUCTION AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study is to measure the meaning of certain things to various people by having them judge against a series of descriptive scales. Make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you.

HERE ARE EXAMPLES OF HOW TO USE THESE SCALES. (THIS IS NOT PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.)

EXAMPLE A:

If you feel that your vacation plan is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair _X_: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: unfair

OR

fair ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X: unfair

EXAMPLE B:

If you feel your vacation plan seems quite closely related to one side of the scales as opposed to the other side (but not extremely), then you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair ___: X: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: unfair

OR

fair ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: X: ___: unfair
EXAMPLE C:

If you feel your vacation plan seems only slightly related to one side of the scale as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair___:___:X:___:___:___:___:___ unfair

OR

fair___:___:___:___:X:___:___:___:___ unfair

EXAMPLE D:

If you consider your vacation plan to be neutral on the scale or unrelated, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space, as follows:

fair___:___:___:X:___:___:___:___ unfair

IMPORTANT: Be sure you mark the scale for every concept, but never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you have had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so please do not look back and forth through the items. Make each item a separate and independent judgment.

I would like to assure you that all responses will be held in strictest confidence and that no names will be used. Results of this survey will appear only as statistical information.

THANK YOU.

PLEASE PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE
There are 14 descriptive word-scales below. Determine how the descriptions best fit the impression you have about your SUPERVISOR. (THE PERSON WHO DIRECTS YOUR WORK EFFORTS)

SUPERVISOR

good:____:____:____:____:____:bad

cruel:____:____:____:____:kind

positive:____:____:____:____:negative

pessimistic:____:____:____:____:optimistic

believing:____:____:____:____:skeptical

weak:____:____:____:____:strong

lenient:____:____:____:____:severe

complex:____:____:____:____:simple

active:____:____:____:____:passive

excitable:____:____:____:____:calm

rational:____:____:____:____:intuitive

rash:____:____:____:____:cautious

interesting:____:____:____:____:boring

insensitive:____:____:____:____:sensitive

PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE
There are 3 descriptive word-scales below. Determine how the words describe the impression you have of HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION. (THOSE IN MANAGEMENT OTHER THAN YOUR SUPERVISOR)

HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION


There are 4 descriptive word-scales below. Determine how the words describe the WORK ENVIRONMENT (climate) in your hospital.

**HOSPITAL ENVIRONMENT**

positive:____:____:____:____:____:____ negative

unsociable:____:____:____:____:____:____ sociable

harmonious:____:____:____:____:____:____ dissonant

bad:____:____:____:____:____:____ good

This page completes the questionnaire. Do not write your name anywhere.

THANK YOU.
APPENDIX B

PRELIMINARY QUESTIONNAIRE

CONFIDENTIAL

DO NOT WRITE YOUR NAME ANYWHERE

INSTRUCTIONS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study is to measure the meaning of certain things to various people by having them judge against a series of descriptive scales. Make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you.

HERE ARE EXAMPLES OF HOW TO USE THESE SCALES. (THIS IS NOT PART OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE)

EXAMPLE A:

If you feel that your vacation plan is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : unfair

fair : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X unfair

EXAMPLE B:

If you feel your vacation plan seems quite closely related to one side of the scale as opposed to the other side (but not extremely), then you should place your check-mark as follows:


EXAMPLE C:

If you feel your vacation plan seems only slightly related to one side of the scale as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should place your check-mark as follows:

fair : X : unfair

fair : unfair

EXAMPLE D:

If you consider your vacation plan to be neutral on the scale or unrelated, then you should place your check-mark in the middle space, as follows:

fair : unfair

IMPORTANT: Be sure you mark the scale for every concept, but never put more than one check-mark on a single scale.

Sometimes you may feel as though you have had the same item before on the questionnaire. This will not be the case, so please do not look back and forth through the items. Make each item a separate and independent judgment.

I would like to assure you that all responses will be held in strictest confidence and that no names will be used. Results of this survey will appear only as statistical information.

THANK YOU.

