INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of gr: : value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

**Xerox University Microfilms**

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

76-19,255

TALBURTT, Margaret Anne, 1947-
PROMOTING CREATIVE RISK-TAKING IN WOMEN.

The University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1976
Education, higher

**Xerox University Microfilms,** Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

# PROMOTING CREATIVE RISK-TAKING IN WOMEN

by
Margaret Anne Talburtt

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Education)
in The University of Michigan
1976

Doctoral Committee:

Associate Professor Zelda F. Gamson, Chairperson
Professor Gerald Gurin
Lecturer Jean B. Mann
Professor Allen Menlo
Professor Donald N. Michael

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This dissertation affirms the relationship between support and challenge as the crucial and complementary elements involved in the promotion of creative risk-taking. Aside from the text of this thesis, my experience as the author of this dissertation underscores the importance of these two factors. My doctorate would not be possible without the challenge and support offered to me by many others. I wish to publicly acknowledge and deeply thank those who have contributed so much to this work.

To begin, I am indebted to the women of G-350, who are this dissertation. Their cooperation and patience were invaluable to me and I am fortunate to count them as my friends and sisters.

More than the normal amount of thanks is owed to my dissertation committee: Professors Zelda Gamson, Gerald Gurin, Jean Mann, Allen Menlo, and Donald Michael. Without their enthusiasm and support, I would never have embarked on this effort and without their patience and critical help, I would never have finished. Each member offered unique resources that have considerably strengthened this research. I am particularly grateful to my chairperson, Dr. Zelda Gamson, for her valuable time and wisdom. A public statement does not begin to express my gratitude.

I would also like to thank K. Benson Barr and Barbara Robbins whose skills were most helpful in the technical production of this thesis. Their efforts made this dissertation more of a team endeavor and less solitary.

To conclude, I wish to thank five individuals for their unending and powerful support. As patron parents, my mother and father asked good questions about what I was doing and applied the correct amount of pressure to finish. To Barbara and George, my heartfelt thanks for facilitating my life to date. My professional colleagues and partners, Rick Heydinger and John Seeley, have endured my ups and downs, understood my varying commitments, and have freely given me their time, advice, and analytic gifts. My life and this dissertation have been considerably improved by their personal and professional resources. They are my peers, brothers, uncles, and mates, and I am fortunate to work with such fine humans. Finally, I share this minor victory with James Peggs. His belief in me and the importance of this work made dark days calm. As my partner in life, he contributes reason and love to my creative risk-taking. I gratefully acknowledge his contributions to this thesis and my humanity.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . . ii

LIST OF TABLES . . . . . vi

LIST OF APPENDICES . . . . . viii

CHAPTER 1 The Concept of Creative Risk-taking . . . . 1

Introduction: Background and Need for the Study . 1
Definition of the Concept . . . . . 3
Purpose of the Study . . . . . 4
Plan of the Thesis . . . . . 5
Conclusion . . . . . 6

CHAPTER 2 Review of the Literature . . . . . 8

Introduction . . . . . 8
Feminist Awareness . . . . . 9
Creativity . . . . . 11
Risk Orientation . . . . . 15
Confluent Teaching . . . . . 21
Behavior and Attitude Change . . . . . 26
Conclusion . . . . . 31

CHAPTER 3 Methodology . . . . . 32

Introduction . . . . . 32
The Samples . . . . . 33
Research Design . . . . . 39
Data Instruments . . . . . 40
Chronology of Data Collection . . . . . 43
Data Analysis . . . . . 45
Limitations . . . . . 46
Conclusion . . . . . 48

CHAPTER 4 A Comparison of the Changes in the Two Classes . . . . . 49

Introduction . . . . . 49
An Introductory Profile of the Two Classes . . . . 49
$T_1T_2$ Comparisons and Changes Between the Classes . 54
Discussion of the Data . . . . . 62
Conclusion . . . . . 64

CHAPTER 5 Probing the Initial Changes Within G-350 . . 66

Introduction . . . . . 66
Who . . . . . 66
What . . . . . 71
Why: the Conclusion . . . . . 73

CHAPTER 6 G-350 Students One Year After Their Initial Entry into the Class . . . . . 74

Introduction . . . . . 74
$T_3$ Test and Interview Profiles . . . . . 75
Personality Types and the Utility of G-350 . . . . 80
Delayed Reactions: the $T_3$ Movers . . . . . 89
Conclusion . . . . . 91

CHAPTER 7 Four Case Studies of Those Who Benefited from G-350 . . . . . 93

Introduction . . . . . 93
Susan F. . . . . 94
Lucy T. . . . . 100
Carmen S. . . . . 108
Annie B. . . . . 114
Conclusion . . . . . 120

CHAPTER 8 Four Case Studies of Those Who Did Not Benefit from G-350 . . . . . 122

Introduction . . . . . 122
Molly G. . . . . 123
Kate F. . . . . 130
Nancy W. . . . . 136
Jill R. . . . . 143
Conclusion . . . . . 149

CHAPTER 9 Summary and Implications . . . . . 151

Introduction . . . . . 151
Overview of this Study . . . . . 151
Conclusion: Implications for Use and Future Research . . . . . 166

APPENDICES . . . . . 170

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . 200

LIST OF TABLES


3.1 Pretest-Posttest, Multiple Time-Series, Control Group Design . . . . . 33

4.1 Comparison of Age, Major, and Marital Status in W.S. 340 and G-350 . . . . . 50

4.2 The Prior Educational Experiences of the Two Groups . . . . . 52

4.3 Comparison Between Groups of $T_1$ Mean Scores on Attitudinally-Related Variables . . . . . 53

4.4 Comparison Between Groups of $T_1$ Mean Scores on Behaviorally-Related Variables . . . . . 53

4.5 $T_1T_2$ Score Comparisons for Attitudinally-Related Variables . . . . . 55

4.6 $T_1T_2$ Score Comparisons for Behaviorally-Related Variables . . . . . 55

4.7 $T_1T_2$ Comparison of Patterns of Score Movement Between the Two Classes . . . . . 57

4.8 Comparison of Esteem-Movers' and Esteem-Nonmovers' $T_1$ and $T_2$ Risk Scores . . . . . 61

5.1 Peer Reports of Observable $T_1T_2$ Changes in G-350 Students on Risk, Self-esteem, and Nonconformity . 69

5.2 Percent of Accuracy Between Peer Reports and J.P.I. Test Scores . . . . . 69

5.3 Class Exercises Named as Extremely Significant by Esteem Movers and Esteem Nonmovers . . . . . 71

6.1 $T_1T_2T_3$ Mean Score Profile for G-350 Students . . . 75

6.2 A Summary of Three $T_3$ Interview Questions Which Focused on the Relatedness of G-350 to Student's Lives . . . . . 79

6.3 $T_1T_2T_3$ Mean Score Comparison Between $T_2$ Esteem Movers and Nonmovers . . . . . 81

6.4 Responses of $T_2$ Esteem Movers and Nonmovers to a Felt Need for a Continued Forum like G-350 . . . 83

6.5 $T_1T_2T_3$ Mean Score Comparison of Group A and Group B Within G-350 . . . . . 84

6.6 $T_1$ J.P.I. Scores of Group A and Group B by Score Range . . . . . 87

6.7 $T_1T_2T_3$ Mean Score Profile of the $T_3$ Movers . . . . 89

7.1 $T_1T_3$ Change in Risk Score and Desire for a Forum like G-350 . . . . . 94

7.2 Susan's $T_1T_2T_3$ Test Scores and Summary Differences . . . . . 97

7.3 Lucy's $T_1T_2T_3$ Test Scores and Summary Differences . . . . . 102

7.4 Carmen's $T_1T_2T_3$ Test Scores and Summary Differences . . . . . 110

7.5 Annie's $T_1T_2T_3$ Test Scores and Summary Differences . . . . . 118

8.1 $T_1T_3$ Change in Risk Score and Desire for a Forum like G-350 . . . . . 122

8.2 Molly's $T_1T_2T_3$ Test Scores and Summary Differences . . . . . 127

8.3 Kate's $T_1T_2T_3$ Test Scores and Summary Differences . . . . . 131

8.4 Nancy's $T_1T_2T_3$ Test Scores and Summary Differences . . . . . 137

8.5 Jill's $T_1T_2T_3$ Test Scores and Summary Differences . . . . . 146

LIST OF APPENDICES


APPENDIX A G-350 Reading List . . . . . 171

APPENDIX B W.S. 340 Reading List . . . . . 175

APPENDIX C Feminist Awareness Questionnaire . . . . . 178

APPENDIX D Jackson Personality Inventory . . . . . 180

APPENDIX E Personal Orientation Inventory . . . . . 182

APPENDIX F The Rokeach Belief (Dogmatism) Scale . . . 185

APPENDIX G Biographical Data . . . . . 188

APPENDIX H Peer Rating Questions . . . . . 189

APPENDIX I Final Exam for G-350 . . . . . 191

APPENDIX J $T_2$ Student Interview . . . . . 193

APPENDIX K $T_3$ Follow-up Interview . . . . . 196

APPENDIX L Independent Interviewer's Comments . . . . 198

# CHAPTER 1

## THE CONCEPT OF CREATIVE RISK-TAKING

### Introduction: Background and Need for the Study

The origin of my fascination with and commitment to the increase of creative risk-taking in women began with a study of why women deny discrimination. This fact is well documented, and it is a shameful testimony not only to the inequities of our society but also to the way women internalize them (Levitin et al., 1971; Tinker, 1971; Kahn, 1972; and Talburtt, 1972). Working women face discrimination that is frequently proportional to their job position; the higher the position, the greater the discrepancy between rewards given to women and their male counterparts. Yet, there is an overwhelming tendency for women to deny that discrimination affects them personally although they acknowledge its effects on other women in like positions in the same working environment.

This denial of discrimination has a psychological as well as a cultural basis and seems to particularly characterize many women in the higher echelons of the professions. For the most part, these women are college-educated. While the psychological roots of denial may be too deep to be changed by the American system of higher education, colleges

and universities can have impact on the cultural causes of and possible solutions to discrimination.

Higher education has traditionally accepted responsibility for the training of professionals, but the system does not seem to teach all the skills that the contemporary woman needs, e.g. positive coping mechanisms against discrimination. In considering the role that higher education should assume to meet this challenge directly, new types of classes for women would seem to be a necessary addition to the traditional curriculum.

Not only must intellectual and professional competencies be taught, but other skills and attitudes seem to be crucial to the educational development of a woman's potential. Assertiveness, independence, and risk-taking, as well as high personal and professional self-esteem seem to be necessary for success in non-traditional roles and careers. The college classroom should be a forum for the instruction and mastery of these skills and attitudes. Currently, it is not.

In part, this is because increased risk-taking and/or positive self-concepts are not viewed as compatible with the academic mission of most schools, and therefore, they are not curricular goals. But also, few college instructors are professionally or personally prepared to teach for these ends. Nonetheless, the need is clear and as more women choose to maintain careers in addition to or instead of

families and homes, skills and attitudes such as risk-taking and independence will become more important for successful lives.

This realization led to the creation of a university class that hoped to contribute to the development of the awareness and behaviors that women need in order to better control their destinies; not only to confront discrimination but also to achieve maximum personal fulfillment. Specifically, the class sought to affect creative risk-taking in women.

## Definition of the Concept

Creative risk-taking is a process which involves the recognition of a desired risk, the assessment and creation of alternatives to that end; and the choosing and acting on one alternative. The nature of every risk varies with the individual. Clearly, creative risk-taking has both behavioral and attitudinal aspects. It implies both a willingness to expose oneself to situations which have uncertain outcomes and a confidence to meet such situations in an open, inventive, and self-actualizing manner. Creative risk-taking involves individual assessment of one's values and commitment to acting on those values despite the possible disenchantment of one's parent, boss, or friend. Creative risk-taking emphasizes "brainstorming" or the invention of many alternative means to achieve a risk. Innovation is particularly important at this point. However,

opting to not take a risk may actually be the greater risk and the more appropriate response. Conversely, the instructional goal is to help women carefully sense out which consequences of a risk would move them toward the desired end, which consequences would possibly have negative impact, and which aspects of the risk cannot be controlled (e.g., another's reaction). Conscious determination of any risk is stressed. In this way, the process tries to distinguish between creative risks and those which would produce self-defeating behavior.

## Purpose of the Study

The major aim of this study is to explore the processes and experiences that can be taught in order to promote creative risk-taking in undergraduate women at the University of Michigan. Specifically, the hope is to expand awareness and understanding of both the in-class activities and the out-of-class circumstances that promote and support creative risk-taking in women. The objectives of the study are:

1. To identify significant variables that affect creative risk-taking in women;
2. To define, refine, and evaluate the pedagogical tactics that contribute to the process of creative risk-taking;
3. To integrate the multiple sources of information which describe the promotion of creative risk-taking in women; and
4. To understand, in as great a depth as possible, the relationships between the class, the lives of the women in the class, and the nurturance of creative risk-taking in women.

## Plan of the Thesis

The purpose of this brief overview of the thesis is to give the reader a sense of its continuity and logic. Having introduced the personal reasons for the study of creative risk-taking in women in Chapter 1, a more formal rationale follows in Chapter 2. While no single body of literature defines the process of creative risk-taking, selected theories and studies in creativity, risk orientation, and feminist awareness contribute to an understanding of the concept. Research in confluent teaching methods is also reviewed in Chapter 2, as it helps to explain the philosophy and activities of the class and their relationship to the process of creative risk-taking.

Chapter 3 details the methodology of this study. Research goals are translated into the procedures and instruments of data collection and analysis. Limitations of this study are carefully presented at that point.

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 reveal the findings of this study from three different perspectives. Chapter 4 compares the principal class in this study with a referent class, noting their short-term changes, as measured by several personality tests. Chapter 5 develops in greater depth the short-term changes within the principal class, adding other sources of information about these changes. Peer reports and interview summaries help to interpret the findings. Chapter 6 investigates the persistence of change in the students in the principal class nine months after its completion.

Again, several sources of information document the levels and types of creative risk-taking experienced by the students.

Representative case studies relate the study's summary findings to individual lives. Chapter 7 focuses on four students who responded to the class experience in a strong way, as indicated by sizable test score changes and their self-reports. Chapter 8 studies four students who did not derive any significant benefits from the class, based on their lack of strong positive feeling for the class experience and minimal test score change. Tentative explanations for the differential reactions conclude this chapter.

Chapter 9 expands the summary findings of this study and applies them to other educational settings. The process of creative risk-taking in women not only has important implications for the education of women but also for the education of men, the training of teachers, and the development of an individual's potential within a classroom setting.

## Conclusion

Dr. Jesse Bernard (1971) has argued that:

> If we loosened girls ties to their mothers' apron strings, if we encouraged them to fend for themselves, if we cultivated independence and self-reliance, if we rewarded their efforts to satisfy their curiosity, if we stimulated probing intelligence and vetoed easy answers, if we discouraged feminine submission, frowned on unthinking conformity to social rules, did not emphasize pleasing others so much, then the achievement

> of women would be greater. . . . The supportive function for which the sweet girl is being processed does not make for a high level of creativity.

This study will try to explore some educational means to overcome this socialization and to carefully evaluate the results and impact of that educational experience on the lives of the students involved in the experiment. Creative risk-taking may be one potential remedy for the traditional woman Bernard describes.

# CHAPTER 2

# REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

## Introduction

Creative risk-taking is not a household word and no single body of literature provides insight into its causes, consequences, and dimensions. For the purposes of this study, creative risk-taking signifies an individual's conscious decision to act on a value or idea because of its personal importance and despite an uncertain outcome or possible disapproval from others. Its aim is positive growth not self-defeating behavior. It is a process, not an end. It is individually determined, not prescribed by others. Four sets of variables seem most relevant to understanding creative risk-taking in women: 1) feminist awareness, as a possible catalyst for self-esteem and openness to new role definition; 2) creativity, which may be related to risk-taking through its correlation with self-actualization, autonomy, and innovation; 3) propensity to risk, to live with uncertainty and to try the new; and 4) confluent teaching techniques, which prompt and reinforce creative risk-taking.

Feminist awareness and creativity describe what may be the psychological prerequisites for creative risk-taking, while propensity to risk appears to be tied to

situational opportunities. Together, it is the felt need to risk coupled with the chance to act that seems to move one to take a risk. Confluent teaching techniques are a means to the end, as they can provide the challenge, reinforce the need, or supportively develop the propensity to risk. The interrelationships among these variables are multifold and each represents a unique approach to the understanding of creative risk-taking. The following sections present some of the findings from studies that seem particularly relevant to the psychological, situational, and educational factors linked to creative risk-taking. A final section in this chapter introduces general concepts that help to explain behavior and attitude change. In this way, an attempt is made to conceptualize and integrate the four variables of feminist awareness, creativity, risk, and confluent teaching into a more comprehensive and unified theory of creative risk-taking.

## Feminist Awareness

Feminist awareness implies intellectual and emotional commitments to the necessity for and implications of full equality for women in today's society. This may include familiarity with feminist literature, involvement in feminist groups, and/or identification with other feminist women. This study would like to better understand some of the circumstances under which consciousness about new female roles and options translates into new behavior.

Although the research literature in this area is very scanty, one interesting study by Joan Joesting reported that college-aged women who identified with the Women's Liberation movement (i.e. those with high feminist awareness) scored significantly higher on the creativity, originality, and risk-taking scales of the "Torrance Life Experience Inventory" than did female peers who did not identify with the Women's Liberation movement (i.e. those with low feminist awareness) (1971). Furthermore, women high in feminist awareness had higher grade point averages, a greater sense of adventure, and were more athletic. It appears that risk-taking and creativity are inter-correlated, although Joesting's design does not permit conclusions about the causal priority of these variables.

Other studies have examined the relationship between personality variables and career choice. Sandra Tangri compared Role-Innovators (women in traditionally male professions) to Role-Traditionals (women in classically female professions). Tangri's findings most relevant to this study are: 1) Role-Innovators chose more varied fields in which to work, desired more accomplishment within those fields, and expressed greater commitment to their vocations than did Role-Traditionals; and 2) Role-Innovators evidenced greater autonomy and concern about self than did Role-Traditionals (1969). It would appear that Role-Innovators would be more creative, in the terms of this study, than their more traditional sisters.

Miriam Yu focused on exactly this point. Yu compared women in traditionally male professions (the TMPs) and traditionally female professions (the TFPs) and the role of creativity in their career choice. She found that the TMPs were more outgoing, adaptable, adventurous, socially bold, less threatened by their environment, less anxious, and more natural and trustful. As a group, they were more self-assured and assertive than the TFPs. These findings were even sharper when the groups were stratified on the basis of high and low degrees of creativity. Highly creative TMPs were the most self-assured and confident women in Yu's study.

While neither Yu nor Tangri looked at feminist awareness directly, their work does underscore the preeminent goal of the Women's movement which seeks to encourage women to break out of traditional molds and freely choose whatever field of work or life style they desire. Yu and Tangri found that women in nontraditional careers were more autonomous and creative than traditional females. Rather than focus primarily on career choice, this study will try to illuminate the relationship of creativity and risk to the multitude of life choices that undergraduate women make.

## Creativity

The purpose of this review of studies on the creative personality is twofold: 1) to highlight the psychological

characteristics related to creativity and 2) to attempt to apply these characteristics to the choice to risk. Although the research on creativity has focused almost completely on famous artists and scientific geniuses, most of whom are male, the few studies that do examine creativity in women indicate that creative women are similar to creative men and generally more masculine than feminine in personality (Getzels and Csikszentmihaly, 1964; Casldan, 1966; Helson, 1967).

Creative women do not seem to be strong in traditional "feminine" traits, such as passivity, dependence, or conformity, but rather are assertive, autonomous, and self-sufficient. Since it is likely that a woman may have to choose between developing her creativity or her femininity, a dilemma is posed. This may explain why the number of creative women appears to be low, as many women assume the classic feminine role rather than pursue their creative development. Nonetheless, the potential for creative development rests in many women. The following studies explore the characteristics that need to be encouraged if creative potential is to become a reality.

Freedom from enculturation, openness to respond to new inputs, and autonomy are very important elements in the development of creativity because they are characteristics that permit individuals to accept the inevitable challenges and difficulties of constant growth (Rogers, 1962; Maslow, 1962; Kneller, 1965; and Parnes, 1972).

Openness is crucial to risk-taking because it supports the mental set that encourages one to want to move beyond what is routine and to respond to new stimuli. For women, this may mean openness to new roles or new definitions of self. This acknowledgment may be risky but it could also be a step into a more creative life.

The relationship between a self-actualizing life style and creativity has been heavily researched. Consciousness about one's life, awareness of and tolerance of life's paradoxes, increased problem-centering, and contact with one's inner resources are important characteristics of the self-actualizing person (Maslow, 1959 and 1962; Stein, 1953). Self-actualization relates to creativity in that it challenges one to move past homeostasis and supports one when external security is questionable. It is indicative of increased internal control of one's life which in turn affects autonomy. The individual knows that life has little certainty, but is not beaten or depressed by this realization. Rather, the creative individual is motivated to try the new and re-think the old with an eye to creating her/his own future.

While the previous paragraphs have described the attitudes of a creative person, the directions or outcomes of the creative life are also important. Innovation, imagination, and aesthetic sensitivity represent other common characteristics in creative people (Taylor and Holland, 1964; Zahn, 1966; and Stein, 1953). This drive for

uniqueness is what frequently results in the production of a great piece of art or the new solution to a perplexing problem. The creative person can go beyond what is known, beyond what is censored, in order to achieve a fresh perspective and design an alternative idea or product. This aspect of creativity involves an action or an expression of the creative attitude by connecting the feeling to one's environment.

In sum, autonomy, innovation and self-actualization are involved in creative risk-taking because these qualities open up the individual to risk and contribute to a growth-producing end. For example, a woman who wants to leave an English teaching job to become a writer is taking a risk. The decision process she uses could determine whether she is taking a stupid risk or a creative risk. If autonomy, openness, and a correct assessment of her talent raised the option; if innovation and imagination helped to develop alternative choices in the decision-making process, and if some degree of self-actualization resulted, it is very likely that the woman is a creative risk-taker. A non-creative risk-taker would just act, without forethought or purpose. Klein suggested that the creative risk-taker experiences the following aspects of creative behavior: she maximizes her options, defers judgment to allow for the fullest range of associations and experiences, is action-oriented, has a positive outlook toward life, is open to new experiences and has internal control of her

destiny (1972). These are components of the process of creative risk-taking.