PLEASE PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE
THERE ARE 21 DESCRIPTIVE WORD-SCALES BELOW. DETERMINE HOW THE DESCRIPTIONS BEST FIT THE IMPRESSION YOU HAVE ABOUT HOW THE WORD-SCALE DESCRIBES A TRAIT OR IMPRESSION YOU HAVE ABOUT YOUR SUPERVISOR.

SUPERVISOR

good____:____:____:____:____:____:____ bad

cruel

harmonious____:____:____:____:____:____:____ dissonant

successful____:____:____:____:____:____:____ unsuccessful

progressive____:____:____:____:____:____:____ regressive

positive____:____:____:____:____:____:____ negative

optimistic____:____:____:____:____:____:____ pessimistic

believing____:____:____:____:____:____:____ skeptical

strong____:____:____:____:____:____:____ weak

lenient

tenacious____:____:____:____:____:____:____ yielding

free

complex____:____:____:____:____:____:____ simple

passive

excitable____:____:____:____:____:____:____ calm

changeable

rational____:____:____:____:____:____:____ intuitive

rash

orthodox____:____:____:____:____:____:____ heretical

boring

insensitive

PROCEED TO NEXT PAGE
THERE ARE 5 DESCRIPTIVE WORD-SCALES BELOW. DETERMINE HOW THE WORDS DESCRIBE THE IMPRESSION YOU HAVE OF HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION. (THOSE IN MANAGEMENT OTHER THAN YOUR SUPERVISOR)

HOSPITAL ADMINISTRATION


THERE ARE 5 DESCRIPTIVE WORD-SCALES BELOW. DETERMINE HOW THE WORDS DESCRIBE THE WORK ENVIRONMENT (CLIMATE) IN YOUR HOSPITAL.

**HOSPITAL ENVIRONMENT**

positive____:____:____:____:____:____:____negative

sociable____:____:____:____:____:____:____unsociable

progressive____:____:____:____:____:____:____regressive

harmonious____:____:____:____:____:____:____dissonant

good____:____:____:____:____:____:____bad

This page completes the questionnaire. Do not write your name anywhere.

THANK YOU.
APPENDIX C

Class Activity Log

The class routine consisted of controlled activity which followed a defined presentation pattern. The structural presentation did not deviate even though the educational material changed from session to session. The structured program was designed to present a comfortable class atmosphere and to prepare the student to assume an expectant attitude. The following is a copy of the presentation outline used in class.

I. Session One - A General Semantics Overview

The first session opened with the researcher introducing himself and explaining his personal objectives. The class was informed that the researcher was involved in a dissertation project and that class activity would be used for Doctoral research conducted at Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

A. Classroom Presentation Routine

A portion of the initial class was used to establish rapport between the researcher and class members. Using a delineation duplicating Lesikar's filter of the mind communication model\(^1\) an

overview of the communication environment was presented to the class. The three areas of miscommunication and the eight steps in the model were discussed and investigated through class participation.

B. Outline and Summation of Classroom Activity

1. A General Semantics Overview
   a). Communication in Business
   b). Jumping to Conclusions
      (1). Fact and Inference Statements
      (2). Assumption of Certainty
      (3). Assumption of Probability
   c). Recognizing Language Deficiencies
      (1). Filter of the Mind
      (2). Spoken Language
      (3). Written Language
   d). Definition of General Semantics
      (1). Uncritical Inference Test

---


3Following a lengthy discussion the class derived the following definition: "General semantics investigates the human semantic reaction to words and symbols and promotes an educational process to teach people how to better deal with their environment by understanding the relationship between language and human behavior."

4William V. Haney, The Uncritical Inference Test, 1972. Orders for copies of the test are available from ISGS, P. O. Box 2469, San Francisco, California 94126 (25 cents each, minimum order of 5 copies).
(2). Extensional Devices^5

2. The Structural Differential

a). Language Application^6

b). Time Application^7

3. The Abstraction Ladder

a). Abstraction Exercises^8

b). Written Abstraction Exercises®

4. Perception and Semantic Reaction

---


6Berman, op. cit., p. 25.