Risk Orientation

Risk orientation has many facets—physical, social, ethical, and monetary, to name but a few (Jackson et al., 1971). This study will deal with the personal and interpersonal dimensions of risk-taking, and with those situations in which there is uncertainty of outcome rather than a clear probability of outcome. Consequently, the utility of the literature is limited because of this study's focus on personal strategies to cope with uncertainty rather than the traditional study of probability and intellectual choice.

Risk-taking seems to be a necessary component in personality development. Discussing the teaching of creative students, Paul Torrance stated that "risk-taking seems essential in the development of self concept; it is the test of one's limits . . . Risk-taking is also important in the acquisition of skills and knowledge . . . to try the new is always a risk. However, personality development and growth can occur only through risk-taking. It is a "must" to achieve autonomy, as indecision and risk-taking are negatively correlated." (1962). Risk-taking is related not only to autonomy and self-concept, but also to open-mindedness. In a study of sensitivity-training marathons, B. J. Poe concluded that a significant

relationship existed between openness and risk-taking, and between self-confidence and risk-taking (1971). If one accepts the notion that women traditionally derive their esteem from others' roles (Bardwick, 1971), it is no wonder that female levels of risk-taking and creativity appear low (Yu, 1972). Too often, the self-esteem of women has nothing to do with self, but rather is based on the successes of husbands, children, or bosses. This pseudo-self-esteem appears insufficient to nurture either self-confidence or risk-taking.

Risk-taking behavior can be enhanced or dampened by interactions with others. The effects of small groups on risk-taking has been studied by many researchers. The "risky shift" phenomenon was discovered by Stoner who found that groups acted in a more risky way than their individual members (1961). Kogan and Wallach explained the group impact on increased individual risk as the result of the group interaction around situational risk (1967). They determined that the two most inhibiting factors to risk-taking were fear of failure and fear of social disapproval. Obviously, a group can increase or dispel these fears by the degree of support it gives to its members. The support creates a norm within the group which has an effect on the members' level of risk-taking. This study will continue to probe the group characteristics which may increase or prevent creative risking in its members.

Charlotte Gilson replicated the Kogan and Wallach study, with high school seniors as her subjects, and found that the very pressure of a group, regardless of interaction level, produced higher levels of individual risk in its members (1968). One explanation for the strong effect of the group was that younger people seek peer rewards more than older people do, and thus, would risk more to gain esteem from others. However, Gilson concluded that small group size and positive attention may be more important. Specifically, she noted that it was not fear of failure, as Kogan and Wallach thought (1967), which kept people from taking risks, but rather, the degree to which they received positive incentives for risk-taking. Those who normally do not take risks will push themselves into the "unexplored and new" if: 1) they are rewarded with success via incremental steps toward the larger risk; and 2) they receive extrinsic rewards of peer approval and positive support.

The affective bonds and social interaction which accompany group discussion have been suggested in a number of studies as important rewards available to a group to increase the risk-taking of its members (Nordhoy, 1962; Wallach and Kogan, 1965). Based on these findings, Roger Brown attempted to explicate the normative effects of a group on risk-taking. He suggested that group discussion generally proved to individuals that anticipated risks were not as great or that the means were not as risky as initially imagined. Further, the crucial impact of

discussion was the information it revealed about the extent of the group's value of risk (1965). If the group felt that risk was good, individuals moved in the direction of more risk. Stoner later verified the effects of group norms on movement in the opposite direction: if the group did not value risk vis a vis a certain issue, individuals would move in a more conservative direction after discussion (1968). The power of the group to affect the degree of risk-taking in its members seems clear.

Particular strategies within a group are known to effect a change in individual levels of risk. Bateson found that caution stemmed from a person's lack of familiarity with the new, and that risk would increase as the dynamics of the problem were explored either verbally in a group or individually on paper (1966). O'Mahoney and Labbie confirmed that familiarization with a task increased individual risk in its solution, and again, that group risk was higher than individual risk (1973). Stoner found that in groups which held similar social values, the presence of one risk-taker would result in all group members acting in a more risky way, at least as measured on pen-and-paper questionnaires about risky situations (1968). Together, these studies begin to specify some of the means by which groups can increase risk-taking in their members.

Bennett and Lindskold documented the importance of group size when they found that a small group acts in a more risky manner than a large group in a situational

dilemmas setting (1971). It appears that the affective bonds and social interaction that Wallach and Kogan (1965) found to be important to enhance risk-taking are more likely present in a small group setting than in a large group.

A more complex experiment to increase creative risk-taking was conducted by Richard Byrd. He studied the effects of a laboratory training model on the levels of creative risk-taking in a group of adult theologians. His model was highly non-directive, utilized a supportive group atmosphere, stressed individual goal-setting for personal growth, and urged the implementation of these goals within the lab setting. When compared to a sensitivitv-trained control group which did not utilize the goals-setting approach, the experimental group showed far more growth in autonomy, independence, spontaneity, and risk-orientation. This model has great relevance to this study, as the structured nature of the laboratory activities and the role of a supportive group are similar to the components of the class setting this research will analyze. From Byrd's study, it would appear that the behaviorally focused techniques are more effective in promoting creative risk-taking than unfocused sensitivity groups.

However, the research on risk-orientation is in disagreement about the "risky shift" phenomenon. The findings presented in this chapter concerning the impact of a group

upon individual levels of risk are well-documented; but the generalizability and explanation of the causes are not well understood. Cartwright asserted two major criticisms against the research on the risky shift phenomenon. First, most of the investigations have been inter-connected, building upon previous research rather than challenging it. Second, the risky shift paradigm has not reacted to the scattered but nonetheless valid data which refute much of the accepted theory (1973). He faults the risky shift theoreticians for not keeping pace with the varying facts that new experiments reveal. Cartwright explained that the lack of knowledge may be due to the relative newness of the theory, the lag in journal publication of new findings, the complexity of the risky shift phenomenon, and the methodological problems in assessing risk. However, Cartwright admitted that the risky shift phenomenon has been found to exist in countless experiments in different countries, and in different age, sex, and occupational groups. Certainly, Cartwright's points are well taken but they do not seem to dispel the assumption that a risky-shift phenomenon does exist. Rather, he underscores the need for a better understanding of why and how a group can move its members to increase their risk-taking.

Positive incentives to risk, shared information, and mutual support have previously been hypothesized as different explanations for the risky shift phenomenon. This thesis will attempt to better discern the means by which

a group can affect individual levels of risk-taking and the conditions under which increased risk-taking is beneficial to the individual. Unlike the majority of the studies in this area, this dissertation is equally interested in the creative choice to not risk.

## Confluent Teaching

Confluent teaching attempts to integrate cognitive and affective learning through wholistic approaches to educational methodology (Brown, 1971). Values clarification strategies and the human relations laboratory are very closely associated with confluent teaching. The human relations laboratory assumes that feeling and thought are inseparable and thus encourages the integration of affective and cognitive learning. Values clarification is an approach designed to help students apprize and act upon their own freely chosen values. It is concerned with the process by which students arrive at their values rather than the content of those values. Specific techniques work on this process although no particular set of values is transferred to the student (Simon et al., 1972).

Researchers agree that people respond differently to values clarification techniques, although explanations for differential impact are not well-established. One set of explanations focuses on the mode of instruction. Sidney Simon noted that much of the search for and teaching of values clarification is not related to direct verbal

instruction, but is transmitted by indirect non-verbal means, such as the modeling process or educational strategies like time diaries, public interviews, or lists of gripes, high points, etc. (1969). Students who respond only to verbal instructions would profit less from the values clarification teaching style. Another explanation for the stronger response of students to the values clarification approach involves the students' relationship with the teacher. Because of the non-verbal or more personal type of teaching style implied by this methodology, traditional student-teacher roles are altered. For example, Donald Martin concluded that the development of easy, open communication patterns between teacher and student is necessary before the implementation of values clarification techniques (1960). Specifically, the dissenting and flighty elementary school children in his study seemed to respond least to such an approach and had the most difficulty in establishing an accepting and trusting relationship with the teacher. While this dissertation deals with college students, the importance of a positive student-teacher relationship may be as relevant to this study.

Klevan (1957) and Lang (1962) cited the impact on students' sense of personal purpose as a key benefit of the values clarification methodology. Klevan studied the effects of value clarification techniques on a group of college students in education. He was particularly interested in 1) changes in consistency of attitudes,

2) expressions of purposefulness, and 3) friendly expressions among class members. He utilized two comparison groups of university students enrolled in education courses similar in focus to his own, although the classes were not matched in any systematic way. Based on pre- and post-test scores, Klevan's students showed significantly more consistent attitudes and expressions of personal purpose than did students in the comparison classes. Klevan attributed the change in his students to the values clarification methodology and its strong emphasis on public affirmation of one's values. Melvin Lang confirmed the change in personal purpose in his study of underachieving college students, and added that people without significant emotional blocks respond to their environment in a more purposeful way when they have had value clarifying experiences to guide their self-explorations (1962).

These studies, as well as those by Simon and Martin, suggest variables that may have relevance to this thesis. The students in this study who respond to the value clarification strategies should increase their sense of personal purpose and consistency of attitudes. It is likely that the students who respond to the class will have a closer relationship with the teacher and be comfortable with indirect or non-verbal teaching methodologies. Students who do not establish these relationships will not increase their sense of personal purpose nor will they likely benefit in other ways from the values clarification approach.

Other types of innovative teaching techniques contribute to confluent education. A study by Helen Leatherwood (1971) found that small group discussions and role-play techniques produced higher levels of self-actualization in junior college students than did encounter tapes or straight lecture. This finding is underscored in a separate study conducted by Dr. Elnora Huyck (1971). Huyck compared two University of Minnesota psychology classes holding identical goals of open communication with behaviorally defined communication objectives. One class was taught as a traditional lecture; the other combined lectures with experiential activities. The latter method proved the surer, faster way of achieving the goal of open communication. In sum, student participation in the learning process does appear to breed positive personal and intellectual growth.

Innovative teaching techniques are also related to the enhancement of creativity in students. Too often, what is good for classroom order and task completion runs counter to the stimulation of creativity. Teaching by paradox, open-ended discussion, analogy and problem-solving were found to be highly related to the increase of self-confidence, non-conformity, curiosity, perseverance, and other creative characteristics (Goodale, 1970). Paul Torrance developed several important theories about the necessary qualities a teacher should possess in order to facilitate creative learning. He noted that such a person

must have both primary and secondary creativeness, that is, be able to control her/his impulsiveness, but maintain her/his abilities to fantasize, laugh, be spontaneous, and accept her/his own weaknesses. Further, genuine empathy, flexibility, and above all, the capacity to form good relationships with students characterize the creative teacher (1962).

In summary, the distinguishing characteristics of the values clarification/human relations approach seem to be: 1) Exercises to encourage students to choose, prize, and act on their values; 2) An easy, open, accepting communication pattern between teacher and student; and 3) Participative, environment-based learning. Relating these characteristics to the literature on creativity and risk-taking, it is also clear that confluent teaching should increase both. Confluent teaching facilitates: 1) Acting on one's values which is paramount to self-actualization; 2) Prizing and public affirmation of one's values which entails small to large amounts of risk; 3) Open communication within the class setting which is related to both creativity and risk-taking; and 4) Participative learning which gives students more control over their education and establishes an internal locus of evaluation. Therefore, the confluent teaching methodology and the use of small groups as a major educational structure should create the atmosphere for and challenge the development of creative risk-taking in women undergraduates. The effects of this

teaching methodology will be carefully evaluated in this study.

Behavior and Attitude Change

This study's primary goal is to understand if and how the activities within an experimental class translate to out-of-class creative risk-taking. At the basic level, this involves behavior and/or attitude change. The following studies develop a number of theories which begin to predict and later can explain the impact of the class on the actions and ideas of its members.

Theodore Newcomb's research in this area is exemplary, and two particular studies are useful here. In stating the "ABX" or "Balance" theory, Newcomb suggested that two people who like or identify with one another, will tend to have similar values and opinions and will work to maintain that balanced state, i.e. like attitudes, values, etc. An imbalance in values and attitudes is the occasion for communication in order to eliminate the discrepancy (1953). One can cope with imbalance by either giving up the relationship, by converting the other, by changing one's own mind, or by compromise between the two people and their ideas.

Newcomb later teamed with Feldman to explore college impact on students and concluded that the more open the individual is to change and influence at the start of college, the greater will be the impact of the college on

the student (1969). Feldman added that the greatest influence of college occurs with a continuing series of not-too-threatening divergencies (1972). Too great an imbalance will raise defenses, while too little provides no focus for dialogue or impetus for change. This study will try to create those "not-too-threatening divergencies" in order to influence students to take a creative risk.

As Feldman noted, the conditions which are conducive to attitude change result from some discrepancy between the expression of an attitude and the satisfaction that expression provides the individual. Hunt elaborated that behavioral change is rarely due to change in attitudes or change in situations alone (1965). Rather, it is significant interaction between the two that results in new behavior. Daniel Katz underscored the importance of the interaction between person and environment in the modification of both attitudes and behavior (1960). He stated that "modifying an old attitude or replacing it with a new one is a process of learning, and learning always starts with a problem, or being thwarted in coping with a situation. Being blocked is a necessary, but not a sufficient, condition for attitude change." The attitude is shaped by a feeling or an idea, and a context. Sometimes, discussion will provide a remedy, but more often, as interaction with the environment is demanded to affect change, behavioral implications follow. This study will try to highlight the

important attitudinal, behavioral, and environmental interactions that tend to promote or discourage creative risk-taking in women.

Moving from conditions for behavioral and attitudinal changes to types of changes, Himmelstrand contributed two types of attitude adaptation. He distinguished between attitudes in which change is tied to verbal expression and attitudes in which the change is tied to behavior (1960). In the first case, a person derives satisfaction from talking about a problem; but in the second case, satisfaction is derived from taking some form of concrete action. For example, a discussion of male chauvinism may change a woman's attitude about having doors opened for her. Talking about this may or may not result in her opening doors for herself, depending on whether her attitude resides at the verbal level or is rooted in the action structure of her attitudes. If the latter is true, simply talking about the issue would not be enough. New behavior would have to follow for the change to be complete and for a sense of satisfied closure to be felt. This study will try to contribute to a better understanding of the basis for the two types of attitude adaptation.

Several authors have studied the effects of group pressure on an individual's attitude and behavior changes. Festinger explained such changes in attitude and behavior as representative of attempts to eliminate dissonance, or psychological discomfort with one's environment (1957).

The group pressure to uniformity may stem from the social reality of a situation or group locomotion to attain a certain goal, but the pressure to change increases as the group cohesiveness increases and as the issue becomes more relevant to the group's functioning (1950). Within this study, group pressure and/or support to risk would not be considered positive unless the individual actually sought and understood her motives to increase her creative risk-taking. Therefore, the effect of group pressure will be carefully analyzed.

Kelman suggested that there are three possible responses to social influences: compliance, identification, and internalization, distinguished from each other by locus of control (1961). Compliance means the attitude or behavior is performed only to please another; identification is the adoption of a behavior or attitude in order to facilitate a self-satisfying relationship; and internalization accepts the influence or allows the change because the behavior or attitude is congruent with and maximizes one's own values. Although Kelman did not discuss risk-taking, his schemata complements the Brown (1965) and Stoner (1968) theories which explain the risky shift as the result of normative group pressure. This study will try to understand whether and when risk-taking represents compliance, identification, or internalization. A creative risk, as defined in this study, could only be the result of internalization, or maximization of one's own values.

Resistance to risk-taking may be due to the depth of the attitude that is the target of change or the strength of the defenses which protect the belief. Milton Rokeach theorized that 1) the more central a belief is, the more its change will be resisted and 2) the more central the belief, the more widespread will be the repercussions of change for the individual (1963). This would explain why increased risk-taking may be frightening or difficult for many women, as entire lives might be affected if a strong belief is challenged.

From Rokeach's theory it is expected that those who enter the class as low risk-takers would be too threatened by the class activities to change in any significant way. The values which sustain their non-risky behavior would be so central to their life-style, that change would be resisted. Conversely, those high in risk-taking would be unaffected by the class as their beliefs would not be challenged or changed by the class experience. Stimuli for growth would not be present. Thus, the middle level risk-taker would show the greatest amount of change. She could accept the challenge to her central beliefs and therefore her behavior and attitude changes would be more widespread. Evaluation of these ideas will be pursued in this study.

## Conclusion

From many different sources, the following conclusions emerge. For a woman to be a creative risk-taker, she must be independent, socially bold, comfortable with herself, open to the new, action-oriented, supported by significant others, yet autonomous. Teaching techniques can strengthen these characteristics in individual students by offering opportunities for role-modeling, practice of new behaviors, challenge and support within the classroom. The class as a small group can exert pressure on its members to change in the direction of greater risk-taking. Individuals will respond differentially to group pressure and challenging teaching techniques. Some will protect old ideas and behavior patterns, while others will try out new attitudes and actions. The extent to which students respond to the class activities depends on the appropriateness of fit between their readiness for change and the challenge of the setting. The following chapter will detail the methodology that this study will use to define, describe, and explore the differential impact of one class on the levels of creative risk-taking in its students.

# CHAPTER 3

# METHODOLOGY

## Introduction

This chapter explains the processes and instruments which were used to gather and analyze the information collected in this study. The research procedures were determined by the nature of the learning experiences, the research problem, and the basic goals of this study. Two groups of women's studies classes were involved, although the primary focus of this study remains on the students in one of those classes. The other class serves as a comparison group to help explain differential impact, but it was not an experimental control group in the strictest sense.

A nonequivalent control group design compares two similar but not identical groups. Because of the differences between the two classes, a quasi-experimental design was followed, utilizing separate samples, pretest-posttest scores from multiple time-series testings.* The research design is depicted in Table 3.1.

---

*Campbell and Stanley, 1966.

TABLE 3.1

PRETEST-POSTTEST, MULTIPLE TIME-SERIES, CONTROL GROUP DESIGN

(O = testings, X = treatment)

| | $T_1$ | | $T_2$ | $T_3$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Group A | O | X | O | O |
| Group B | O | | O | |

The strongest similarity between the two groups was their mutual emphasis on women's issues, while the major difference between the two groups was the teaching methodologies. The implications of these points for the research design of this study is detailed in the text of this chapter.

## The Samples

The primary group in this study is a women's studies class titled "Women's Potential and Higher Education." Its course number and reference is G-350. G-350 was sponsored by the Center for the Study of Higher Education, a division in the School of Education at the University of Michigan. It offered three hours of undergraduate credit. The Center allows its graduate students to submit proposals to teach an undergraduate course concerned with a variety of issues in postsecondary education. Consequently, the particular topic of the seminar varies from section to section and term to term as the instructors' interests vary. This necessitates public advertising of each

course's topic. A course description is not published in the undergraduate catalogue.

I submitted a proposal in December, 1972 and taught "Women's Potential and Higher Education" for the first time during the Winter term, 1973. This study examines the third offering of the class, in Winter term, 1974, and the lives of twenty-four students in that class.

The total N for the purposes of this study is twenty-four G-350 students. Twenty-seven students originally enrolled in the course. However, one student left the country and was unavailable for complete participation and two students were dropped from the sample because of faulty data.

G-350 was publicized in handbills which described the class in the following way:

> G-350 assists women in examining their potential within the context of the university. Topics covered include: why you came here, how you want to use your education, and what you can do now, within the university, to evolve your potential. The course attempts to put self-fulfillment and femaleness together, giving university women the necessary skills for self-understanding, creative autonomy, and leadership. The end goal is a more open, assertive, independent and original woman and student.

The course was experiential in nature and utilized a variety of teaching techniques ranging from values clarification exercises to running a mile or interviewing a prominent campus woman. It sought to affect personal growth and education by providing both cognitive and

affective inputs. For the most part, a human relations laboratory format was operative.

The G-350 class atmosphere was open, informal, and participative. However, it was far from unstructured: each class was planned around a formal task or experience as a role play exercise; a creative problem-solving task; or a written analysis of each student's values and goals. Another set of class activities focused on the decisions that each individual had to make. These varied with the woman: career, marriage, divorce, or roommate problems were a few of the issues confronted. As some of these decisions were made by means of the classroom activities, it was expected that small degrees of risk-taking would begin to occur, stands would be taken, and new behaviors tried. It was assumed that tying personal examples with behavioral consequences would contribute to an increase in creative risk-taking (Byrd, 1970; Leatherwood, 1971).

Positive feedback was another tenet of G-350. As recognition and support from others in the class increased, it was hoped that self-esteem would increase, and therefore, would contribute to increased risk-taking. Setting one's own goals, implementing them, achieving success when faced with classroom challenges were thought to be tactics which would inspire self-worth and creative risk-taking (Torrance, 1962; Poe, 1971).

In addition, G-350 used five trained facilitators, all previous students in G-350, to help lead small group

sessions. It was thought that these leaders/teachers would serve as role models in creative risk-taking for the students as well as assist in group work. Tidball (1973) and Stoner (1968) have documented the positive effects of role models in other educational settings, supporting this idea and its application to G-350.

The course was coordinated and taught by this author. Experienced in small group techniques and confluent education, my training was acquired through formal study, apprenticeship and workshop participation. As both the teacher and the experimentor, there may be unstated bias in the chapters to follow. Several efforts were designed to deal with this problem in a self-conscious manner and will be discussed later in this chapter.

The referent group for G-350 was an undergraduate Women's Studies course, Women's Studies 340, titled "Our Bodies, Our Heads." It was described as a course in psychophysiology. There were approximately twenty-five students enrolled, of whom one was a male. Fourteen of these students initially volunteered to participate in this study and twelve of these students completed all test instruments. W.S. 340 focused on the study of the psychology of women, feminine social roles, and individual experiences in relation to feminine psychological theory. The teacher was a female doctoral candidate in clinical psychology. Within the course framework, small group discussion was frequent, although lectures, films, and outside

speakers were commonplace. This referent group was chosen because of the comparable size, similar content (see Appendix A-B for both reading lists), informal class atmosphere, and probably comparable levels of feminist awareness. The possible bias introduced by the selective participation of only half of the comparison class cannot be assessed, but should be kept in mind by the reader as a caveat when comparisons are made between the two classes in the following chapters.

It is interesting to ponder why different students were attracted to one or the other of these two classes. Approximately a third of the students in G-350 registered for it because of recommendations given to them by personal friends who had previously taken the class. Another half of the class was attracted because of the goals of G-350 as they were presented in the handbills posted around campus or printed in the student newspaper. The remaining students enrolled for a variety of reasons, including convenient evening meeting time, once-a-week class session, or general curiosity about themselves as women. There were no education majors enrolled despite G-350's listing as a course in the School of Education. These different reasons for enrollment in G-350 do not seem to explain differential impact of the class on its students. As later chapters explain, personality variables are more cogent predictors of impact.

The referent class, W.S. 340, was not as widely advertised or as descriptively presented as G-350. It had received official accreditation as a course in the Women's Studies Program within the College of Arts and Sciences. It had been listed in the standard University Time Schedule, and was advertised in handbills during pre-registration. W.S. 340 met twice a week during regular daytime hours. W.S. 340 was more institutionalized than G-350 and therefore may have attracted a more academic type of student.

The greatest difference between the two classes was in the teachers' styles and classroom procedures. In G-350, the values clarification/confluent teaching techniques created very focused and structured class activities. While small groups were utilized, they were specifically working on a larger task. In G-350 the teacher's role was that of a facilitator, actively participating in whatever group she was a member. Further, each student met with the teacher outside of class at least once during the term in order to establish a more informal relationship.

The teacher's style in Women's Studies 340 was rather different. In W.S. 340, small groups were discussion-focused and far less structured. The teacher's role was that of an organizer, not as a participant, and student contact outside of class was more formal, generally by appointment. The impact of both classes on their students is complicated by the issues of student self-selectivity and general maturation over the semester. However, similar

age ranges, interest in women's issues, and personalized course content allow reasonable comparisons between the two classes. Certainly, the teaching format was the major difference between the two classes. Chapter 4 profiles the classes in greater depth.

## Research Design

Time 1 (entrance into courses) and Time 2 (end of courses) test measurements were obtained for all students in G-350 and a voluntary sample within W.S. 340. In addition, the G-350 students were interviewed at Time 2 by the teacher to both discuss their test score changes and to probe their reactions to the class. A peer report questionnaire was given to G-350 students who chose an out-of-class friend to complete the form, noting their changes over the course of the term. The friend could be anyone—a roommate, husband, or employer but must have known the student before she enrolled in G-350.

Time 3 measures were collected from G-350 students approximately nine months after the class had ended. Two of the personality tests were again given and another individual interview session was held. Copies of most test and interview instruments are included in Appendices C-K. An independent interviewer, who was familiar with the activities and goals of G-350, conducted these interviews and distributed the tests for students to complete and return by mail. This longitudinal follow-up greatly

facilitated assessment of the overall impact of G-350 on its students. Not only did initial $T_1T_2$ changes shift, but there were some students who did not react to the class until it was over.

Data Instruments

1) A Feminist Awareness Questionnaire (F.A.Q.) was designed by the author to assess basic attitudes toward and familiarity with the women's movement. Three of the fifteen attitude questions came from the "Women's role" section of U.C.L.A. Higher Education Measurement and Evaluation Kit, for which national norms were available. Examples of the F.A.Q. questions are: "Job vacancy notices should not mention sex" or "Family patterns and attitudes should allow and often encourage married women to follow their own interests even if they have young children." Scores on each item ranged from 0-4. (Appendix C )

2) The Jackson Personality Inventory (J.P.I.) is a standardized test to assess the personality variables of tolerance, self-esteem, risk-taking, innovation, value orthodoxy, interpersonal affect, conformity, anxiety, breadth of interest, and social participation. (Its scales are included in Appendix D ). The test itself consists of several hundred questions regarding a person's

behavior rather than attitudes. The test's scales have been clinically judged significant (at better than the .001 level) with peer-rating measures of the traits. Some of the questions from this true-false type of test are: "I would not speak out in public on unpopular issues unless I was fairly certain of my position"; "If I had a chance to canoe through rapids, I would take it"; and "I would enjoy a job which is always changing in function more than one which is routine." Scores on the J.P.I. scales range from 1-20.

3) The Self-Actualization scale from the Personality Omnibus Inventory (P.O.I.) assesses the overall affirmation of a primary value of self-actualizing people (Burke, 1974). A representative item is "I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others." The P.O.I. is a pen-and-paper test of 26 two-choice comparative value judgments. The items are based on the research and theoretical formulations of several writers in humanistic psychology, including Maslow's (1962) concept of self-actualization; the Riesman et al. (1958) typology of inner and other directedness, and the May et al. (1958) and Perls (1951) concepts of time orientation. Validity studies by Shostrom (1964) indicate that the Inventory significantly discriminates between

clinically judged self-actualized and non-self-actualized groups on eleven of the twelve scales, including the self-actualization scale. (Appendix E ).

4) The Dogmatism Scale, developed by Milton Rokeach et al., measures individual differences in openness or closedness of belief systems, as well as general authoritarianism and intolerance. The 40-item scale was designed to be ideologically neutral; rather it claims to measure the formal and structural properties of belief systems. For example, "A person who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived" would be responded to on a six-point scale of agreement, spanning -3 to +3. Reliabilities range from .68 to .93 as tested on both college and hospital populations. (Appendix F ).

5) An individual biographical data sheet asked for information on marital status, academic major, and previous experience with women's courses, interpersonal groups, and non-graded classes. (Appendix G ).

6) A peer rating form, completed by an out-of-class friend of each student in G-350, solicited information about changes the peer may have observed over the term, on such characteristics as self-esteem, risk-taking, and values affirmation. It

was designed by this author and pre-tested with a small number of University of Michigan students. (Appendix H ).

7) A final exam/course evaluation collected students' reactions to G-350 in general and to particular class exercises as well. (Appendix I ).

8) Two interview questionnaires which were designed by this author and were used in April, 1974 and February, 1975 respectively. Topics discussed included memories of the class, important life events, and future plans. Complete questionnaires are included in Appendix J and K .

Chronology of Data Collection

The J.P.I., Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and the P.O.I. were distributed in both classes during the first week of the semester in January, 1974. They were completed outside of class and returned to me in person at the following week's class. Both classes completed the Feminist Awareness questionnaire in their classes during that same week.

The four tests were again administered three weeks prior to the end of the term, in April, 1974. Interview sessions for G-350 students were scheduled during the last week of classes, allowing students the opportunity to discuss their test scores as well as to reflect on their class experience. Peer rating forms were distributed in G-350 at this time, and students chose a friend to complete the

form. Instructions were that the friend should fill out the form alone, but responses could be shared if both parties desired to do so. However, all original answers were to remain and additions following dialogue were to be properly noted as such. This form was then returned by mail.

The final exam was passed out at the last class meeting and turned in by the end of the final exam period. It solicited student evaluation of the class. All of the Time 2 data were collected by the middle of May, 1974.

It is important to note that the students in the referent class were given the opportunity to discuss their test score changes and class experiences with me after the Time 2 testing. However, only six of the twelve students expressed an interest in this feedback.

The Time 3 data collection involved only G-350 students. Each student was interviewed for approximately one hour by the independent interviewer. She distributed the J.P.I. and Rokeach tests at the end of the interview and the student returned the completed tests to me by mail.

In sum, the interview and test information was extensive and demanded a variety of approaches in the analysis. Despite a relatively small N (total = 37), the multiple series of testings, the various written and interview instruments, and the combination of self, peer, and observer reports produced a substantial data base. The

complimentarity and interface of this data greatly enrich the generalizability of this study.

Data Analysis

Because of the small size of the samples, multivariate statistical treatment was difficult. Two-sample t tests were used on all test scores, both within each class and between the classes. Zero-order correlations were run between most test variables, but few proved statistically significant.

The interview data were coded to provide summary conclusions. However, individual case studies were a necessary supplement to the aggregate information. Without the case studies, much of the richness of the peer and self-reports would have been lost. Coding themes were established by this author, but were shaped and verified by discussions with a graduate student who assisted in G-350 during the term this study began.

Within this framework, three layers of analysis exist. First, this study focuses on the women enrolled in G-350, seeking to describe and understand its impact on them. Comparison with the other women's studies class and its different teaching format facilitated this type of analysis, as both classes were initially composed of similar types of women. Chapter 4 presents this information. The second level of examination seeks meaningful subgroups within G-350, noting differences and similarities between the

"movers" and "non-movers." Chapters 5 and 6 develop these findings. Finally, representative individuals have been chosen to fully expand the aggregate findings as they translate into personal experiences. Chapters 7 and 8 focus on the individual case studies.

## Limitations

There are several limitations of the present study which restrict the degree to which the findings might be generalized. First, the sensitivity of the instruments is limited. Self-reporting is frequently valid, yet there can be discrepancies between reported and actual behavior. The use of many data sources to understand the personality and situational variables involved in this study is intended to counterbalance this limitation.

Self-selectivity is another major issue. Were G-350 students already risk-takers if they were interested in such a class? Were the thirteen students in the comparison group who did not participate in this study more or less risk-oriented than the women from that class who did volunteer? What biases did the W.S. 340 volunteers bring to this study? All of these questions relate to the dilemma of those who chose to be or not to be in this study and the effects of self-selectivity on the conclusions of this study. There are no easy answers to this problem. Self-selectivity into G-350 can be assessed partially by comparing its students with those in the other class.

However, the voluntary participation of those in W.S. 340 is more problematic as it limits the randomness and generalizability of the data and is without further comparison points. Nonetheless, acceptance of W.S. 340 volunteers was the only feasible means of gaining access to the comparison class. This limitation is recognized and should be remembered as conclusions are presented.

The small size of the sample and the strong feminist beliefs in both classes further limit the general applicability of this study. The liberal and independent nature of the women in this study may be unlike the larger female population. However, a diversity of personality types is found in each class and helps to counteract this limitation.

Finally, my combined roles as teacher and evaluator were potentially problematic. Could I clearly evaluate G-350? Were the students changing because of a desire to produce the results that I wanted? These questions were handled in several ways. The use of objective test data was one method of verifying change. The use of an outside interviewer was another. The longitudinal analysis of change probed the students' dependence on me for support. The peer reports helped to validate both the students' self-reports and my interview conclusions in April, 1974. While this dual involvement may limit the objectivity of this study, it also may prove to be a strength. Student-teacher trust and openness enabled very private but important facts to be shared and researched.

## Conclusion

The methodology of this study is based on a pretest-posttest, multiple time-series, control group design. Despite a relatively small sample of thirty-seven women from two women's studies classes, and limited by the issues of self-selectivity, teacher/evaluator bias, and the feminist nature of the sample, this study is strengthened by its multiplicity of data sources, its longitudinal design, and its variety of data instruments. The analysis of the information which follows will present both aggregate and individual profiles of the students involved in this study. It is hoped that this methodology will contribute to a better assessment of the impact of G-350 on its students and their levels of creative risk-taking.

# CHAPTER 4

# A COMPARISON OF THE CHANGES IN THE TWO CLASSES

## Introduction

The previous three chapters have established the foundations of this study. The personal, academic, and methodological frameworks have been presented to increase the reader's understanding of why and how this study was conceived. This chapter turns to the results of the research. Specifically, the similarities and differences between the two women's studies classes are explored and discussed. Both classes' test data are compared and interpreted to begin to understand the factors involved in the promotion of creative risk-taking in women.

## An Introductory Profile of the Two Classes

The comparison class, W.S. 340, was selected for reference because of its expected similarity to G-350 in terms of class size, curricular focus, and the backgrounds and feminist perspectives of the students. These initial assumptions were generally correct. The age span, and marital status of both groups were nearly identical. The choices of academic majors were also very similar with one exception. Surprisingly, the number of social science

majors is quite low in G-350 (8%), while the proportion of humanities majors is rather high (25%). The opposite is true in W.S. 340, where 25% of the students were in the social sciences and none were in the humanities.

Table 4.1 summarizes this descriptive information.

TABLE 4.1

COMPARISON OF AGE, MAJOR, AND MARITAL STATUS IN W.S. 340 AND G-350

| | | W.S. 340 | G-350 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Age | 18 | 33% | 25% |
| | 19 | — | 16% |
| | 20 | 25% | 12% |
| | 21-2 | 25% | 33% |
| | 25+ | 17% | 14% |
| Major | Social Science | 25% | 8% |
| | Humanities | — | 27% |
| | Professional* | 25% | 32% |
| | Education | 17% | — |
| | Undecided | 33% | 32% |
| Marital Status | Single | 83% | 87% |
| | Married | 17% | 13% |
| | | N=12 | N=23 |

*Professional includes Business, Nursing, Speech & Physical Therapy, and Pharmacy major.

In terms of prior educational experiences, the two groups were similar in their exposures to traditional

learning environments, but somewhat different in their experiences in nontraditional settings. For example, approximately 50% of each class had taken a pass/fail class before Winter term, 1974. However, the most striking difference between the two groups involved their experiences with human relations labs and personally-oriented classes. The women in W.S. 340 appear to have had twice the percentage of experiences in these types of settings than the students in G-350. This could mean that the referent group students who volunteered to be a part of this study were more comfortable talking about themselves in front of a group but also that the impact of such an experience might be lessened. On the other hand, the psychological emphasis of W.S. 340 may have attracted these students because of their desire to continue in a group milieu. In terms of G-350, it is hard to know whether the lack of experience in personalized settings made the students more susceptible to the impact of the class, due to less sophistication in this area, or if its newness was initially threatening. On the other hand, G-350 women had more experience in women's studies classes. Perhaps they were slightly more politically oriented than the interpersonally-sophisticated women in W.S. 340. Later chapters expand these differences which are presented in Table 4.2.

TABLE 4.2

THE PRIOR EDUCATIONAL EXPERIENCES
OF THE TWO GROUPS

| Experience in: | Pass/Fail Classes | Small Group Discussions | Women's Studies Classes | Human Relations Labs | Interpersonal-Sensitivity Labs |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| G-350* | 50% | 84% | 21% | 32% | 34% |
| W.S. 340** | 50% | 83% | 8% | 75% | 75% |

*N = 23
**N = 12

By way of explanation, it is important to note that both classes scored at the "feminist" extremes of the Feminist Awareness Questionnaire. The test did not distinguish different scoring ranges within or between the classes. Consequently, this test was eliminated as a methodological tool for this study. The one-sided and extreme scores confirm that both groups were composed of feminist women.

Tables 4.3 and 4.4 contrast the initial mean test scores of the two classes as measured on the Jackson Personality Inventory, the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and the Personality Omnibus Inventory. The eight test variables have been divided into those which are attitudinally related (Table 4.3) and those which are behaviorally related (Table 4.4).

TABLE 4.3

COMPARISON BETWEEN GROUPS OF $T_1$ MEAN SCORES ON ATTITUDINALLY-RELATED VARIABLES

| | Self-Esteem | | Value Ortho-doxy | | Tolerance | | Rokeach | | P.O.I. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 |
| $\bar{X}$ $T_1$ | 13.9 | 11.4 | 5.0 | 4.50 | 12.9 | 10.0 | -41.8 | -29.5 | 21.3 | 20.5 |

TABLE 4.4

COMPARISON BETWEEN GROUPS OF $T_1$ MEAN SCORES ON BEHAVIORALLY-RELATED VARIABLES

| | Risk | | Innovation | | Nonconformity | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 |
| $\bar{X}$ $T_1$ | 10.4 | 7.1 | 13.6 | 13.5 | 7.34 | 7.00 |

It is obvious that G-350 began with higher levels of Risk, Self-esteem, Tolerance, and Openness, as recorded on the Rokeach scale. This edge can be explained in several ways. Table 4.2 showed G-350 women to be more experienced in women's studies classes which could therefore explain their higher levels of Self-esteem, Tolerance, and Openness. Pride in and acceptance of new roles for women could be a result of the women's studies classes. Their attraction to G-350, whether based on the handbill description or stemming from a recommendation of a friend, may further explain the higher level of Risk score. As a group, they may have been ready to risk and thus have enrolled in a class that departed from the typical academic fare and

seemed to promise different (and thus riskier) types of educational outcomes. Finally, it should be noted that the twelve W.S. 340 volunteers could be like or very unlike the other members of their class. Consequently, the lower Risk and Self-esteem scores may not be indicative of the typical W.S. 340 student. For the most part, the two classes appear comparable as indicated by the composite test profiles.

### $T_1T_2$ Comparisons and Changes Between the Classes

Between January, 1974 and April, 1974, both groups attended sixteen weeks of class sessions. Some growth and change would be expected as part of a natural maturation process. Nonetheless, when $T_1T_2$ scores are compared between the two classes, some distinguishing score changes are found. Table 4.5 and Table 4.6 summarize the scores. In reviewing these tables, it should be remembered that statistical significance is exceedingly unlikely in W.S. 340 due to the small N. However, score changes may still be important.

Two particular trends are highlighted by Tables 4.5 and 4.6. The first underscores the positive movement seen in both groups on those variables which were attitudinally based (Table 4.5). Both classes evidenced the same approximate degree of score increase on these variables, with the exception of Tolerance and Openness (Rokeach Scale). In this instance, a unique and confounding movement appears.

TABLE 4.5

$T_1T_2$ SCORE COMPARISONS FOR ATTITUDINALLY-RELATED VARIABLES

| | Self-Esteem | | Value Ortho-doxy* | | Tolerance | | Rokeach* | | P.O.I. | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 |
| $\bar{X}$ $T_1$ | 13.9 | 11.4 | 5.0 | 4.50 | 12.9 | 10.0 | -41.8 | -29.5 | 21.3 | 20.5 |
| $\bar{X}$ $T_2$ | 15.5 | 12.7 | 4.91 | 3.75 | 13.5 | 11.4 | -47.0 | -26.8 | 22.7 | 21.9 |
| $\bar{X}$ Dif-fer-ence | 1.56 | 1.33 | .086 | .15 | .61 | 1.42 | 5.26 | - 2.7 | 1.4 | 1.4 |
| .05 Sig-nif. | Yes | No | No | No | No | No | No | No | Yes | No |
| | N=21 | N=12 | N=21 | N=12 | N=21 | N=12 | N=21 | N=12 | N=21 | N=12 |

*Negative movement is positive change.

TABLE 4.6

$T_1T_2$ SCORE COMPARISONS FOR BEHAVIORALLY-RELATED VARIABLES

| | Risk | | Innovation | | Nonconformity* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 | G-350 | W.S. 340 |
| $\bar{X}$ $T_1$ | 10.4 | 7.1 | 13.6 | 13.5 | 7.34 | 7.00 |
| $\bar{X}$ $T_2$ | 12.9 | 7.9 | 15.1 | 13.2 | 5.52 | 6.83 |
| $\bar{X}$ Difference | 2.48 | .83 | 1.48 | - .33 | 1.83 | .16 |
| .05 Signif. | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes | No |

*Negative movement is positive change.

These scales measure similar attitudes, i.e. tolerance of differences between self and others. G-350 students' change score doubled that of the referent group on the Rokeach measure, yet, W.S. 340 students showed twice the gain over G-350 students on the J.P.I. Tolerance scale. One may question the validity of the tests, but another interpretation is that the two scales were sensitive to different types of change in tolerance. This point will not be debated here as it involves methodological issues and detracts from the main finding that both groups moved in a positive direction on the attitudinally-related variables.

The second generalization is that only G-350 students moved signif_cantly on those variables which were behaviorally oriented (Table 4.6). The referent group showed almost no change on these more action-based items, although similar $T_1$ scores were evident on the Innovation and Nonconformity scales of the J.P.I. The catalyst to risk appears to be missing within the referent group. Although the lower W.S. 340 $T_1$ score in Risk may indicate that a minimum threshold to risk was lacking, other explanations were explored.

It became important to know if the seeming stability in the referent group was based on the non-movement of many or the extremely low scores of a few. In order to respond to this issue, the eight scores were first narrowed to the three J.P.I. variables that had shown the greatest

$T_1T_2$ mean increase in G-350: Self-esteem, Risk, and Nonconformity. Within each class, the ranges of initial scores were determined. The difference was then divided by three to arbitrarily establish high, medium, and low score ranges in each class. Finally, the $T_1T_2$ direction of movement between score ranges was traced. In this way, one can see not only what the initial score distributions were, but also the patterns of changes that followed. The reader is again reminded that the desired movement in Nonconformity is from the high to low score range. Stability and movement in each group is contrasted in Table 4.7.

TABLE 4.7

$T_1T_2$ COMPARISON OF PATTERNS OF SCORE MOVEMENT BETWEEN THE TWO CLASSES

| G-350 (N=23) | | | | | | W.S. 340 (N=12) | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | RISK $T_2$ | | | | | RISK $T_2$ | | | | |
| | | Lo | Med | Hi | N | | Lo | Med | Hi | N |
| RISK $T_1$ | Lo | 50% | 16% | 33% | 6 | RISK $T_1$ | 85% | 15% | 0 | 7 |
| | Med | 0 | 71% | 29% | 7 | | 33% | 33% | 33% | 3 |
| | Hi | 0 | 10% | 90% | 10 | | 0 | 50% | 50% | 2 |
| | | SELF-ESTEEM $T_2$ | | | | | SELF-ESTEEM $T_2$ | | | |
| SELF-ESTEEM $T_1$ | Lo | 0 | 100% | 0 | 1 | SELF-ESTEEM $T_1$ | 20% | 80% | 0 | 5 |
| | Med | 0 | 56% | 44% | 9 | | 33% | 33% | 33% | 3 |
| | Hi | 0 | 0 | 100% | 13 | | 0 | 0 | 100% | 4 |
| | | NONCONFORMITY $T_2$* | | | | | NONCONFORMITY $T_2$* | | | |
| NONCONFORMITY $T_1$ | Lo | 100% | 0 | 0 | 10 | NONCONFORMITY $T_1$ | 100% | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | Med | 67% | 16% | 16% | 6 | | 28% | 43% | 28% | 7 |
| | Hi | 0 | 43% | 57% | 7 | | 0 | 0 | 100% | 1 |

*Negative movement is positive change.

Table 4.7 permits several generalizations to be made about the patterns of score changes found within and between the two classes:

1) Whereas G-350 students seem to record a more constant pattern of moving up to the next score range, W.S. 340 students exhibit less consistent results. On all three variables (Self-esteem, Risk, and Nonconformity), movement in the W.S. 340 middle range is split, with half of the movers going up and half going down;
2) The occurrence of negative movement seems more frequent in W.S. 340, particularly as noted in Risk and Self-esteem. While it is impossible to say if the class created the negative movement, it appears that W.S. 340 did not prevent or buffer these changes for some of its students;
3) The greatest amount of change in both classes is found in Self-esteem. Although G-350 began with greater proportions of the students in the medium and high score levels, the patterns of change in Self-esteem are parallel, with all high scorers remaining high and other students generally moving in a positive direction; and
4) Although the same number of women in both groups have low $T_1$ Risk scores, 49% of the low scorers in G-350 moved into higher ranges versus only 15% in W.S. 340.