9Each student was requested to recall his favorite television, magazine or newspaper commercial message, and to write what he remembered on a sheet of paper. The student was then asked to isolate the "high abstraction words." After discussion of class findings, the students rewrote the commercial message using conscious word application. Students who could not remember a specific message were given a "typical" commercial copied from magazines and newspapers in a random fashion.
a). The Bride and Mother-in-law Exercise

b). Class Discussion

II. Session Two - Effective Listening

The second session opened with a brief discussion of the two class assignments made at the close of the first session. The two assignments were to (1) Be alert for high abstraction statements and, (2) Try to recognize fact-inference statements. The assignment was designed to promote student awareness of language application to situations while "on the job." Evaluation of the student assignment presented a non-lecture opportunity to promote class discussion.

A. Outline and Summation of Classroom Activity

1. Effective Listening
   a). Three Myths of Listening
   b). Active Listening

2. Paraphrase Game

B. Listening As A Personal Skill

---


12Ibid., pp. 191-193.

13Ibid., pp. 369-370.
C. Better Listening Procedure
   1. Listen For Total Meaning
   2. Respond to Feelings
   3. Note All Cues

D. Class Discussion

E. Written Examination Over Sessions One and Two.

III. Session Three - Human Misunderstanding

The third session included a review of the examination administered at the conclusion of session two. Five questions had been asked the students: (1) Define general semantics, (2) Define communication, (3) Sketch and label the structural differential, (4) Identify Alfred Korzybski, and (5) Write the percentage of time we spend listening.

Average score was 90 per cent correct answers given to the five questions.

A. Outline and Summation of Classroom Activity

   1. Human Misunderstanding

      a). The Arc of Distortion

---


b). Means of Communication

2. One-way Communication Exercises

B. How to Lessen Misunderstanding

1. Why do we misunderstand each other?
2. Projection and by-passing
3. Assumptions
4. Projections
   a). Forms of Projection
   b). Awareness of Projection

C. Semantic Fact-Inferences
D. Projection Test
E. Oral Examination

IV. Session Four - Understanding Your Environment

A brief discussion about how to apply "on the job" general semantics opened the fourth training session.

A. Outline and Summation of Classroom Activity

1. Understanding Through Communication

---

16Ibid., pp. 511-512.
17Ibid., p. 510.
20Haney, op. cit., p. 188.
2. Our Language and Behavior
   a). Verbal World
   b). Non-verbal World

B. Steps in Human Behavior
   1. Something Happens
   2. Nervous System Reacts
   3. Evaluation Follows
   4. Response Occurs

C. Container Myth

D. What Do You Mean?

E. Understanding Through an Open Mind
   1. Allness Attitude
   2. Either/or Orientation

F. Role Playing
   1. Order-taker Exercises

---


24 Myers and Myers, op. cit., pp. 200-201.
2. Survival Decision Exercise

G. Human Behavior and Reality

H. The Semantic Nurse

1. Role Playing
2. The Person
3. The Content
4. The Style
5. Self-Concept

I. Conclusion

1. Answers and Non-answerable Questions
2. The Scientific Method
3. Class Discussion using Question and Answer Method.

V. Session Five - Human Communication Workshop

The last session was student oriented to the extent that much of the class time was utilized in discussion and personal experiences using general semantics background knowledge. Session five was an inter-action experience using a laboratory rather than


26Myers and Myers, op. cit., pp. 100-105.

27Ibid., p. 49.

28Ibid., pp. 51-52.
than lecture.

A. Communication Processes

1. Bypassing
2. Allness
3. Reaction to Communications

B. Applied General Semantics

C. Semantic Reactions

D. Language and Culture

E. Review of Course Activity

1. Question and Answer Period
2. Conclusion and Summation

---

29 Haney, op. cit., p. 245.

30 Ibid., p. 294.

31 Ibid., p. 490.


33 Evans, op. cit., pp. 23-32.
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