These conclusions lead to a few preliminary distinctions between the two groups. Over the course of the semester, they seem to have experienced similar changes, although the extent and consistency of the changes, particularly in Risk and Nonconformity, were much greater in G-350. The fact that consistent patterns of change do exist in G-350 is noteworthy. Those who had room for positive movement in G-350 increased their scores on a regular basis. This strengthens the view that the changes may be related to the class itself rather than other outside factors.

It is somewhat surprising that G-350 students had higher initial scores and greater growth than the W.S. 340 students on two key variables, Risk and Self-esteem. Given the educational backgrounds of most W.S. 340 students and their stronger link with human relations labs and personally-oriented groups (see Table 4.2), one might have expected higher levels of personal integration than were evidenced in the scores.

Summary impressions of the G-350 scores shown in Table 4.7 are that the medium level scorers seemed to move the most, and moved in a positive direction. Conversely, the G-350 low level scorers had the most room to move but appear to have changed the least. The high scorers remained at high levels. The following theory about class impact thus receives some preliminary confirmation.

It would appear that the G-350 students in the middle score ranges, unlike the low scorers, have enough of the qualities or needs to take risks, resulting in positive score change. However, unlike the high scorers, they also need the class to move and strengthen their desires and skills in risk-taking. The middle range scorers in G-350 were able to accept the challenge of the class but also needed its support. Low level scorers were likely frightened by the challenge or required more support than the class offered. Although they had less room to move, high level scorers were probably unchallenged and found the class support unnecessary. This conclusion is only tentative but will remain a point of focus in later data discussions.

To further understand the relationship between increased self-esteem and increased risk-taking scores, an additional test was devised. A new category, "esteem movers," was created. "Esteem movers" were women whose esteem scores increased three points or more or who maintained a ceiling score of 18-20 on the Jackson Personality Inventory between the January and April, 1974 testings. Again, a very interesting pattern was discerned between the two classes when comparing the J.P.I. Risk scores of the "esteem movers" and those whose esteem scores did not change appreciably. Table 4.8 presents the findings.

TABLE 4.8

COMPARISON OF ESTEEM-MOVERS' AND ESTEEM-NONMOVERS' $T_1$ AND $T_2$ RISK SCORES

| | ESTEEM MOVERS | | | | ESTEEM NONMOVERS | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $T_1\bar{X}$ Risk | $T_2\bar{X}$ Risk | Sig. | N | $T_1\bar{X}$ Risk | $T_2\bar{X}$ Risk | Sig. | N |
| G-350 | 11.3 | 15.6 | .01 | 11 | 9.7 | 10.8 | .05 | 12 |
| W.S. 340 | 5.0 | 5.6 | .12* | 5 | 8.5 | 9.5 | .12* | 7 |

*.12 is not statistically significant. However, it is mentioned here as one of the few statistics for this N=12 that approached significance.

The differences between the two classes is clearer as a change in Self-esteem is significantly related to a change in Risk in G-350 while it is unrelated to any change in Risk in the referent group. Although both the Esteem movers and nonmovers in G-350 changed their Risk scores in a positive direction, the gain is far more accentuated for the Esteem movers. From this data, it would appear that within G-350 a change in Self-esteem is necessary for a change in Risk.

Within the referent group, there is some positive change in Risk, regardless of the change in Self-esteem. However, neither the Esteem movers nor the nonmovers in W.S. 340 evidenced significant score increases in Risk. Thus, a change in Self-esteem does not seem to be correlated to any change in Risk in the referent class. Further, it is possible to conclude, as the following section

explains, that a change in Self-esteem is necessary but not sufficient for a change in Risk.

Discussion of the Data

The issues become clear: Between the two classes, why does a change in Risk require more than a change in Self-esteem. Within G-350, what connects the changed attitude (Self-esteem) to changed behavior (Risk-taking)? These issues are also complex. The following sections assert some tentative explanations.

To change behavior, one must treat behavior. A changed attitude may be necessary but it is not sufficient for a change in behavior. As the referent group's scores indicate, feeling good about one's self does not automatically lead to increased risk-taking. W.S. 340 affected students' attitudes but not their behavior. G-350's format appears to have connected the two more consistently. Not only did the G-350 experience have impact on students' Self-esteem, but the class linked this to new action, Risk.

Clearly, the change in Self-esteem is crucial. The increase in esteem seems to jar the individual to consider new possibilities for herself; to accept new feelings about her worth; and thus, to open herself up to risk. However, the change in risk will not take place unless the environment psychologically and behaviorally strengthens this tendency to try the uncertain. This is the role

G-350 seems to have served. Particular class activities were designed to increase Self-esteem while others were designed to reinforce creative risk-taking and to contribute to the skills needed to succeed in the act. The combination of shake-up and support highlights the relationship between Self-esteem and Risk.

The support seemed to be available in both classes, and perhaps, the increase in Self-esteem in both groups reflects its existence. The women's studies experience may be the common root of the support and resultant positive feelings. Perhaps, learning about the challenges other women face legitimatizes/excites/collects a contemporary woman's feelings about herself. A sense of community decreases alienation while increasing self-esteem and tolerance. Both classes facilitated this exchange via small group discussion, integrating individual personal experiences with concepts about the female experience. Both groups felt the impact, as the attitudinal score changes indicate (see Table 4.5).

Certainly, a single class cannot do all of the "shaking and moving" for students. It is very likely that a woman must want to move in the directions of increased Self-esteem and Risk in order to accept the challenge and support involved in creative risk-taking. However, given the desire, a class structure can help some students to change both attitudes and behaviors.

The challenge to risk was a more constant feature of G-350. Although G-350 was not advertised as a course in creative risk-taking, the description intimated work in this area and this promise may explain why the class attracted women who had higher initial Risk scores. Clearly, self-selectivity is a major issue, for G-350 students may have entered the class as risk-takers. However, the $T_1T_2$ G-350 scores indicate positive movement for individuals at all levels of scores. Conversely, those who entered W.S. 340 with low and medium Risk scores did not change in any consistent way. There appears to be some experience in G-350 that helps to catalyze creative risk-taking in some of its students. The following chapters will try to define and evaluate the parts of the educational process that seem to contribute to the change.

## Conclusion

The summary conclusion is that movement in self-esteem is a necessary but not sufficient condition to affect an increase in creative risk-taking. There appears to be the need for an intervening experience, such as G-350, to harness the changed attitude to changed behavior. This explains, in part, why the women in G-350 moved significantly more than the referent group on the behavioral variables presented in Tables 4.3 and 4.4. A class structure, like G-350, appears to link the attitudinal change to action. In no way is this a criticism of W.S. 340, but

rather, this may distinguish the difference between the goals and teaching styles chosen by the two instructors. The educational outcomes attest to the impact of both courses.

# CHAPTER 5

## PROBING THE INITIAL CHANGES WITHIN G-350

### Introduction

The previous chapter noted the apparent relationship between the G-350 experience and increased levels of Risk and Self-esteem in many G-350 students. The goal of this chapter is to pursue this finding to better understand who is affected by G-350, what about the class seems to lead to change, and why the class helps many but not all of its students to become Esteem and Risk movers. New data sources will be introduced to expand interpretations of the impact of the class. The data sources include the peer rating form (Appendix H), the final exam (Appendix I), and the $T_2$ Interview questionnaire (Appendix J). This chapter will relate specific class exercises to the preliminary changes of some students.

### Who

As previously stated, the personality tests provided just one source of information to explain the effects of G-350 on its students. To check movement and change, or the lack of it, students were asked 1) to assess the impact of G-350 on them by completing the final exam and the $T_2$ interview and 2) to choose a peer outside of the

class to respond to a peer rating questionnaire which solicited the opinions of friends about possible changes which may have occurred over the course of the term.

While it is very difficult to state an association between behavioral change and G-350 in any sort of statistical manner, a relationship does seem to exist. Tabulations of the three questionnaires previously cited establish the following points:

1) 90% of all peer respondents stated that they had heard their G-350 friend talk about her class experiences. Two peers said the class ranked as one of three most significant experiences their friend had had in that semester;

2) 50% of the students in G-350 rated the class, or some aspect of the class, as one of the three most significant life experiences they had had that term; and

3) 70% of the Esteem movers echoed the importance of G-350 overall or mentioned one particular session as a prime life experience in that four-month period. However, only 41% of the Esteem nonmovers felt that the class had been one of their most significant life experiences that term.

Although the class was interesting for the majority of students, it was of crucial importance for approximately half of the class. Those who changed in Esteem found the class more relevant than those who did not change in Esteem, apparently due to the strong fit between movers' needs and class offerings. The Esteem movers either wanted

to or were able to use the class to affect their lives. Conversely, nonmovers did not evidence large score changes nor did they seem to find the class experiences very useful or important to their lives. This leads to the conclusion that one factor in a positive score change is the out-of-class utility of G-350.

In the previous chapter, it was found that the middle range scorers on Risk, Self-esteem, and Nonconformity showed change on these variables. It was theorized that these women were ready for the challenge of G-350 and found the class offerings appropriate to their needs. Consequently, the class was best suited for them and gained meaning in a way it did not for the nonmovers who scored at the high or low extremes of the scales. In sum, the Esteem movers category appears to be composed of those who were middle-range scorers and those for whom the class had relevance to life outside the class.

The changes recorded on the tests were substantiated by the peer reports of parallel changes in the students. The following tables compare the peer comments about a student's growth with the test score movement on the variables of Risk, Self-esteem, and Nonconformity. The desired pattern of change would be an increase in Risk and Self-esteem and a decrease in Nonconformity.

TABLE 5.1

PEER REPORTS OF OBSERVABLE $T_1T_2$ CHANGES IN G-350 STUDENTS ON RISK, SELF-ESTEEM, AND NONCONFORMITY

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Nonconformity |
|---|---|---|---|
| Peers Noted Positive Change | 68% | 80% | 55% |
| Peer Did Not Note Positive Change | 32% | 20% | 45% |
| N = | 20 | 20 | 20 |

TABLE 5.2

PERCENT OF ACCURACY BETWEEN PEER REPORTS AND J.P.I. TEST SCORES

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Nonconformity |
|---|---|---|---|
| Scores and Peer Agreed on Change | 58% | 65% | 55% |
| Scores and Peer Did Not Agree on Change | 32% | 10% | 20% |
| Scores and Peer Agreed on No Change | 10% | 25% | 25% |
| N = | 19* | 20 | 20 |

*Missing data = 1.

Two major points can be drawn from Tables 5.1 and 5.2:

1) More than half the class moved in a positive way on all three variables and the changes were reflected in their out-of-class behavior. Friends who were not involved in the class could describe the new levels of Risk, Self-esteem, and Nonconformity they saw in their G-350 peers.

2) There is a good match between change as observed by the out-of-class friend and as reflected in the test scores.

Highest agreement between peer ratings and test scores were found with respect to Esteem. This is not surprising because Esteem movers seemed to benefit from G-350 more than the nonmovers and, therefore, their changes would be more visible. Of the movers, 82% were found to have peer, self-reported, and test-reported confirmations of their change in Self-esteem, while 67% of the nonmovers received the same confirmation. Although many of the nonmovers had increased their Esteem scores by one or two points, they had not attained the three or more point increase required to be an Esteem mover. Thus, the discrepancies between peer and test reports of positive change may be reconciled for some of the nonmovers. Three of the twelve nonmovers had peer and test profiles that agreed that no change had taken place.

To better understand exactly what in the class led to the changes that have been documented in this section, another level of analysis focuses on the students' assessment of the class activities.

What

Students were asked to comment on specific class exercises in both the final exam and the $T_2$ interview session. Esteem movers had more consensus about the exercises which were most important for them than did the nonmovers. Table 5.3 summarizes the information.

TABLE 5.3

CLASS EXERCISES NAMED AS EXTREMELY SIGNIFICANT BY ESTEEM MOVERS AND ESTEEM NONMOVERS

| | The Bullseye | The Wall | Empathy Session | Other | N |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Movers | 67% | 67% | 55% | 6 exercises listed by 1-3 people | 11 |
| Non-movers | 60% | 33% | 40% | 13 exercises listed by 1-3 people | 12 |

The three exercises listed in Table 5.3 were designed to affect Self-esteem, Risk, and openness. The Wall challenges the entire class to literally climb a six-foot wall (or blackboard). The rules are that everyone must go over the wall. Physical and mental stress and risk result from the process of solving this problem and developing group cohesiveness. The Bullseye is a type of strength

bombardment exercise, done in small groups as individuals reveal their past successes and receive positive feedback from the group. This requires some degree of self-disclosure which can be risky. However, the positive feedback the individual receives is guaranteed to increase Self-esteem. The Empathy session builds the skill of empathy by encouraging students both to share their problems as well as to empathize with the problems of others. High amounts of self-revelation may create some insecurity but the pay-offs are improved Self-esteem, Risk, and openness.

Thus, it appears that the Esteem movers had similar needs and responded to the same exercises, producing a similar effect in all of them—increased esteem and increased risk. The reported trio of experiences involve high degrees of verbal and behavioral risk, plus openness to new situations. Esteem movers seem to want and need both the esteem-building exercises, e.g. the Bullseye, and the risk-related activities, e.g. the Wall. The nonmovers, however, did not seem to value the Wall exercise. High risk and openness were either too threatening or not challenging enough for those not ready to change at this time, explaining the less accentuated impact of these exercises on the nonmovers during the term of the class. Esteem movers better received, and therefore, more rapidly linked the in-class learning to their out-of-class behavior.

Why: the Conclusion

The impact of G-350 is differential, and Esteem movers seem to react to the class in a more responsive and shared way than Esteem nonmovers. The combination of increased Self-esteem, increased Risk, and decreased Conformity in Esteem movers appears to be associated with a particular set of exercises, especially meaningful to the movers. The class seemed to facilitate these changes in general and for Esteem movers in particular. Moving beyond these immediate reactions to the class, the following chapter will probe the long-term relationship of G-350 to the levels of creative risk-taking in its students.

# CHAPTER 6

## G-350 STUDENTS ONE YEAR AFTER THEIR INITIAL ENTRY INTO THE CLASS

### Introduction

> What seems to be important at the moment
> is never what is really going on.
>
> R. Buckminster Fuller

Fuller's quote captures the purpose of the longitudinal aspect of this study. It is clear from previous chapters that by April, 1974, many G-350 students had increased their risk-taking. Additional testing and interview sessions with the students were conducted in January and February of 1975. By assessing the persistence of change and by understanding more completely the long-term relationship and utility of the class to its students, it was felt that what had really been going on would become more clear.

The $T_3$ interview and test data included in this chapter appear to show a strong maintenance of $T_1T_2$ patterns of growth. Stratification on two variables from the interview and test information, however, leads to some unexpected and new insights about the impact of G-350 on its students. In this chapter an attempt is made to detail

and evaluate the ultimate effects of the class and to provide a synthesis of the findings.

## $T_3$ Test and Interview Profiles

Twenty-three G-350 students participated in the $T_3$ data collection. Over the course of a three-week period, each student was interviewed for approximately one hour and was given a packet of tests to be completed and immediately returned by mail. The J.P.I. and the Rokeach tests were chosen for $T_3$ administration because these instruments had proven to be discriminating in the prior testings.

The mean score profiles from the $T_3$ testing are presented in Table 6.1, and the $T_3$ mean scores are juxtaposed with those from the prior testings. The obvious stability seen in the test scores between $T_2$ and $T_3$ is striking.

TABLE 6.1

$T_1T_2T_3$ MEAN SCORE PROFILE FOR G-350 STUDENTS

| N=23 | Risk | Self-esteem | Innovation | Conformity* | Value Orthodoxy* | Tolerance | Rokeach* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1\bar{X}$ | 10.4 | 13.9 | 13.6 | 7.3 | 5.0 | 12.9 | -41.7 |
| $T_2\bar{X}$ | 12.9 | 15.5 | 15.1 | 5.5 | 4.9 | 13.5 | -47 |
| $T_3\bar{X}$ | 12.8 | 15.5 | 14.9 | 5.7 | 4.0 | 13.5 | -47.2 |

*Negative movement is positive change.

In general, the changes that took place between $T_1$ and $T_2$ have been sustained with the exception of Value Orthodoxy, where slight movement continued in a positive direction. Perhaps the evolving self-determination of one's

values as reflected in the Value Orthodoxy score, is related to the stability of the other scores. It may be representative of students taking more control over their lives. In other words, the more a woman determines her own values, the more likely that other choices in life will be consciously made, e.g. increasing Risk, Esteem, and Nonconformity.

A further interpretation of the $T_2T_3$ score stability is that the impact of G-350, which originally fostered the $T_1T_2$ increases, has been internalized and adopted by the majority of the students. Because they were not dependent on the class for sustenance, the higher levels of Risk, Esteem, and Nonconformity remain. The students had consciously changed their behaviors as a result of the class, but it was a decision each woman made for herself, not for the teacher or her class peers. The strong maintenance of the $T_2$ scores supports these theories.

The following interview data can be useful in challenging or confirming the theory that the class experience was related to the lives and personalities of the students after they left G-350. Specifically, a $T_3$ interview question solicited the most significant life experiences students had had since leaving the class and asked them to describe why it was significant; where the locus of control rested; and finally, if G-350 related to the outcomes in any way. Of the total fifty-six life experiences listed by twenty-three respondents, personal relationships and

job-related experiences ranked as most important: 27% and 23% of the responses, respectively, gave these types of examples. Approximately 16% of the events were associated with travel experiences, while 9% mentioned academic issues as crucial. Living situations, counterculture experiences (such as drugs), or therapy combined to make up 25% of the remaining replies.

Regardless of the type of experience, 83% of the students said that G-350 was related in some way to the outcomes of these important moments. Specifically, 63% noted the contribution to be attitudinal in nature, such as "the class brought out my independence and self-awareness"; "the contact with different women posed new options for me"; or "Peg was a dynamic role model, the first woman instructor I had." The remaining 37% felt they had received behavioral supports from the class. The problem-solving skills, anti-discrimination skills, or the mapping of priorities, values, and goals are examples of this outcome. For those four women who responded "no" to this question (Did G-350 relate to the outcome?), either the individual had little control over the outcome, such as a sister's marriage, or the feeling was expressed that the experience was far beyond a relationship to any class or single input.

The interview probed the applicability of the learned skills and attitudes to the professional goals of the students. Seventy-three percent (73%) of the class affirmed

a positive relationship between their professional needs and the class offerings. Of these positive replies, 68% felt the skill was an attitude, such as "a belief in myself and my potential," "the ability to 'future-trip' and achieve some goals," or "the self-confidence to face issues and assert myself." The remaining 32% specifically listed skills, such as the problem-solving process, empathy, and other communication skills as items they felt they would use professionally. Of the 27% who felt the class had not provided skills or attitudes they would incorporate into their professional lives, general reasons given were "lack of professional application" or the inability to recall any particular skill or attitude learned in G-350.

Another question asked all students: "Have you taken any risks since the conclusion of G-350?" Nineteen of the twenty-three respondents (or 87%) said "yes" and cited a total of thirty-one examples, which ranged from moving to New York City to start a career as a writer to working out a new relationship with a husband. The foci of the risks were job- or career-related for 40% of the students; relationship-related for another 33%; 10% listed travel; and the remaining 17% of the responses involved academic decisions, geographic moves, or other events. In all but four cases, at least one of the previously listed significant life experiences was also cited as an example of a recent risk. The relationship to G-350 was underlined.

The class had offered either the support to undertake a risk or the skills to better succeed at the risk.

Whether the impact of G-350 was attitudinal or behavioral, it nonetheless affected the ways these women were living their lives. It is interesting to note that the three respondents who said "no, they had not taken any risks since class ended" were also members of the group who felt that G-350 had not related to the outcomes of their significant life experiences. Conversely, perhaps G-350 would have related to their lives if they had taken risks.

Table 6.2 summarizes the patterns of responses to the prior questions and permits several conclusions to be drawn.

TABLE 6.2

A SUMMARY OF THREE $T_3$ INTERVIEW QUESTIONS WHICH FOCUSED ON THE RELATEDNESS OF G-350 TO STUDENT'S LIVES

| Question: | Did G-350 Relate to Your Significant Life Experiences? | Have You Taken Risks Since G-350 Ended? | Do You Expect to Use G-350 Learnings Professionally? |
|---|---|---|---|
| Yes | 83% | 87% | 73% |
| No | 17% | 13% | 27% |
| N = | 23 | 23 | 23 |

While the utility of G-350 to its students should not be overstated, it would appear that 1) the majority of the class externally applied some of what they learned in G-350;

2) the points of application were both personally and professionally related; and 3) the class seemed to be useful (or not useful) to a consistent group of people. This last point was confirmed by reviewing the raw data. Generally, the same three to five people were responding negatively to the relatedness of the class to their lives. These conclusions seem to reinforce the necessity for fit between learners' needs and class offerings. For the majority of G-350 students, the interface between their needs and G-350 activities was appropriate.

If the fit was good, a reinforcing cycle seemed to exist. Apparently, the behavioral activities in class led to changed attitudes which led to behavioral changes out of class. However, the process only became solidly cemented when the student internalized the goal or outcome of a class activity and applied the learning on her own, outside the confines of the classroom. A student did not seem to wish to re-apply a learning if the initial exercise had not served her needs. Professional reference points helped to contribute to the utility of G-350 for a student. An initial fit between learner needs and class activities was crucial for maximum utility. Certain personality variables explain why G-350 was useful to a majority, but not all, of the class. These are explored in the next section.

## Personality Types and the Utility of G-350

From previous chapters it is apparent that the impact of G-350 was greatest for the $T_2$ Esteem movers. They were

able to benefit from both the challenge and support engendered in the class. Table 6.3 reviews and explores the progress of the Esteem movers and the nonmovers since leaving the class.

TABLE 6.3

$T_1T_2T_3$ MEAN SCORE COMPARISON BETWEEN $T_2$ ESTEEM MOVERS AND NONMOVERS

| | $T_2$ Esteem Movers N=11 | | | | $T_2$ Esteem Nonmovers N=12 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Risk | Esteem | Non-conformity | | Risk | Esteem | Non-conformity |
| $\bar{X}$ $T_1$ | 11.3 | 12.0* | 6.6 | $\bar{X}$ $T_1$ | 9.7 | 15.4* | 7.9 |
| $\bar{X}$ $T_2$ | 15.6* | 15.6 | 4.1 | $\bar{X}$ $T_2$ | 10.8* | 15.4 | 6.6 |
| $\bar{X}$ $T_3$ | 14.6 | 15.1 | 4.0* | $\bar{X}$ $T_3$ | 11.4 | 15.8 | 7.1* |
| $T_2T_3$ Direction of Change | - | 0 | 0 | | + | 0 | - |

*Significance between groups' scores is > .05.

The $T_2$ Esteem movers and nonmovers have maintained almost identical Esteem scores, but show opposite movements in Risk and Nonconformity. The movers have decreased slightly in Risk while remaining more nonconformist or autonomous than the other group. The nonmovers, on the other hand, have incrementally increased their $T_3$ Risk score but have become slightly more conforming to the wishes of others.

There are no clear explanations for these changes. One possibility is by $T_3$, the $T_2$ Esteem movers are at a

consolidation stage, following their marked changes between $T_1$ and $T_2$. The movers could maintain their $T_1T_2$ growth but could not continue to increase their scores without exposure to G-350 or another set of challenging yet supportive circumstances. Conversely, the nonmovers experienced positive $T_3$ change in Risk but moved in a seemingly negative direction in Nonconformity. It is possible that their growth is just beginning.

To understand the meaning of these scores, new questions about the lack of change in the $T_2$ Esteem movers and the positive changes in the $T_2$ nonmovers must be raised. Did the $T_2$ Esteem movers depend on G-350 for the impetus to risk? Not according to the $T_3$ interview data, for both the $T_2$ movers and nonmovers cited examples of the risks that each had consciously chosen to take since the end of class (see Table 6.2). Initially, the Esteem movers seemed to need G-350 to launch them in risk-taking but have not needed the class to sustain them. Then were the $T_2$ Esteem movers dependent on G-350 to stimulate them to increase risk-taking? A particular set of $T_3$ interview responses provide insight to this query. The interview question read: "Since the class ended, have you felt the need for a forum or experience like G-350 to help you with a decision, situation, or skill?" Table 6.4 presents the replies.

TABLE 6.4

RESPONSES OF $T_2$ ESTEEM MOVERS AND NONMOVERS TO A FELT NEED FOR A CONTINUED FORUM LIKE G-350

| | Group A: Yes for Forum | Group B: No for Forum | N* |
|---|---|---|---|
| $T_2$ Esteem Movers | 8 | 2 | 10 |
| $T_2$ Esteem Nonmovers | 6 | 6 | 12 |
| Total | 14 | 8 | 22 |

*Missing data = 1.

It is obvious that at $T_3$ a large majority (or 81%) of the movers and almost 50% of the nonmovers desired a forum like G-350 to assist them in their risk-taking. The positive responses broke down into two categories of need: 58% of the "yes" respondents mentioned a desire for group support while 42% sought a situation where they could practice or develop skills for creative risk-taking. Approximately the same proportion of movers and nonmovers were found in each category of need.

If desire for a continued forum is viewed as a sign of dependency, this data indicates that more than two-thirds of the class were dependent on G-350 to promote their risk-taking. However, other interpretations of this information are plausible, particularly when Table 6.5 is considered. This table modifies Table 6.3 because of the transfer of the six $T_2$ Esteem nonmovers into Group A. Table 6.5

contrasts the $T_1T_2T_3$ mean scores of those who desired a continued forum (Group A) and those who did not (Group B).

TABLE 6.5

$T_1T_2T_3$ MEAN SCORE COMPARISON OF GROUP A AND GROUP B WITHIN G-350

| | Group A (Yes to Forum) | | | | Group B (No to Forum) | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Risk | Self-esteem | Non-conformity | | Risk | Self-esteem | Non-conformity |
| $T_1$ | 8.9 | 13.0 | 8.7 | $T_1$ | 12.5 | 15.5 | 5.1 |
| $T_2$ | 11.7 | 15.2* | 6.6 | $T_2$ | 14 | 15.6 | 4.1 |
| $T_3$ | 11.8 | 14.7 | 7.0 | $T_3$ | 14 | 16.2 | 3.9 |
| Total $T_1T_3$ Change | 2.9 | 1.7 | 1.7 | Total $T_1T_3$ Change | 1.5 | 1.3 | 1.2 |
| N = | 14 | 14 | 14 | N = | 8 | 8 | 8 |

*Significance of score change = < .05.

The effect of the shift of the six Esteem nonmovers into Group A is interesting. The Group A mean scores in Risk and Nonconformity have decreased in a negative direction when compared with the movers' scores in Table 6.3. The addition of the six nonmovers to Group A, therefore, has a strong and regressive effect on the previously high scores of the $T_2$ Esteem movers. Although both groups A and B have high Esteem scores and show sound maintenance of the $T_1T_2$ increases, Group B records significantly higher mean scores on all three variables. Group A, which began with lower entry scores and had more room for growth, evidenced more overall change than Group B. Thus, it

appears that the $T_2$ Esteem nonmovers who had low Risk and high Conformity scores joined all but two of the $T_2$ Esteem movers in their desire for a continued forum like G-350. The impact of the two Esteem movers who entered Group B was negligible (one had high Risk, Esteem, and Nonconformity scores while the other had medium to low scores on these variables). The exodus of the six $T_2$ Esteem nonmovers to the $T_3$ Group A is sufficiently important to warrant an examination of the motives behind this trend.

It is speculated that Group B is predominantly composed of the "launched," i.e. those who were creative risk-takers before they entered G-350 or those who became risk-takers during their enrollment in the class. They have the high scores, the life experiences, and the self-support systems to sustain their creative risk-taking. Therefore, they do not need a forum like the class for further skills or support. Group A, on the other hand, may be viewed as predominantly composed of those who are still in the process of becoming creative risk-takers, i.e. women who still desire a forum like the class to help them grow in that direction. Personal support and skills development have been identified as the crucial resources needed by Group A.

The interview data, while not as discriminating as the test scores, suggest that almost all women from the class were taking some risks in their lives. Consequently, it is possible that Group A's desire for a forum is not indicative

of a dependency on G-350 to initiate their creative risk-taking, but only to help them improve their risk-taking. For example, Group A may be taking risks but is either not achieving the desired end, with a resulting drop in Self-esteem, or is not conforming to societal expectations of more passive behavior. The resulting dissonance could have a negative impact on Self-esteem. Group B, on the other hand, may be taking fewer risks and therefore be feeling less dissonance with their environment, as a stable Risk score might suggest, or they may just care less about the dissonance, as their strong Nonconformity and Esteem scores could indicate. Having developed sufficient skills or support systems to both institute and live with the results of their risks, Group B would appear to be more comfortable with themselves as risk-takers. Because of their independence and strong sense of self, it would be tempting to assume that this group is composed of those who do not require structured experiences like G-350 to foster their risk-taking.

Before such an assumption about Group B's homogeneity could be accepted, however, one other source of information was considered to test the suspected composition of Group B. Table 6.6 contrasts the $T_1$ score ranges of Group A and Group B. In this way, the mean score is broken down into more descriptive categories.

Having arbitrarily determined the high, medium, and low categories by dividing the full score range into three

TABLE 6.6

$T_1$ J.P.I. SCORES OF GROUP A AND GROUP B BY SCORE RANGE

| Score Range: | Risk | | Self-esteem | | Non-conformity* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Group A | Group B | Group A | Group B | Group A | Group B |
| High | 14% | 50% | 36% | 50% | 7% | 25% |
| Medium | 36% | 25% | 57% | 50% | 57% | - |
| Low | 50% | 25% | 7% | - | 36% | 75% |
| N = | 14 | 8 | 14 | 8 | 14 | 8 |

*Low scores are desired.

equidistant groups, Table 6.6 reveals that Group B is actually composed of two extremes: in addition to the majority of high scorers, there is also a small group of low scorers present. Clearly, half of Group B was already high in Risk and Self-esteem at $T_1$ and almost three-quarters were very low in Conformity. These facts refine the explanation of Group B's lack of desire for a continued forum like G-350. Most of the women in the group were high scorers and therefore beyond the need for classroom challenge or support in risk-taking. However, for the few low scorers in Group B the class was probably too threatening, with too little support and too much challenge to risk. Conversely, Group A was largely composed of the middle-range scorers, or those whose capabilities and needs were more appropriately matched to G-350. It is only natural

that the class should have had more impact on Group A as both their scores and interview responses attest.

In summary, G-350 proved initially useful to the women who were middle-range scorers in Risk, Self-esteem, and Nonconformity. The immediate impact of the class was greatest for this group and resulted in either the formation of the behaviors and attitudes necessary for creative risk-taking or in the refinement and demonstration of risky behavior. For the latter, repetition of an experience like G-350 was not necessary, as the class had passed on the desired learnings about creative risk-taking. For the former, a continuation of G-350 or some similar experience was sought eight months after the class had ended as a way of maintaining and continuing their evolution as creative risk-takers.

In addition to those who had grown as creative risk-takers while enrolled in the class, i.e. the movers, another group of students also desired a continued forum like G-350. These were women whose scores did not change during the class but who, nonetheless, seemed to derive some benefits from their participation in G-350. It is as if many of these nonmovers had just reached the threshold of creative risk-taking and they needed a forum like the class to help them in taking the first steps into this new realm. As discussed in the following section, the dynamics of a delayed impact is evident in the evolution and progress of many of those who did not change until after the class had

ended. Although all individuals in this group did not gain three or more points in Esteem, they will be called the $T_3$ Esteem movers because their Risk and Esteem growth patterns parallel the changes seen in the $T_2$ movers.

## Delayed Reactions: the $T_3$ Movers

For a small group of G-350 women, the utility of the class was not manifest until after the class had concluded. To understand this phenomenon, the test scores of the $T_3$ movers were examined to gain insight into their development. Table 6.7 presents the $T_1T_2T_3$ test profile of the $T_3$ movers. The range of scores for each variable is also offered because of the wide and somewhat extreme span of the scores. Although this group is small (N=5), their evolution as creative risk-takers seems to reaffirm the theory that a positive change in Self-esteem accompanies a change in Risk.

TABLE 6.7

$T_1T_2T_3$ MEAN SCORE PROFILE OF THE $T_3$ MOVERS

| | Risk | | Self-esteem | | Nonconformity | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | $\bar{X}$ | Range | $\bar{X}$ | Range | $\bar{X}$ | Range |
| $T_1$ | 9.4 | 2-15 | 13.6 | 5-18 | 6.2 | 2-10 |
| $T_2$ | 10.2 | 2-17 | 12.2 | 2-18 | 3.8* | 1-8 |
| $T_3$ | 14.2* | 6-19 | 13.8 | 6-19 | 6.0 | 0=11 |

*Significance of score change = < .05.

The most important points drawn from Table 6.7 are: 1) the $T_3$ movers recorded little positive change in Risk and some negative change in Esteem while they were in the class; 2) their $T_1T_2$ decrease in Conformity was quite large; and 3) their strong $T_2T_3$ increase in Risk and Self-esteem is surprising when juxtaposed to an increase in Conformity. The $T_2T_3$ increase in Risk and Self-esteem support the speculation that these two variables are sequentially related. For the $T_3$ movers, and unlike the $T_2$ Esteem movers, an increase rather than decrease in Conformity complements the changes in Risk and Esteem. An explanation for this finding comes from the interview data.

In talking with the $T_3$ movers, it became clear that their semester of enrollment in the class was quite stressful. Four of the five women were graduating seniors coping with crucial personal and professional decisions about their futures. The fifth student was deeply involved in personal counseling. Therefore, it could well be that the $T_3$ movers' increase in Conformity—in its middle range of score—is actually a move toward balance in and with one's environment. Since leaving the class, these women first had to resolve their other conflicts. Only then, over a period of months, could they increase Risk and Self-esteem as they shaped their new social and professional situations to meet their personal standards and values. While other students could respond and apply the skills and learnings of G-350 immediately, the $T_3$ movers had to center, digest,

and then practice what they had learned in the class. In essence, this was creative risk-taking, as they waited until they knew they were ready to consciously and openly take risks.

## Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the long-term effects of G-350 and its utility for its students. The findings are encouraging in that the initial changes and growth in creative risk-taking were sustained by the $T_2$ movers and were also experienced by a later group, the $T_3$ movers. For many women in the class there was an expressed desire for a continued forum like G-350 to assist them in their risk-taking. Group support and skills improvement were equally cited as examples of what the students wanted from an additional experience. It is important to recognize that the women were not dependent on G-350 to initiate their risk-taking, but used the class as a forum to support or enhance their actions. Fully 87% of the class reported that they had taken significant risks since the end of the class sessions. Because their risk-taking affected important life decisions for many of the women, their need for support or practice is understandable.

The need for a change in Esteem prior to a change in Risk was underscored by the test score patterns of the $T_3$ movers. The delayed impact of the class on this group appeared to be based on the necessity for a more stable

environment before major risks were chosen. Obviously, in a stressful life situation, additional stresses are not desired. The fact that the $T_3$ movers were able to distinguish their priorities and delay their risk-taking attests to their growth as creative risk-takers.

A sector of the class did not seem to benefit from G-350 at all. In general, these women were either advanced risk-takers and therefore not challenged by the class or they were far below the threshold of risk and felt threatened by the activities of G-350.

The group data developed to this point have documented the relationship of G-350 to the levels of risk-taking found in its students. The persistence of change as reflected in the test scores and in the ways that lives have been lived will be probed in greater depth through the following individual case studies of movers and nonmovers.

# CHAPTER 7

## FOUR CASE STUDIES OF THOSE WHO BENEFITED FROM G-350

### Introduction

The women whose lives will be detailed in the following two chapters represent the many different types of students in G-350. The eight women that have been selected for this in-depth study vary in age, social and academic background, level of entry test scores, and pattern of score change. This chapter focuses on four of these students, each of whom became a "risk-mover"* during the course of this study and each of whom desired a forum like G-350 nine months after the class had ended. The next chapter explores the lives and experiences of four students who did not change their Risk scores substantially nor did they desire a forum like G-350. The names of the eight women chosen for further study and their placement with respect to the selection criteria are presented in Table 7.1.

This chapter will integrate the interview data, test scores, and peer report information for Susan, Lucy, Carmen

---

*A "risk-mover" is defined as one whose Risk score on the JPI test increased by three or more points between $T_1$ and $T_3$ or one who maintained a ceiling score of 19 or 20.

TABLE 7.1

$T_1T_3$ CHANGE IN RISK SCORE AND DESIRE FOR A FORUM LIKE G-350

| $T_1T_3$ Risk Score Change | Desire for a Forum like G-350: Yes | Desire for a Forum like G-350: No |
|---|---|---|
| 3 points or more | Susan<br>Lucy<br>Carmen<br>Annie<br>(N=9) | Molly<br>(N=4) |
| 0 points or negative | (N=5) | Kate<br>Nancy<br>Jill<br>(N=4) |
| Total | (N=14) | (N=8) |

and Annie. From these diverse and rich data sources, a deeper understanding of creative risk-taking and its relationship to G-350 may be achieved.

Susan F.

Susan, a twin, appears to be a classic, upper-middle class college junior in January, 1974. She is president of her sorority and a business major. At that time, she is described by a close friend as "outgoing, thinking and intelligent." A year later Susan will describe herself as questioning, gregarious and striving. When she entered G-350, she registered high levels of Risk and Self-esteem, as recorded on the Jackson Personality Inventory.

To begin, what were the changes that the class seemed to evoke while Susan was enrolled in it? According to a

peer, Susan had "matured a lot over the term—she knows how to deal with just about any type of person. She seems to be a bit more sensitive to others and willing to be happy for their accomplishments. . . . (particularly with regard to risk-taking) she seems more able to face sticky situations, especially when it comes down to confronting someone . . . she'll just ask them without being afraid of what they'll say." The friend also felt that Susan's self-esteem, openness to new ideas and people, and public affirmation of her values had increased over the course of the semester. Both Susan and her friend felt that being president of her sorority had been one of Susan's most significant experiences that semester, for as Susan states: "I learned to cope—learned so much about people, their feelings, their needs—and how to cope with their conflicts."

From Susan's perspective, the most important thing she learned in G-350 was that she "had potential that needs to be fulfilled." Specifically, she realized that she wants a "real job" and has to think about her future in specifics. In this way, I became a significant role model for Susan as I "effervesce wake-up, am going places, and make Susan unsatisfied with her life in a positive way." Some of the class exercises reinforced this, particularly the positive feedback, university painting, and values clarification experiences. From these, she gained new self-knowledge of

her strengths as seen by others, a sense of her creativity, and improved understanding of her reasons for doing (or not doing) certain things with her life. Two generalizations are relevant at this point. First, Susan seemed to benefit most from those exercises that helped her to feel more comfortable with others in the class, significant because she sometimes felt inferior, as she was more traditional than many of the other students (as she saw it). Second, Susan most enjoyed those exercises which gave her positive information about herself, important because her living unit and presidential responsibilities were highly conflict ridden. As Susan stated, the most risky thing she did/learned in G-350 was "to cope with conflict and be patient." Realizing and correcting her weaknesses were cited as one more important experience she had over the semester. While she did not feel that G-350 increased her level of risk-taking, she did feel the class and her project on leadership styles helped to give her new ways of handling her presidential responsibilities. In sum, these practice sessions in class related to the risky moments she faced out of class.

Susan's test scores are very interesting because of the dramatic changes seen in Risk, Innovation, Tolerance, and Value Orthodoxy between the first and last testings. Table 7.2 presents this data.

TABLE 7.2

SUSAN'S $T_1T_2T_3$ TEST SCORES AND SUMMARY DIFFERENCES

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Inno-vation | Non-confor-mity* | Value Ortho-doxy* | Toler-ance | Rokeach* | P.O.I. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | 13 | 17 | 10 | 6 | 8 | 12 | - 6 | 23 |
| $T_2$ | 11 | 17 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 10 | -46 | 25 |
| $T_3$ | 18 | 18 | 14 | 11 | 6 | 15 | -34 | — |
| $T_1T_3$ $\Delta$ | + 5 | + 1 | + 4 | - 4 | + 2 | + 3 | +18 | + 2 |

*Negative movement is positive change.

The most striking aspect of Susan's test profile is the negative movement in Risk, Conformity, Value Orthodoxy, and Tolerance evidenced between $T_1$ and $T_2$ only to be followed by strong positive changes in these variables between $T_2$ and $T_3$. Susan was asked to explain the personal meaning of these scores and their relationship to the events in her life.

Susan described a very frustrating term as the root cause for her negative test score movement between $T_1$ and $T_2$. She said she had felt a lot of personal hurt, stemming from over-extending herself as president and also holding another part-time job, as well as facing the conflicts of her sorority. Her social life had had its ups and downs. The impact of this is reflected in lower Risk and Tolerance scores and higher Conformity than appeared at $T_1$. However, her high Self-esteem remained and her creativity (Innovation) increased, as did her open-mindedness (Rokeach) and her self-actualization (P.O.I.). Susan explained that over

the term she had learned that she had faults and had been socialized to think too much for others. By the end of the term, she was ready to explore herself more, to discover more interests and people outside of her sorority, and to let herself "feel" more, versus the intellectualizing of her emotions. It would seem as though the semester had been an important one for Susan. G-350 had not changed her self-image, but it had helped her to cope with present negative experiences while encouraging her positive development, particularly with an eye to the future.

By $T_3$, Susan was a year older, almost ready to graduate from college, and no longer president of her sorority. The positive test score increases were related to two significant events in the last year. It began with her decision to have sexual intercourse with a man for the first time. This was a conscious decision and one she felt in control of. As described, she felt no guilt and realized that sex can deepen a relationship. Aside from sexual liberation, the decision made her confront her socialization which equated virginity and marriage. Susan considers this act one of the major risks she had taken in the last eight months. It is a risk she chose and one which had a positive outcome for her. When asked if she felt G-350 related to the decision, Susan first responded with a general yes, but not to the direct relationship. Perhaps, she said, the contact with so many different types of women in class was

important as there were so many varying life styles among the students. She also credited G-350 with making her aware of the means she had to emotionally support herself.

A second significant life experience for Susan had been a long look at her parents and family life. Being home for the summer and thinking hard about her future forced Susan to think about her past. She realized that her father "rules the roost while her mother plays a secondary role." Susan wants more: "I was socialized to be a wife and therefore not to strive high." And yet, Susan describes herself as "striving"—seeking vital roles in or out of the family.

When queried about her memories of the course in the $T_3$ interview, Susan most remembered the teacher, the women, and the skills-type of exercises. Problem-solving and group creativity and cooperation were aspects of the class she wished she had better learned, while "being comfortable with achieving your potential and overcoming socialization without hostility" were two issues she hoped the class would cover in the future. Finally, Susan desired a forum like G-350 because she feels that group sessions can be rewarding; "when things are bad, I've learned the importance of having someone to share it with." For Susan, a risk is "looking at a situation, seeing two avenues, choosing one and knowing that I may lose out on the other." Susan seems to be practicing this philosophy, and G-350 apparently has supported her in some direct and indirect ways.

In summary, we see a young woman who has increased her level of risk-taking by choice. G-350 introduced her to "women who were more socially conscious" than she, a random contribution at best. However, certain assertive and clarifying exercises expanded her ideas about herself and increased her abilities to communicate this to others. Susan became a more open person, acting on her needs and better accepting those of others. If G-350 introduced Susan to new values and new aspects of herself, the full integration was to come later. One explanation for this delayed impact may be her traditional socialization, taking her much longer to come to grips with its depth. Another possibility would be that a "rough term" negated a change in self-esteem, which seems to be necessary for a change in risk. Nonetheless, when Susan made her choices, increased risk-taking obviously was present. G-350, and its students and teacher, seem to have provided some of the challenge and a few of the skills which fostered Susan's later growth, although it was in combination with other forces in her life.

Lucy T.

Filing a sex discrimination complaint, trying new things by willingly testing her self-imposed limitations, and learning to stand up for herself productively are a few of the most significant implications Lucy attributes to her involvement with G-350. Married and graduating from a

5-year professional degree program in pharmacy, Lucy was a senior at the time she took the course. She was and is career-oriented and is in a field which is not considered a traditionally feminine occupation. The benefits she gained from G-350 were both professionally and personally relevant to her and are reinforced in her test score changes.

Lucy's greatest score changes occurred while she was in the class. As Table 7.3 indicates, her $T_1T_2$ shifts were significant. There is positive movement in Risk, Self-esteem, and Conformity seems related, as well as parallel increases in Innovation, openness (Rokeach) and self-actualization (P.O.I.). Lucy felt that her new involvement in her career, including the establishment of a small pharmaceutical consulting firm, had forced her to take some risks and be creative. The negative move in Tolerance was attributed to meeting a person that term that she could not abide! This had never happened to Lucy and left her still questioning the dynamics of her dislike. For the most part, Lucy's semester had changed from a bleak to a bright time in her life, particularly as graduation became a reality.

Over the nine months between the $T_2$ and $T_3$ testing, Lucy's scores remained fairly stable. She did show sizable increases in Risk and Tolerance. With the exception of Value Orthodoxy, Lucy has made positive and seemingly permanent changes on every test variable between $T_1$ and $T_3$. While she has not been dependent on the class to sustain her risk-taking (as measured by the J.P.I. Risk score), she

nonetheless is one of the $T_3$ women who expressed a need for a forum like G-350, to give her "feedback" on her progress as an assertive, professional woman and to help her further develop the skills she feels she needs. Table 7.3 documents the changes between her first and final testings.

TABLE 7.3

LUCY'S $T_1T_2T_3$ TEST SCORES AND SUMMARY DIFFERENCES

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Inno-vation | Non-confor-mity* | Value Ortho-doxy* | Toler-ance | Rokeach* | P.O.I. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | 8 | 11 | 8 | 10 | 3 | 13 | -42 | 17 |
| $T_2$ | 11 | 14 | 14 | 4 | 5 | 11 | -46 | 21 |
| $T_3$ | 15 | 14 | 14 | 7 | 3 | 15 | -51 | — |
| $T_1T_3$ $\Delta$ | + 7 | + 3 | + 6 | + 3 | 0 | + 2 | + 9 | + 4 |

*Negative movement is positive change.

From the interview data, a greater understanding of Lucy's growth in and cultivation of risk-taking is achieved. To begin, Lucy said that she learned some specific new attitudes and actions in class which she applied outside of class. Buying a bicycle and going on three-hour trips were examples of her new lifestyle and significant because she never thought she had the energy to do this. The most important thing that Lucy felt she learned in G-350 was an awareness of herself—as a woman and a person. She became more conscious of life and reaching her potential; that "self-interest is good and you should plan for yourself." The mixture of women in the class had also given her more

drive and more trust in women. She found that "all the women are feminists, i.e., . . . can understand the problems of taking a risk." G-350 supported Lucy to increase her risk-taking through the reading, discussion, and skill exercises which showed her "how easy it was for me to be dormant and stagnant. In order to grow, I must be active and seeking. This involves doing new things and doing old things new ways." The Bullseye, the Wall, and the Empathy exercises were listed as the class events that were most meaningful to her. It is not surprising that these are some of her more powerful class experiences as they taught risk, openness to the new, a belief in yourself, and utilization of group synergy. They were most remembered because they seemed to have best met Lucy's needs.

The class also affected Lucy's decision-making ability. The key was that she began making decisions, rather than letting things happen. The exercises in conflict management, feedback, leadership and even the Wall underscored the importance of exerting some control over one's destiny, in addition to offering a chance to practice decision-making. The repercussions were felt in Lucy's professional and personal life. Because of a pharmacy internship involved with her class project, Lucy decided to file a sex discrimination charge against her employer. In her own words, this was the most risky thing Lucy did in G-350 because "I have never stood up for my rights. It is new for me to be gutsy and to take an anti-institutional stand. . . . The best

education of all is that which helps you to get through life sane . . . (From the complaint process) I learned to recognize discrimination and to be aware of unfair treatment. I learned how to get over legal hurdles, such as filling out repetitious forms." Her confidence, her belief in herself, and her ability to take a stand were crucial in Lucy's choosing to tackle this project. And she won the case!

The other focus for class learnings was Lucy's relationship with her husband. Because of the skills practiced in class, such as feedback, empathy, and problem-solving, and because of her new attitudes of self-confidence and independence, Lucy coped with some marital issues in a better way. To begin, she found herself choosing which issues to work on and which to leave alone. This prioritization was productive, as the superficial dilemmas were put aside. Apparently, her husband was upset with her as she became a "libber" and blamed her assertiveness on the class. But Lucy felt she could enlighten him and cope with this because of the class experience. Further, states Lucy, "I no longer begrudge him his independence. I do my own thing while he's off messing around!" Her increased self-sufficiency and creativeness explained these changes. Ironically, Lucy asked her husband to complete the "peer report" form for this study. He refused. Although Lucy tried to get another friend to finish the form, it was never received. Thus, no external documentation of Lucy's changes

is available, but the refusal may be evidence of their existence.

The most helpful thing that Lucy learned in G-350 and has applied since has been "a kind of standing up for yourself and justifying what you are doing. . . . (In class) you just couldn't ham around or not decide how you felt about something. . . . you couldn't ride the fence. . . . I have had a problem in not doing this, not taking a stand. . . . I think of every other way to answer a question . . . and have an answer for everyone rather than an answer for myself. . . ." The use of whips (a quick, verbal, public completion of a sentence), role-play, and group feedback were mentioned as crucial to Lucy in the development of her decisiveness.

The importance of this "taking a stand" is better understood when Lucy talked about the risks she has taken in the eight months after she completed the course. As a pharmacist, she must advise patients and doctors about possible drug alternatives, and as Lucy said: ". . . you have to stick your neck out, you have to take a stand. Not only are you liable for the statement but it could be easy to hedge off a firm reply. I find that I'm not willing to do that. If I don't know the answer, I will find it. I feel that I have to express a competent response even if it's taking a risk."

In addition to her professional work, a significant life experience and risk for Lucy was an extended backpacking trip she took with her husband and some friends.

As Lucy states: "I was carrying a lot of weight and I was in agony . . . <u>really roughing</u> it and that is significant . . . to know that I could put up with a lot of hardship. I've gotten to the point where I don't complain a lot like I used to. This is a change. I might have a hardship but I'm not going to complain and burden like I used to when I lived with my mother (in high school) . . . I was conditioned to think I had a weak constitution. . . . I've realized that you can hike all day and really hurt and get a headache and so what!"

Again, the important question is did G-350 relate to these outcomes? From Lucy's perspective the answer is yes. Simply, the attitude of trying new things opened her up to many of these experiences. The significance of previous risks such as long bike trips and filing a discrimination charge take on new meaning as Lucy's professional and personal risk-taking continues. The structured nature of the class seemed just right for her because "it was a place where I went and learned new ways of doing things. We had exercises not only on how to get things done . . . but also a lot of discussion. Maybe they (the exercises) were kind of simple minded, but you knew the idea was there. . . . This was new to me and I think it opened up my eyes quite a bit. I guess you could call it the great awakening . . . it (the class) was a place where I went and I loved the things it brought out."

In terms of Lucy's future, more risks were in store. Lucy had decided to look for a new job. "I want to branch out. I want to do something where I am solely responsible and that's like running the show. I don't want to have someone else on top of me. I want to start being my own boss and I don't think I'm going to take the crap I used to take." Shortly after the interview, she found such a job. Lucy's assertiveness is building. She tells people how she feels now, "not only negatively but positively. When I like things or when someone has done something good for me, I make it a point now in telling them about that." Her relationship with her husband has also improved, perhaps for this very reason. Lucy has had and will have a place to apply some of the skills she learned in G-350. Within the next three years, she and her husband hope to have a drug consulting firm established. The merger of her personal and professional life will certainly demand the self-confidence and communication skills Lucy has developed.

Lucy's life is in stages now and she is excited by its reality and promise. G-350 appears to have given her some skills and attitudes which she could quickly put to use in her life. With some success, as evidenced by her test scores and the changes in her life, Lucy has learned how to take a stand and try new things, two important tenets in creative risk-taking.

Carmen S.

Given traditional societal attitudes about the feminine role, any woman has difficulty becoming a creative risk-taker. When that is compounded by being a Mexican-American woman in an alien culture, potential roadblocks to creative risk-taking could be even more problematic. Carmen is thus a fascinating person to study, as she is a Chicano woman in her late twenties, married with one child, and was a returning student. She had earned her A.A. degree from a community college many years before. Upon entering G-350, Carmen personified a gentle, soft-spoken, timid and traditionally feminine woman. She left the class still gentle and soft-spoken, but her confidence, independence, and assertiveness had replaced timidity. The intermingling of the class with other life events seemed to explain the changes Carmen experienced during the span of the class.

Above all, the semester that Carmen spent in G-350 supported her to be aware of her own growth and development, and in fact, to demand growth and development for herself. The description of Carmen's increased awareness of herself as a woman, reported by a close friend, details this change: "She is much more independent of a very strong husband (who tries to facilitate this independence). She is more sensitive to her rights and is much readier to speak for herself. She also seems to enjoy being and experiencing being a woman. . . . Her priorities are changing and past dependencies (on her mother and husband) are dissolving." Examples

cited included ". . . confronting at a dinner party the best selling novelist in the Southwest on his inconsistencies . . . considering an open marriage with another couple . . . and being much more assertive and sure of herself. . . ."

G-350 was just one source of these changes. Both Carmen and her friend list a marital workshop Carmen and her husband attended as one of the most significant experiences she had had that semester. It opened up some of Carmen's deep feelings and posed new options, like open marriage. In turn, this experience led Carmen to seek a professional counselor to help her with her feelings of inferiority and lack of confidence. Simply, a spiral effect was operant. The class exercises, such as the Bullseye, the feedback sessions, and the readings greatly aided Carmen in "being proud to be a woman and to know and feel capable of growth and development." She revealed her needs and fears in class, was given support, her confidence improved, she practiced this assertion more and found life to be better. Successful at the class level, she took a larger step by attending the marital workshop. There she met her counselor and this took her one more step. Issues raised in these outside experiences, such as open marriage, were plugged into G-350 sessions again, as Carmen applied problem-solving and other techniques to these dilemmas. The cycle was complete. In-class growth led to out-of-class growth which in turn increased the usefulness of the class for Carmen.

It is also clear that the teacher served as an important role model. For Carmen, the teacher was enthusiastic, dynamic, intellectual but creative and warm, open to close contact with students/women, and saw risks as challenges." These qualities were important to a Chicana woman who was uncertain of her academic and interpersonal capabilities. Together with her class project, a term paper on the history of birth control which overcame academic and cultural hurdles she previously feared, Carmen was able to find great meaning in G-350.

Test score verification of these changes is sporadic. Table 7.4 presents all test scores and notes overall change.

TABLE 7.4

CARMEN'S $T_1T_2T_3$ TEST SCORES AND SUMMARY DIFFERENCES

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Innovation | Non-conformity | Value Orthodoxy | Tolerance | Rokeach | P.O.I. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | 6 | 12 | 16 | 16 | 4 | 12 | -65 | 22 |
| $T_2$ | 10 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 0 | 13 | -37 | 23 |
| $T_3$ | 11 | 13 | 15 | 11 | 2 | 10 | -68 | — |
| $T_1T_3$ $\Delta$ | + 5 | + 1 | - 1 | + 5 | -2 | - 2 | + 3 | + 1 |

Carmen appears to be an exception to the theory that a change in risk accompanies a change in esteem, for her self-esteem, as measured by the J.P.I., changed very little. However, her Risk and Conformity scores indicate the positive movements one would expect. It is possible that

because Carmen's low self-esteem was so culturally ingrained, it took a combination of the class, therapy, and new experiences to change her image of herself. Thus, one point increase in self-esteem may represent a major victory. Or, the test may not have captured Carmen's growth. In any case, the majority of Carmen's test increases occurred while she was in G-350. However, slight positive changes continued during the following eight months with the exception of strong positive movement on the Rokeach score and a slight negative move in Value Orthodoxy and Tolerance. As the $T_3$ interview data attest, the changes in Carmen are still evolving; steady progress in the direction begun in G-350.

The most significant life experience for Carmen in the eight months following G-350 involved academic and personal relationships, paralleling the important events she had had during G-350. The first was a trip to Mexico City, significant in part because she talked her husband into it and also because she did not allow her Mexican relatives to establish her schedule or change her lifestyle while there. In addition, this trip was an important "myth breaker" for Carmen. Her father is buried in Mexico and every time she has gone for a visit, something terrible would happen in this country, necessitating her immediate return. In Carmen's religion there is a superstition that if the Virgin doesn't want you in Mexico, something will happen to

make you leave. Carmen thought this might explain her previous, quick trips even though she found the superstition ridiculous. Thus, the recent trip was an opportunity for Carmen to prove to herself that she had control over her life—her destiny did not rest with the Virgin, her husband, or her relatives. She recalled the G-350 attitude of "try it, you can do it" as something that very much helped her to pursue this plan. This same attitude supported her in taking risks. For example, in discussing open marriage with her husband, she was able to overcome some fears about bringing up such feelings. Assertion skills helped make the discussion meaningful, another small contribution of her class experience.

Carmen's decision to switch therapy counselors was an additional important moment in her life. She had become dissatisfied with the sociologist who was working with her. Her husband is a clinical psychology doctoral student and in comparing and discussing his counselor and counselee experiences, Carmen realized her needs were not being served. The switch was both a wise therapeutic move as well as a declaration of equality with her husband. She attained equal treatment, literally and figuratively. The repercussions have been positive. Carmen states: "I think consciously my husband accepts it (the new therapy) and wants it because he wants me to be assertive and competent . . . but when he sees that I'm blossoming . . . then he feels afraid that I'm going to leave him, or leave him for another

man; that I'm going to get side-tracked, and that's not it at all! I think I realize that I'm no longer afraid (of me, him, or other people). I love my husband and I know why I love him. It's not like before . . ." Now, more than ever, they are together by choice.

Other prominent events for Carmen were her decisions: 1) to take harder, different, academic courses and 2) to be more open with people. Both were conscious decisions and both risky for a woman who comes from another culture and had been reared to be submissive and fearful of failure. Academically, the language barrier and the rigor of upper level psychology and history courses intimidated the former music major. However, Carmen decided to expose herself to the experience because she wanted the knowledge. At last report, she had been named an honors student. Similarly, she has chosen to reveal her inner self to other people. She believes this crucial " . . . because I feel like people are very isolated in our times. People are afraid of other people . . . afraid to tell you they have problems . . . I think it's important to be able to know and to be able to express your feelings and not to be afraid of people. . . . To be able to be yourself, just be you, problems and all, instead of pretending to be someone you're not." The decision to become this kind of a person stems from her interactions in G-350, her sessions with her sociologist, her current therapy, and a bit from a psychology class she was attending.

Spinoffs from the above have affected Carmen's relationships with Anglo people, her husband, and her family. She is less intimidated by white values and culture; more curious to explore the differences. Aside from sharing feelings and new commitments to each other, Carmen and her husband now divide all household and life maintenance tasks. Carmen's mother nearly died to see Carmen's husband ironing his own shirt. While Carmen worries about their eventual transition back into the Latin culture, she is excited about the new family dialogue these changes have provided.

In summary, Carmen's memories of G-350 and its impact on her are detailed in this quote from her interview in March, 1975:

> I think I learned a lot of things. . . . sometimes I'll be walking down the street and I'll remember Peg encouraged us to do this, like something new; try something new all the time. And I guess it just kind of helped me. I felt I was reinforced to find; to seek counseling; to do something I was afraid to do, and I saw it as a help, to encourage me to get to know myself. . . . The course was something to kind of encourage you to seek another way or seek it in your own life, in your own time. And, the class was just kind of helping you to see that there are other ways and other things that you can do in your life, to help yourself. . . . It gave me kind of a push that I needed, an encouraging push not a rejecting shove."

Annie B.

Annie is a ball of fire. Spirited, natural, independent, mature, and creative are adjectives her peer-reporter and other students use to describe Annie. She enrolled in G-350 in the second term of her first year at the university.

She had graduated a semester early from a progressive, Catholic high school near Detroit. There, her senior project had been on women's prisons and as part of her research Annie actually lived in the Detroit Women's Jail. She came to the class a high Risk-scorer, and yet, she gained immensely from its offerings. To this end, both Annie and her friend stated G-350 as one of the most significant experiences she had had that term.

When asked if G-350 had increased her level of risk-taking, Annie replied: "Yes . . . mostly because Peg always emphasized through examples that you can do just about anything you want to. I've always been pretty gutsy, but being acquainted with the many different women in the class has given me a broader outlook and a new sense of confidence in tackling the new." Annie's out-of-class-friend also found a change in her. "She has become more aware of her potential as a person . . . has expanded her scope of possible goals (that she feels are actually achievable). She no longer limits herself to a future career as a nurse but is considering other careers—this has caused her a lot of mental anguish but I think it will be (or has been) beneficial." Both agreed that Annie was taking more risks; the biggest being a decision to live with her boyfriend during the summer. This was a risk because it negated much of her upbringing and her parents' values. In addition, the relationship with her lover was the first time

Annie had really given "me" to someone else, as she was previously a little scared to open up to such depths.

G-350 seemed to give Annie a confidence in herself that was derived from the esteem offered by other women in the class, facilitated by class exercises meant to do this. The Bullseye and the Five Year Futures were crucial in the exchange and internalization of this feeling. Both exercises provide positive feedback to the individual, based on revelations the student has made about herself. In hearing about others' lives and receiving others' opinions about her life, Annie developed an awareness of options she had not considered for her future. Annie also came to value her individuality to a much greater extent. By the end of the semester, she had decided to keep entry into medical school as an alternative for herself, rather than absolutely commit herself to traditional nursing. Her class project involved apprenticing to a natural childbirth team at University Hospital. She became fascinated with both the new (or reinstated) field of midwivery and women's health care as provided by male doctors. Thus, G-350 sometimes sponsored and sometimes integrated Annie's changing awareness of herself and her world.

Communication skills she learned in class were also greatly valued by Annie. The feedback labs helped her to be positively assertive, first ironing out a problem with her roommate, and later, with other personal friends and family. Annie was happy with the outcomes of these

confrontive experiences. Her peer friend notes that over the course of the term she "seemed to slow down a little and listen to people better." For Annie, the friendly class atmosphere aided in the mixing of different women, while the exercises shaped exchange as they improved communication skills.

Aside from these changed self-images and relationships, G-350 also gave Annie a unique educational experience. The small groups, the non-traditional grading process, the personalized exercises and projects gave Annie a new excitement about the learning atmosphere in a large university. Perhaps as a first year student, the educational impact of G-350 was more potent for Annie than for older students. Coming from a progressive high school yet dwarfed by the size of the University, Annie was primed for the challenge yet desirous of the support that G-350 offered. The other people in the class provided another educational resource for her, as she learned about their ideas, personalities, values, and activities. Finally, the teacher had great impact on Annie. Peg's "creativeness, openness to others, to the world, and to herself; . . . the quality of <u>doing</u> what <u>you</u> want" impressed Annie favorably.

As a transition between the two interviews, a review of Annie's test score changes is appropriate.

TABLE 7.5

ANNIE'S $T_1T_2T_3$ TEST SCORES AND SUMMARY DIFFERENCES

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Inno-vation | Non-confor-mity | Value Ortho-doxy | Toler-ance | Rokeach | P.O.I. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | 18 | 12 | 16 | 4 | 3 | 17 | -30 | 23 |
| $T_2$ | 20 | 18 | 19 | 1 | 2 | 17 | -39 | 26 |
| $T_3$ | 19 | 16 | 18 | 2 | 3 | 17 | -39 | — |
| $\overset{\Delta}{T_1T_3}$ | + 1 | + 4 | + 2 | +2 | 0 | 0 | + 9 | + 3 |

It is important to note that Annie entered the class at the positive extreme of every test variable, with the exception of Self-esteem. At the end of her enrollment in G-350, she has significantly changed in a desired way on every test variable, with the exception of Tolerance, where she remained stable. However, at $T_3$ there is slight score slippage on all variables but Tolerance and the Rokeach scale. Nonetheless, the overall positive score changes remain intact. By far, the shift in Self-esteem is the greatest movement for Annie. The class seemed to pull her out of the middle range of scores and into the high level, thus paralleling her other test placements. As Annie stated upon seeing her $T_1T_2$ score differences: "The Self-esteem change is a real plus to G-350. It tremendously helped me to feel good about myself . . . to be more accepting of my own ideas and to pursue them." It is this behavioral pursuit that is most crucial to this study.

Eight months after the end of G-350, Annie described herself as "alive, energetic, and confident." Specific G-350 exercises remained in her mind for the awareness of herself, other people and her future which they engendered. The ability to "future trip" as Annie calls it, is a skill she credited to the class and felt would be helpful to her professional future. "Future tripping" means looking ahead, plotting creative options and choosing an initial course with flexibility. Annie was enthusiastic about her self-confidence in decision-making and this made her feel more capable as a person and a professional.

Annie's significant life experiences in the last eight months included: 1) living with her boyfriend; 2) helping a friend cope with death; and 3) a camping trip with some close friends. All were conscious decisions of involvement and Annie added that G-350 skills related to her decisions. Her confidence, contact with her feelings, ability to create options for herself and accept responsibility for their outcomes were qualities which made the ends successful rather than problematic. "Exercises like the Bullseye and Problem-solving" said Annie, "were crucial (in helping to develop the above qualities). . . . The support and modeling from the other women in the class also made the class exciting and helpful." An outcome from G-350 of a different nature was a summer job as a mid-wife in a West Virginia poverty program. This job resulted from Annie's initial class

project and a class visit to the Career Planning and Placement Office. It was the product of "future tripping" made real. All of these events have led Annie to choose medicine as her future profession, either as a doctor or a nurse practitioner. She has given up nursing school for a pre-med major and looks forward to the day she will focus on women's health problems. This "gutsy" risk-taker has truly evolved into a confident, creative risk-taker.

Conclusion

These four vignettes deepen our understanding of the effects of G-350 on four very different types of women. Their backgrounds and futures are not similar, but their excitement about today and tomorrow is a common bond. All responded positively to their G-350 experience, as test and interview data indicate, despite their different starting points. Having an immediate reference point to practice or apply lessons learned in G-350 seems to be one shared characteristic which may explain why these women became "risk movers." G-350 was useful as a catalyst, teaching a small lesson or skill which gained meaning when applied, at the individual's initiative, outside of class. The attitude of trying new things had impact on all four women. In addition, G-350 helped all four students to carve out a future for themselves. Finally, increased confidence and self-esteem appear to have liberated these women. Support from

others led to the development of increased self-support systems, and this in turn, to increased creative risk-taking.

In sum, two types of conditions seem to have facilitated the fit of G-350 to the lives of these four women. An innovative attitude and increased esteem relate to the first condition which is personal openness to risk. The class appears to have succeeded in fostering this feeling in these women. The second condition is the similar felt need that all four students shared. They wanted to develop the skills to control their destinies and the future clarification and personally-oriented exercises met this need. Together, the conditions of psychological readiness (increased esteem and openness) and felt need (problems to solve) seem to explain change. G-350 encouraged their attitudes and legitimated their actions which resulted in a mutually-reinforcing reaction: the class related to their creative risk-taking and their creative risk-taking related to the class. In other words, for these women G-350 appears to have promoted the desire to act and then the action.

The next chapter will focus on four students who did not respond to G-350 in such a dramatic way. If the principles of application, innovative attitude, futures clarification, and increased esteem explain the risk-taking of Susan, Lucy, Carmen, and Annie, perhaps the following chapter will support or refute these ideas as applied to four different students.

# CHAPTER 8

## FOUR CASE STUDIES OF THOSE WHO DID NOT BENEFIT FROM G-350

### Introduction

The goal of this chapter is to explore the lives of four G-350 students who did not seem to benefit from the class in any significant way, particularly focusing on why the class did not serve their needs. Like Chapter 7, the selection of these women is based on two criteria. They are: 1) negative or no change in Risk, as measured by the J.P.I.* and 2) negative response to the desire for a continued forum like G-350. Table 8.1 reproduces the

TABLE 8.1

$T_1T_3$ CHANGE IN RISK SCORE AND DESIRE FOR A FORUM LIKE G-350

| $T_1T_3$ Risk Score Change | | Desire for a Forum like G-350: Yes | Desire for a Forum like G-350: No |
|---|---|---|---|
| 3 points or more | | Susan<br>Lucy<br>Carmen<br>Annie<br>(N=9) | Molly<br>(N=4) |
| 0 points or negative | | (N=5) | Kate<br>Nancy<br>Jill<br>(N=4) |
| Total | | (N=14) | (N=8) |

*An obvious exception to this rule is Molly, who did increase her Risk score by four points. However, her comments about her change and her relationship to G-350 merit her inclusion in this group.

process of selection. This chapter will study Molly, Kate, Nancy, and Jill.

In addition, these "non-beneficiaries" characterize the various ages, social backgrounds, and diverse initial test scores found within G-350. Their case studies will utilize a number of data sources, including test scores, peer reports, and interview information, in order to better comprehend the lack of class impact on Molly, Kate, Nancy, and Jill.

Molly G.

Molly did, in fact, change on her Risk scores but she does not attribute the move to G-350. Rather, the increase seems related to her transition from student to working woman. Having taken the class during her last term at the university, G-350 helped to confirm or strengthen Molly's ideas about herself and her future, but its input was of a secondary nature. Upon graduation, Molly took a job connected with the Office of Student Services and this experience seems to have been the real risk for Molly. Her background and needs provide insight into this point.

Molly came to G-350 as a political science major, a resident advisor at one of the university dorms, and skilled in group dynamics. She had had T-group experiences as well as training in small groups as part of her preparation for her current counseling/advising position. Molly was attracted to G-350 because of the recommendation of a friend

who had previously taken the class and because "it was my last semester of the University of Michigan, and I had a lot of time, so I decided to do a lot of personal analysis; finding out where I was and where I was going. I think I faced some things in class . . . so I came out with . . . a better degree of confidence in myself." Her objectives were personal, but also related to skills improvement in her role as a facilitator.

Because Molly already possessed many of the skills that the class offered, its benefits were of a different nature than the learnings derived by others in the class. For her, the most important outcome of the class was "the knowledge that I have certain personal strengths which I value and I feel good about myself as a woman." Her peer reporter notes that: "She has come back from class very excited about techniques used in class and different ideas presented. . . . she has used them in meetings and teaching situations since experiencing them in class." Molly works extensively with other women, and thus, it was some of the early, personal growth type of exercises, such as the Bullseye, that she enjoyed most. Yet, she described the feedback and the problem-solving labs as more meaningful although "less positive" experiences. Perhaps, her following statement clarifies some of the apparent contradiction. Explaining why she felt G-350 had increased her level of risk-taking, Molly said: "Some of the group exercises (warm-ups) were risk-taking situations because I am not a person who opens

up easily—and when directed to answer a question . . . it became a risk because it meant identifying your feelings and relating that to another person right then and there. Getting to know people in the class was a bit of a risk and the class facilitated meeting other people and lessened the risk." G-350 did not affect the core of Molly's self-image but it improved or strengthened what she knew about herself, as a facilitator and as a person.

Simultaneous with her enrollment in G-350, and as her class project, Molly became heavily involved with the Women's Crisis Center and its rape education program. Both she and her peer reporter felt this to be one of the most significant experiences that she had that term. Not only did Molly learn a lot about the problem of rape, about women working together and supporting each other, and about the psychology involved in female self-defense, but she also learned a great deal about politics, as she spoke before city councils and ran workshops for communities outside of Ann Arbor. While G-350 gave Molly credit for this work, it did not substantially relate to the outcomes. In fact, the utility of G-350 somewhat paled in comparison. It was not as feminist oriented, nor as single focused as the rape education project, nor did it demand as much from Molly. The class refined Molly's existing skills and attitudes, while her rape project gave her new capabilities.

Molly also rated her decision to date a man several years her junior and her R.A. experience as other

significant events of that semester. Her peer friend underscored the male relationship and added graduation and job-hunting to the list. With regard to her future, Molly felt that the most risky thing she did because of G-350 was to "not take a job (as Dorm Resident Director) though it would have been a real security thing—and not something I really wanted to do . . . I'll wait it out and look for something else." G-350 did assist in resolving these issues, as some of the exercises clarified her feelings or posed some creative futures. But again, the impact was secondary rather than primary. Molly's friend did not feel that the term brought any change in Molly's risk-taking, self-affirmation, knowledge of her values, or openness. The friend felt Molly was sharing more of herself with more people but that Molly had always been aware of herself and other people.

Molly's test scores do reveal some changes during the semester of her enrollment, and even greater changes after she left the class. Table 8.2 reviews her test scores.

The $T_1T_2$ increase in Innovation is sizable, as is the continued growth in Risk. The $T_2T_3$ change on the Rokeach scale is quite large, yet not repeated in other "values openness" variables. While Molly enters G-350 high in Risk and Self-esteem, there still appears to be room for growth in these areas. At her $T_2$ interview, Molly credits G-350 with new ideas that have helped her be more innovative and

TABLE 8.2

MOLLY'S $T_1T_2T_3$ TEST SCORES AND SUMMARY DIFFERENCES

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Innovation | Non-conformity | Value Orthodoxy | Tolerance | Rokeach | P.O.I. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | 15 | 18 | 16 | 2 | 5 | 15 | -53 | 21 |
| $T_2$ | 17 | 18 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 14 | -61 | 25 |
| $T_3$ | 19 | 19 | 19 | 0 | 5 | 15 | -83 | — |
| $T_1T_3$ $\Delta$ | + 1 | + 3 | + 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | +30 | + 4 |

to be more open to risk. However, these outcomes were not crucial inputs to her life.

When interviewed eight months later, Molly still had thoughts about some general learnings from G-350. Particularly helpful to her had been the insight of what it meant to take a risk. Said Molly: "I'm not sure if I am any more of a risk-taker than I was, but at least I know what it involves and that there are certain issues you have to face up to. I probably have benefited from that knowledge. . . . I've fallen short in a lot of areas, but at least I realize what's involved and what I should be doing that I'm not doing, whether I act on it or not." Molly wished she had done more work in the class on decision-making because she feels it related to risk-taking, and she would have liked to have seen the course provide more experience in assertiveness training.

Since the end of the class, the most significant event in her life, and the focus of her risk-taking, has been her

job. Working for the university in one of its student services offices was a compromise for Molly. She did not want to be in Ann Arbor, but the work offered her a chance to design programs, facilitate groups, and counsel students. It also provided the opportunity to be a catalyst to the office, as its youngest and more feminist member. Much of the risk of this job has been its "first time" nature: trying to figure out what's going on, learning the ropes, and switching from a student to a professional role. Molly feels G-350 helped in this transition by increasing her self-confidence and by showing her the positive side of risk, i.e. "Hey, that's not so bad, the world won't end tomorrow." However, her feelings toward her job fluctuate between "being scared by being so settled, and on the other hand, . . . thinking this is a good start." She expects to move on to management consulting or some kind of catalytic programming in education within the next few years.

Molly has utilized G-350 but only minimally compared to the students in the previous chapter. The explanation appears two-fold. Because of her extensive experience with small groups, Molly did not find that the course was a challenge or was a new input in the same way it was for other students. "The class," reflected Molly, "was just an interesting forum, because it generated for me . . . some questions and some issues that I personally thought about at the time, and it was a good (relevant) time for me to do this." Secondly, the course did not seem to provide Molly

with any role models. Neither the facilitators nor the other students served this purpose for her. Molly respected the teacher for her aliveness and openness but perceived her as more of a friend than a role model. At the second interview eight months later, Molly initiated this point. "Peg asked . . . if I had any female role models . . . and I couldn't say yes. There were women I admired for what they were doing, but not sure that I could see myself there or relate to their role . . . Even in women I know really well who have it together, don't really have it together yet . . . When she asked me I thought about that a long time, and discussed it with some friends. (We) sat around and said 'there really aren't at this point' . . . You can't find them but . . . it's important for all of us to have them. . . ."

It is interesting and relevant to compare Molly's and Annie's experiences in G-350. Chapter 7 detailed Annie's growth from the class. Both women entered G-350 as high Risk scorers (Molly achieved an initial score of 15 versus Annie's score of 18). Like Molly, Annie was adventurous, creative, non-conformist and open, as both her test scores and personal background confirm. However, there are some crucial distinctions between the two women which may explain their differential responses to G-350. First, there is a marked difference in their original Self-esteem scores (Molly began with a score of 18 while Annie entered

the class with a score of 12). Consequently, the personal support that G-350 offered in its activities and atmosphere was more relevant to Annie's needs than to Molly's. Annie's $T_1T_3$ four point increase in her Self-esteem score reflected the impact that G-350 seemed to have for her. The second distinction is the age difference between the two women. Annie enrolled in G-350 as a freshwoman while Molly was a senior. Quite naturally, Molly was more mature and sophisticated than Annie, who was four years younger. The differential ages help to explain why Annie derived more from G-350 than did Molly. For example, Annie found the other G-350 students and the teacher stimulating role models and catalytic reference points. Molly did not. Instead, Molly needed far deeper life experiences to challenge her risk-taking. Her entry into the working world seemed to provide such a risk.

Kate F.

Kate was another woman who entered the class already high in Risk and Self-esteem, but her changes are unlike Molly's. A second term freshperson, she was financially and emotionally supporting herself completely, and the year had not been easy for her. To begin, she decided to enroll only a few weeks prior to the start of the semester. She took an apartment and found herself living in the midst of a drug traffic connection. Legal and personal fear forced her to drop out of school for a month, shortly after G-350

began. However, she returned and was able to finish the semester. Energetic and bright are but two words to describe Kate.

An overall picture of Kate is gained by a look at her series of test scores, presented in Table 8.3. The consistent scoring at the positive extreme of all scales is obvious.

TABLE 8.3

KATE'S $T_1T_2T_3$ TEST SCORES AND SUMMARY DIFFERENCES

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Innovation | Non-conformity | Value Orthodoxy | Tolerance | Rokeach | P.O.I. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | 17 | 19 | 19 | 3 | 4 | 17 | -28 | 23 |
| $T_2$ | 18 | 19 | 17 | 1 | 6 | 18 | -36 | 25 |
| $T_3$ | 18 | 20 | 20 | 1 | 4 | 17 | -30 | — |
| $T_1T_3$ $\Delta$ | + 1 | + 1 | + 1 | +2 | 0 | 0 | + 2 | + 2 |

There is little movement in her scores, but that may be due to extremely high initial scores. In interpreting her scores, Kate felt the Rokeach and the Value Orthodoxy shifts were significant. The former, because she felt she had grown more willing to listen to others; she "really wants to hear different viewpoints." The latter, because she felt that the slightly negative move (from 4 to 6) was actually positive, as she had been too tolerant of bad situations. Discriminating choice was desirable. Kate credited G-350 with helping to open her up and giving her

both the nerve and the self-confidence to relate to new and different people. To have a reciprocal relationship with older women, three to fifteen years her senior, was a new and rewarding experience for Kate. Like Molly, Kate changed, but only incrementally. If score change is one measure of class impact, Kate remains in the margin.

At the end of the term, Kate's peer reporter noted that major changes had occurred in her values and in her openness. Kate seemed to grow increasingly more open to new ideas, people, and experiences and more likely to publicly affirm her values and goals. However, the friend felt that Kate's levels of risk-taking, self-esteem, and values awareness had not changed since the start of the term. Kate's test scores validate this perception.

The class still held meaning for Kate. The most important thing she learned in class was "not to let my first impressions stand in my way and also to be as forward as I possibly can; to directly state exactly how I feel, for best communication." The most risky thing she did in class was to reveal her weaknesses to a group . . . "something I usually make a point of not doing." Kate felt that G-350 did increase her level of risk-taking over the term, yet the risk seemed to arise from and be carried out in the class. Specifically, the Empathy Lab encouraged Kate to reveal and receive feedback on the coping styles she was using to solve some major problems. Her cowardly behavior amazed her and also underscored the usefulness of some of

the problem-solving techniques. In addition to the Bullseye and the visit to the Career Planning Office, Kate felt the Empathy Lab to have been one of her most significant class and life experiences that term.

Perhaps because her life outside of class was so tumultuous, simply coping involved risk. Consequently, the small pressure situations in class sometimes frightened Kate and deferred or negated her learning from them. As she states: "I was anxious at first; the class exercises were demanding and you had to do something you weren't sure you wanted to do . . . I had to develop self-confidence to be able to relate to Peg, but I did, because of her interest in me." Coupled with her early, sporadic attendance, it is provocative to wonder if the class impact might have been greater if her environment and the class had been less threatening. The class did seem to help, but both Kate's scores and peer report suggest minimal impact. As Kate summarized at the end of that term: "This class served to drastically alter my self-image. I thought I knew myself, only to find that I really knew very little. I had never been introspective. I learned to view my emotions as an important influence on my behavior." G-350 offered Kate her first close female friends at the university, facilitated some new goals, increased her confidence, and introduced her to the first woman professional she had ever known: Peg. This contact turned her thinking toward a career(s). Taken togehter, Kate received support

and ideas which expanded her horizons greatly, but she did not seem to internalize many of the skills presented in G-350.

The following eight months brought about some drastic changes for Kate. Briefly, she had enrolled in summer school and ended up with poor instructors. She almost transferred, but by accident decided to take a term off and applied for a job in medical research to give her financial support. This job opened a whole new career ramp for Kate and she was ecstatic about its possibilities. Currently, she is the only undergraduate in this lab; she works forty hours per week; she is taking Chemistry and Math during her lunch hours, and she is completing other pre-med requirements by CLEP.* Kate also has been sponsored by a noted medical professor for a complex research project.

Kate felt the class related to these changes in four ways: 1) the five-year projections and goals work made her realize she had a lot of options but all involved extensive training. She learned that education could relate to careers rather than just isolated intellectual development. In fact, she could apply school to a career goal; 2) the exercises on dealing with personal conflicts were imaginative and helpful, but could have been more extensive and given her more skills; 3) practicing self-assertion had been invaluable in her getting her job and working in the

---

*Credit earned by exam placement.

predominantly male field of medicine; and 4) more than the exercises, "it was Peg herself . . . she is very dynamic, she's always going, all the time; very positive. It was important to see a female in that type of role because I hadn't had anything like that before."

It is interesting to note that, with the exception of a role model, the aspects of the class that Kate uses or remembers most are not the experiences she felt to be most significant or helpful at the time she took G-350. Either she's forgotten, not practiced, never learned, or disregarded much of what happened in the class when she was enrolled. Most likely, all of the above apply.

Kate sees herself as a loner and as very independent. She has not felt the need for a forum like G-350 and considers her inner resources adequate for coping with her current life. The class was a good support group at the time, but Kate is now more tuned in to her academics and career advancement. In April, 1974, she noted that "the university should expand the opportunity for women to take more classes like G-350," but by March, 1975, Kate seemed to feel that the class (and this study) were misleading; the former, too much of a consciousness raising experience and the latter, unclear in its original intent to study the class. Again, this may explain why the class seems only indirectly related to Kate's life. The general support and confidence she gained in class were utilized during the term for her "survival." These strengths were internalized

and applied months after the class was over and on her own initiative. Her career is focused on basic research and she does not seem to need others for her daily living or decision making. G-350 helped her over a hurdle, passed on an idea or two, but was not particularly relevant afterwards, as Kate assumed a high degree of control over her life. The usefulness of the course was as an early means to this end. G-350 served as a cushion and a support in her otherwise challenged life.

Nancy W.

Like her classmate Lucy, Nancy began the class with medium range scores in both Risk and Self-esteem. However, if Lucy represents a career-involved graduate, Nancy, aged twenty, is much more a member of the counterculture. She is described by her peer friend in April, 1974, as "relatively independent, unconventional, somewhat quiet and reserved, and good karma-borderline cosmic." A year later, Nancy characterizes herself as "insightful, vital, and very independent." One senses change and there certainly have been some significant moments for Nancy. G-350, however, does not appear to be neatly related to those moments. Although Nancy noted great growth in herself, her test scores showed very little change while she was enrolled in G-350 nor at the eight month follow-up. Table 8.4 presents this information:

TABLE 8.4

NANCY'S $T_1T_2T_3$ TEST SCORES AND SUMMARY DIFFERENCES

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Inno-vation | Non-confor-mity | Value Ortho-doxy | Toler-ance | Rokeach | P.O.I. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | 8 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 12 | -38 | +22 |
| $T_2$ | 9 | 12 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 11 | -38 | +21 |
| $T_3$ | 7 | 12 | 10 | 3 | 2 | 12 | -25 | — |
| $T_1T_3$ $\Delta$ | -1 | + 1 | + 3 | -2 | 0 | 0 | -13 | - 1 |

Except for her Innovation and Rokeach scores, there is great stability on all variables. Neither the movement nor the placement of her score seems unusual. Nancy appears to be a non-conformist, but within the average range of self-esteem, risk, and creativity.

Yet, as Nancy's life unfolds on the following pages, this test data may be interpreted two ways. Either the test scores do not tap or are not sensitive to Nancy's evolution; or the events did not, in fact, force Nancy to investigate new parts of herself. They may have been first-time experiences but their impact was easily incorporated into her life. This issue will become clearer as Nancy's circumstances are explored.

Nancy enrolled in the class shortly after separating from a man she had been living with for two years. Together, they had lived in several communes, explored Eastern religions, and founded a small, cooperative business. However, they had gotten to the point "that the

the relationship was taking on a life of its own, which we didn't really agree with, and perhaps was not beneficial to each of us . . . we were both kind of a crutch and a burden to each other, and I was having a lot of trips laid on me by him that weren't really good for me . . ." Alone for the first time in years, Nancy was attracted to G-350 for its potential experience with and about women. Having spent the past several years in various kinds of "communities," her greatest need was to explore a community of women.

For the most part, G-350 did meet Nancy's expectation of contact with fascinating women. She described her classmates as "very interested in themselves, in others, and in life, both inner and outer." The class exercises were "unusual, sometimes redundant, but good catalysts for bringing things out or sharing ourselves." The teacher was impressive in that "Peg had done a lot with her life and that's inspiring and encouraging. But she sometimes expected too little to happen in class and too much to happen out of class." This last point may refer to a disappointment she voiced in April, 1974: ". . . it was very hard to get together with people outside of the class . . . but the people were the most impressive aspect of the class; really 'together' women. It was frustrating to want to know them more deeply."

The class exercises which Nancy found most meaningful were those which created a strong sense of group

cohesiveness. The lab which asked students to paint their university experience was the high point for Nancy. This medium allowed her to use some of her untapped talents and to relate to others in a new way. Specifically, she was perceived as a leader for the first time in her life. A class potluck dinner was another important activity for Nancy. Finally, she loved the reading list for the class.

In general, the skills and futures types of exercises were not useful to Nancy. In part, it may be that they were too simplistic or too unnatural for a woman who desired much deeper contact with others. Nancy's orientation was much more focused on "the now." As she expressed this: "I don't worry about the future very much, nor do I worry much about the present if I know it's changing." Unlike Kate, Nancy's educational goals involve spiritual and emotional growth.

Nancy's peer reporter did not find that her values or value affirmation had changed over the term. He felt she had not increased her general level of risk-taking, but as a result of increased self-esteem, she was initiating relationships for the first time and this was a type of risk. Both Nancy and her friend agree that leaving her former mate had been her biggest risk that term. He added that she was more open-minded and that her ability to communicate had improved because "she has increased her participation in the 'here and now' and her abilities to respond and begin conversations are better." He credits G-350 "as

academic and social for Nancy. The readings were very interesting (to her) but there were some wherein objectivity and logic were partially dismissed for the sake of emphasis. Lectures, or rather discussions, for the most part, were too fundamental and rarely added new keen insight. The class stimulated Nancy's awareness of other women's positions and built a sense of unity." This underscores Nancy's feeling that her respect for other women had soared because of knowing the women in the class. She valued their counsel and their openness, and she felt G-350 had facilitated this interaction by some of the communication exercises, like the Feedback Lab. The project presentations at the end of the term reinforced her respect for women in general as well as giving her a personal sense of her own potential.

Nancy left the class high on female comraderie. Perhaps because she had known few women previously or because she was alone and needed their support or because her communal values demanded unity; or perhaps for all of these reasons, Nancy used G-350 to meet her needs for intimacy. Aside from the informal structure of the class and its emphasis on sharing, the class activities did not seem to have deep impact on Nancy.

Eight months later, Nancy's greatest memory of the class was "finding so many women who were worthwhile people," and she still regretted not having known more of the women more deeply. "I wish . . . that I had gotten the

knack for finding time and ways to get together with people, to know them better. It seems like, myself included, that people did not latch on to that opportunity, though the potential was there. There is very much a tendency, while you're in school, to stay within your own nitch (sic) . . . and not really branch out significantly . . . I wish we had gotten together more outside of class and spent more time together . . ." Whether the impetus for more structured out-of-class activities lay with Nancy or myself remains to be seen. Certainly, more contact would have served her needs.

She now saw herself as changed and as having taken risks consciously to bring about those changes. Restoring a friendship with her former mate, establishing love relationships with other men, trying acid for the first time, and generally following through on plans, responsibilities and academic interests have been Nancy's most significant experiences since G-350 ended. All of these were risks because they involved "doing something I had been afraid to do in the past," and asserting control over her life. Nancy cited interaction with and feedback from other women in G-350 as particularly helpful in her risk-taking. "The examples of other women whom I admired a lot probably set the stage for me to feel stronger and better about myself, especially in my interacting with men." The decision to take acid was based on trust of a friend who had done it with positive results and "being in a space where I was

taking more risks." While these are sizable risks, they are of a different nature than those previously described by other students. Nancy's risks seem to relate to overcoming past fears rather than grappling with future issues.

Again, Nancy is not as focused toward the future as other women in G-350 were. She stated: "I am not yet thinking in terms of professionalism. I'm just getting an education . . . I'm not going to school for the future, for a profession, or skill, so I'm not oriented that way, yet." Although she feels G-350 affected her, many of its offerings were not relevant to her most important needs. Nancy concludes: "I think the class was a positive force in my changes, but I can't say there was any one thing . . . that changed any one thing that I can pinpoint." She has not felt the need for a specific forum like G-350, but she would like to get to know more women and, hopefully, find a female community living situation.

Thus, Nancy's hopes for the future involve living with some women roommates and having a job that really interests her, perhaps training horses. She anticipates graduation in a year. G-350 provided an atmosphere and facilitated some contacts that have certainly benefited Nancy. She looked forward to coming to class, she valued the women she met there, and she was open in her criticism of its occasional inappropriateness for her. Her future is evolving; not in a passive way, but with a determination to go with its flow.

Unlike Lucy, a "risk mover" who began with scores similar to Nancy's, the professional focus, the desire for certain skills improvement, and the desire to apply activities touched on in class to out-of-class events did not exist for Nancy. Many of the creative risks that Nancy has defined for herself were not related to the content of G-350. The class was too superficial for a deep sense of community and too specific in its problem-solving and futures orientation. Despite this lack of fit, Nancy enjoyed the class, probably because the sense of personal sharing was far greater in G-350 than other university courses.

Jill R.

For Jill, G-350 represented "an opportunity to take what you wanted from class and grow." In reviewing what Jill took and how she grew, a disjointed picture emerges. Jill immensely enjoyed the class and credited it with opening her eyes to many new ideas and people, but she remained fairly untouched by the experience. By background and by nature, Jill is more conservative and less autonomous than the majority of her G-350 peers. Although she was not threatened by this difference, it may explain the eventual lack of impact of the class for Jill.

Jill was enthusiastic about G-350. In discussing the class at the end of the term, she said that "all the exercises were worthwhile; they were stimulating but not too

intense; energy and effort were demanded and I'd always think about what I'd done later." The most important thing the class did for her was "to show me that I'm capable of doing many things myself." The most risky thing she did because of the class was to climb the Wall, apparently because of the group interdependencies that had to be forged with strangers. The Bullseye showed her some of her strengths; the Empathy Lab made her realize that compared to others, her life was not so bad; and the visit to Career Planning and Placement most affected her risk-taking. The explanation for this last point was that "I had to talk to a stranger about my future. Before, I usually counted on my parents. From that point on (after the visit), I had to go for interviews and also ask people for recommendations." The inference was that this type of self-revelation to others was a real risk to Jill and a new experience for her. Rather than learning skills from the class, Jill received many new insights about herself. However, the awareness did not seem deep enough to change her behavior.

Jill's class project was unique and creative. She created a collage sculpture of a woman's head, and covered it with images of "the awakening of the female consciousness." The project helped her to analyze her own ideas and feelings about being a woman. "The sculpture was a projection of me," said Jill, ". . . not an emergence of my old self to a new, but instead, an awakening to myself. I feel a growing consciousness in some areas never before expanded

on." However, the highlight of the project was building the wooden base for the sculpture. Jill reflected: "Previously I relied on my father to do carpentry work. This time I wanted to do everything for myself. With this in mind, I proceeded to saw, hammer, and sand. This gave me a new confidence of doing things which I was never taught or thought to do."

There is no question that Jill acquired a new understanding of herself. However, she did not feel that G-350 gave her new values or a new self-image. She had not made any decisions differently nor had her relationships with others changed much because of the class. She also felt more relaxed with herself and others. Jill noted that the class had helped her to grow, but not drastically and only in tandem with other events of the year. As a senior, Jill was facing the "what do I do now" anxiety and this was complicated by her boyfriend's move to Atlanta earlier that year. Dealing with this disappointment and making plans for her future increased her happiness as the term progressed. Jill credited her father and Peg with helping her through these traumas. The former had impact because of his understanding and counseling; the latter because of her self-esteem and control over her life. Supported by some new ideas about herself and her options, Jill began to finalize her life away from the university. Consequently, her anxiety seemed to decrease.

Jill's test score profile is an interesting one. She entered the class very high in Self-esteem and very low in Risk; high in Conformity and Narrowness (as measured by Rokeach) yet high in Innovation. In general, there is little movement between the first and second testing, with the exception of openness (Rokeach) and self-actualization (P.O.I.). These shifts substantiate the decline of anxiety and openness to others that Jill mentioned as forms of growth she had undergone during the semester. The score changes at the third testing do not appear connected. For example, Tolerance moves significantly in a positive direction while Value Orthodoxy (or rigidity) continues in a negative direction and diametrically opposed to the Tolerance change. Table 8.5 summarizes these changes.

TABLE 8.5

JILL'S $T_1T_2T_3$ TEST SCORES AND SUMMARY DIFFERENCES

| | Risk | Self-esteem | Innovation | Non-conformity | Value Orthodoxy | Tolerance | Rokeach | P.O.I. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $T_1$ | 3 | 19 | 18 | 14 | 5 | 7 | +21 | 17 |
| $T_2$ | 2 | 18 | 19 | 14 | 7 | 6 | -11 | 21 |
| $T_3$ | 2 | 18 | 16 | 12 | 10 | 11 | - 9 | |
| $T_1T_3$ $\Delta$ | -1 | - 1 | - 2 | + 2 | - 5 | + 4 | +30 | + 4 |

The interview eight months later added insight into Jill's changes. Her most significant life experiences had included: 1) getting into the routine of a full-time job

as an apprentice to an interior decorator; 2) earning her own money and obtaining some means of supporting herself, although she was living at home; and 3) joining a women's baseball team. These events added to her independence and took her in some new directions. However, G-350 had not proved relevant to these experiences. Although Jill felt the class "increased my tolerance level and my standing up for my beliefs, no particular thing from the class has been crucial to my life since then . . . A lot of life is experiencing. The class gave me some confidence—it was an eye-opener but not the same as life." A double question is: Does the class not relate to Jill's life or does her life not relate to what she learned in class? It appears that Jill's recent life had not involved much risk-taking and that she never made the behavioral connections in or out of G-350 that might have better related her life to the class.

Eight months after leaving G-350, Jill most remembers "the good feelings I got there meeting the people in the class and increasing my own self-satisfaction." She has not felt the need for a forum like the class since its conclusion, although "it was fun and educational." Apparently, its utility was short-lived. And yet, Jill describes herself as "currently lacking in self-confidence, fat, and frustrated." This negative self-perception was unique among G-350 students. A glance at Jill's

Self-esteem scores indicates no strong negative movement. It could be that Jill believed strongly in her general self-worth but her current situation was filled with displeasing aspects. She had made some changes in her life, but only in circumstances, not in direction or outcome. She still lived with her parents and while they have a fine relationship as she has previously reported, there seemed to be some dependent aspects to it. Jill's biggest gain from G-350 appeared to be in awareness of herself, but she did not learn or did not want to learn the behavioral skills that could help to pull her out of her current situation.

Jill's high level of self-esteem may actually work against learning such skills. It is possible that her sense of self worth protected her from the world and its challenge to risk. This may be why a positive change in self-esteem and resulting reconsideration of one's potential are so necessary for an increase in risk. The supplementary decrease in conformity is also important as it represents a move toward internal control of one's behavior; it sets the atmosphere in which risks may be taken. Jill did not experience any of these positive moves while she was enrolled in G-350, and only a small decline in her relatively high Conformity score after leaving the class.

Despite a high level of Self-esteem, Jill did not internalize or use much of what G-350 offered. The interviewer made an interesting comment about Jill, which

may best summarize her situation: "Jill was cautious and tense. She remembered events as afterthoughts—she wanted to please. Her life situation currently is a little grim. Her job has big potential but few tangible benefits now. Jill lives at home—frustrated." It is precisely this type of woman that G-350 hoped to assist in the building and practicing of creative risk-taking. Jill reinforces the importance of recognizing, in any change effort, the need for a strong fit between an individual's readiness for this input and the actual class experience.

## Conclusion

Some general conclusions may be drawn about the women in Chapters 7 and 8. In contrast to the risk-movers in the preceding chapter, neither Molly, Kate, Nancy, or Jill seemed to be able to apply what they learned in G-350 to their out-of-class lives. In part, this is because each woman was coping with some major stresses in her environment; energies had to go into survival. Additionally, the class offerings were not highly relevant to their life situations. The future orientation of the class, the potential offered by role models, the interpersonal depth of the class exercises, and the encouragement to try the new were not helpful for these four women. Rather, Molly, Kate, Nancy, and Jill represent the extreme scorers in the class, testing very high or very low on the J.P.I. variables of Risk, Self-esteem, and Non-conformity. Molly and

Kate did not feel challenged to deeply respond to G-350's offerings while Nancy and Jill did not have the basic personal security that appears to be a prerequisite for growth in the class. Molly and Kate were very autonomous, very clear about their futures, very creative, and very risk-oriented. Nancy and Jill represent the opposite end of the continuum as they were fairly dependent women, unclear about their futures, less creative in their problem-solving, and threatened by the challenge to risk. For Molly and Kate, G-350's interpersonal support was unnecessary while Nancy and Jill found the group dynamics insufficient to serve their greater needs for personal support.

Together, these reasons emphasize the importance of a fit between what the classroom offers and the needs, strengths, and life situations that students bring to class. Molly and Kate were, indeed, creative risk-takers prior to their enrollment in G-350. They enjoyed the class, but its lessons did not prove potent enough for them. Conversely, Nancy and Jill needed a less threatening and more supportive approach to risk-taking. By understanding the importance of these conditions, insights into both the educational process and creative risk-taking are attained.

# CHAPTER 9

# SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

## Introduction

This chapter briefly summarizes the preceding chapters and attempts to integrate the theories related to creative risk-taking, as discussed in Chapter 2, with the findings of this study (Chapters 4-8). Five major points emerge from this research and serve as the foci for further theoretical development. These findings, while uncovering many issues for future study, also clarify previous speculations about creative risk-taking in women. This chapter concludes with a discussion of some of the individual and institutional implications of this study.

## Overview of this Study

The purpose of this investigation was to study the extent and nature of influence which a confluent and behaviorally oriented university class had on the development of creative risk-taking in its students. While the class, G-350, did not specify the increase of creative risk-taking as an explicit goal for the students, it was hoped that the relationship between this end and the class experience would be a positive one. For the majority of women in the class, an increase in creative risk-taking occurred.

Creative risk-taking is a process which involves: 1) knowing what risks exist; 2) creating options in order to take a risk; 3) choosing one option; 4) doing it; and 5) accepting the responsibility for that action. All of these steps must be done in an open and inventive manner to actualize the self, not to defeat the self. Thus, a distinction is made between creative risk-taking and foolish risk-taking.

The setting involved two classes for women taught at the University of Michigan during the Winter term, 1974, one in the School of Education (G-350, the focal group) and one in the College of Literature, Science and the Arts (Women's Studies 340, the comparison class). Both classes were administered the same tests at the start and end of that term. The tests were the Jackson Personality Inventory (which measured Risk, Self-esteem, Nonconformity, Innovation, Value Orthodoxy, and Tolerance), the Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, and a part of the Personal Orientation Inventory (which measured self-actualization). A feminist awareness questionnaire was also given to both groups at the beginning of the classes. G-350 students were interviewed and peer questionnaires collected from out-of-class friends at the end of the term. A third testing and interview session took place one year after the initial entry into G-350. While the comparison class dealt with the biological, social, and clinical foundations of female psychology, G-350 explored the issues surrounding women's

potential—why it is untapped and how it could be expanded. Both classes sought to integrate students' personal experiences with class content.

Twenty-three G-350 undergraduates were followed for the entire year and one-half of this study. Their ages ranged from eighteen to forty-eight. The academic profile included freshwomen to seniors, a majority being liberal arts students, although business, nursing, and other professional majors were also present. The reference group of twelve students, drawn from the Women's Studies class resembled the G-350 group in age and academic profile.

The greatest difference between the two courses was in their teaching methodology. In G-350, activities were flexibly structured, demanded action or behavioral inputs, and utilized techniques such as values clarification. The referent group generally functioned in a small-group discussion format. In comparing the two classes and their changes during the semester of enrollment, three points became clear:

1) both groups increased significantly in self-esteem and showed positive changes on other attitudinal variables such as value flexibility, tolerance, and openness;

2) only G-350 students changed significantly on those variables which were behaviorally based, such as risk-taking, innovation, and nonconformity;

3) in comparing the test scores of those who changed positively in esteem in both groups, again, only the women in G-350 also changed positively in risk.

Therefore, a change in Self-esteem was seen, in this study, as a necessary but not sufficient condition for a change in Risk. Required to effect the link between Self-esteem and Risk was an experience like G-350, which seemed to harness changed attitudes to new behavior. The action-oriented structure of G-350 appeared to present a crucial opportunity for women to experiment with, practice, and refine new behaviors related to creative risk-taking.

Another level of analysis examined changes in the G-350 women at the end of the term. In general, most students either moved positively on all variables or maintained high initial scores. When there was room to move, almost every student did change, with medium level scorers changing the most in a positive direction. Positive relationships were established between a low Nonconformity score and an increase in Esteem and Risk. A close fit existed between self-reported changes in Risk, Esteem, and Nonconformity and the test and peer reports of these changes. Eighty-two percent of those women who increased their Esteem score (i.e. the movers) validated this change in their interviews and were reported by peers to have also changed. A specific trio of exercises was selected as major sources for these attitude and behavior changes.

Long-term impact of the class and the permanence of change were assessed eight months after G-350 ended. At that time, approximately 87% of the class reported they had taken risks since G-350 ended, i.e. made important decisions that changed aspects of their lives. Sixty percent of the class also desired a continued forum like G-350 for support, practice, and challenge in their creative risk-taking. The continuation of risk-taking behavior after the class ended was documented in both interview data and test scores, although a slight decline in self-esteem seems to parallel a slight increase in risk during this time. A simple interpretation is that risk-taking is difficult, particularly without a support group and without experience in such action, and that duress can affect esteem. Only three women felt they had not taken any risks since class had ended. Virtually all risk-takers said that G-350 related to their risk-taking by contributing attitudinally or behaviorally.

Two chapters presented case studies of those who changed greatly in creative risk-taking and those who did not. The "movers" shared these patterns: G-350 helped to clarify their futures; increased their esteem; provided them with female role models; created an excitement to try the new, which then became both an attitude and lifestyle; and gave them an opportunity to learn things in the class which they could apply on their own outside of class. The converse of these points was characteristic of the

nonmovers. The confrontation with self and/or others was either too much or too little of a challenge to affect changes in this group.

From this research, five major points emerge and serve as foci for further theoretical development. They are:

Point #1: What explains the significant increase in Self-esteem in both G-350 and the referent women's studies class?

Women's studies courses seem to legitimize and foster positive self-concepts in female students. While this effect is not surprising, it is important for any minority group which has had to cope with social and historical denigration. White et al. (1974) found that the feminist focus of course content is crucial for the reversal of negative self-concepts in women. For the students in this study, examination of women's roles in history, sharing current problems faced by women, and group discussion of remedy were important features experienced in both classes. The common result appears to be increased Self-esteem in female students.

Point #2: What explains the behavioral changes in G-350 and the apparent lack of such changes in the other class?

There is a great deal of research on behavior and attitude change relevant to this point, as well as several important studies of teaching techniques. Newcomb (1953), Katz (1960), Himmelstrand (1960), and Hunt (1965), have studied the relationship between behavior and attitude

change and the environmental conditions which support change. All agree that environmental dissonance can lead to attitudinal and behavioral modifications. Paploizos and Stiefel (1971), Leatherwood (1971), and Huyck (1971) have researched particular teaching techniques that have impact on behavioral change. Whether the teaching format included role-play, simulation, or other participative and experiential activities, the research established that these approaches more effectively influenced student behavior and skills development than traditional lecture methods. From these studies, it is possible to conclude that:

1) changing an attitude requires interaction with one's environment. If the change is rooted in the cognitive realm, consonance can be achieved by revising one's thoughts or words. However, if an action component is involved, and most interactions with one's environment demand action to effect a change, then a behavioral adjustment must follow;

2) to facilitate or foster a change in a cognitive or verbal component of an attitude, a classroom need only employ verbal or cognitive methods. But to effectively alter behavior, the educational experience must deal with behavior. The action component of an attitude is behavior. An educational methodology that utilizes the student's environment as a problem focus, and develops action remedies to the problems faced in that realm, will likely

change not only the cognitive or verbal element of an attitude but also the related actions.

To this end, G-350 focused on behavior to a much greater extent than did the other women's studies class. Consequently, both the attitudes and behaviors of G-350 students registered change over the course of the semester. Either the students in the other class only sought verbal or cognitive input or the teaching style only related to or fostered that type of movement. In sum, it is clear that attitudinal change can relate to behavior if the student is ready to change and is supported in applying attitudinal changes and learnings to her life situations. Environmental action, interaction, and application seem to be the components for growth and must characterize both the teaching style and the student learning style if change is to evolve.

Point #3: Within G-350, what explains the relationship between positive changes in self-esteem, nonconformity and a positive increase in risk-taking?

The connection between risk-taking and self-esteem has been well documented [(Torrance, 1962), (Poe, 1971), and (Yu, 1972)]. Belief in the self is crucial for growth in new and unpredictable ways. The findings in this study reinforce the necessity for an increase in self-esteem because it opens up new possibilities to the self, breaking some myths about who one is and what one is capable of. Declining conformity is important because it also liberates

one from the dominance of others, in which internalization of the locus of control and responsibility moves to the self. Therefore, risk has already been taken by some women in allowing new dimensions of the self to develop in a direction determined by internal rather than external forces. In turn, new opportunities for creative risk-taking may be opened up to the individual.

The relationship of conformity to risk-taking has been discussed by Brown (1965) and Stoner (1968) in their research on the risky shift phenomenon. Both note that conformity to group norms pushes a group of individuals to move in the direction of greater risk on certain kinds of issues. There appears to be a bond among members to converge around a central value of risk. Thus, individual conformity to group pressures actually encouraged risk-taking in these settings.

One could hypothesize that many G-350 students who increased in risk were actually, therefore, increasing their conformity in class. However, the test scores indicate the opposite to be true. Conformity, as measured by the tests, <u>generally</u> decreased for those who increased in risk. Brown's theory of the importance risk can have as a group value helps to explain why many students may have chosen to open themselves to the uncertain and to take a risk in the context of a class that encouraged them to do so. However, because these students were dealing with real life situations rather than with the hypothetical problems

studied in the risky shift research, the act of taking a risk built inner strength and esteem which resulted in less compliance with the standards of others. By virtue of self-selection into G-350 there may have been an initial and overriding value on risk-taking which may have served to increase Risk scores. Nonetheless, conformity scores did not increase; this leads to the conclusion that the final outcome was indicative of individual, and not group, decisions to move in a risky direction.

This study has found that an increase in self-esteem and decrease in conformity precede an increase in risk-taking. It will be important for future research to better understand the causal relationships between these variables as feminine esteem and conformity are so often negatively related to risk-taking in women (Bardwick, 1971).

Point #4: Within G-350, what explains the appropriate fit between the class offerings for those women who increased their Risk, Esteem, and Nonconformity scores?

There are two types of theories which add insight to this question: those which explain changes in terms of individual variables and those which explain them in terms of group variables. Both types of theories will be drawn upon to explain the complexities of student change.

One type of group approach investigates the effects of the class structure on the individual. Byrd (1970) and Mann and Mann (1959) found that structured but flexible teaching methods had greater impact on students' personal

growth than did unstructured settings. Familiarity with risk, gained through written exercises or group discussions in class, also increased risk-taking in students (Bateson, 1966).

These studies suggest some of the reasons for the outcomes which seemed to be attributable to the teaching techniques used in G-350. Exercises like "5 Years Future," Creative Problem Solving, and the Goals lab necessitated personal goal-setting and implementation. When such clarifying, goal-setting activities are carried out, Bateson and Byrd would predict increased self-esteem, risk-taking, and autonomy would follow. This was the case for many students in G-350. These exercises fostered analysis of personal and professional dilemmas and, consequently, led to familiarization with the risks involved. As in Bateson's study, both the individual written work and group discussions resulted in increased risk for the movers. Finally, the structured nature of the class, as in the Mann and Mann setting, seems to have fostered student friendship and support, which were important to and characteristic of those who increased in Risk, Self-esteem, and Nonconformity.

Conversely, the nonmovers did not cite the implementation of goals, the futures and problem exercises, nor the structured class setting as G-350's attraction for them. They more frequently found the class unrelated to their lives, although it was fun and provided a warm atmosphere. The inappropriate degree of challenge in the class

activities or the individual's inability to connect in-class learnings with their out-of-class life are two themes that seem to explain why the class was not helpful to the nonmovers.

Individual receptivity to new experiences is another explanation for the fit between G-350 offerings and the needs of some of its students. As Feldman described the circumstances related to student growth, it is important to provide students with a series of challenging, but not too threatening experiences (1972). For example, those students who were stimulated but not frightened or bored by the challenges of G-350 responded most affirmatively and changed most significantly on Risk, Self-esteem, and Non-conformity. The case studies document this point. Lucy enjoyed the teacher's pressure to take a stand, and Annie thrived on the philosophy of "try it." On the other hand, Kate, a nonmover, was frightened by public revelations and Molly was simply not challenged. The movers changed their minds about themselves and, frequently, about their environments, increasing their risk and esteem in the process.

The drive to eliminate the imbalance between self and setting seemed to foster creative risk-taking in and out of class, reinforcing Newcomb's balance theory of attitude change (1953). The nonmovers, however, either did not feel enough of an imbalance in class to provide an impetus to change (i.e. they entered the class already high in Risk and Esteem) or they were so low in Risk and Esteem that

they found the class too threatening. The low scorers in the nonmover group would sometimes show short-term change, but it dissipated after leaving the class.

It appears as though the movers internalized the offerings of G-350, in a way that typifies Kelman's description of this type of attitude change (1961). The class challenged and supported the movers in their efforts to increase their risk-taking but did not force them into more risk. The nonmovers seemed to experience either short-term compliance (perhaps to please the teacher or the other students) or temporary identification with the class and risk-taking (perhaps a desired end but dependent on G-350, the teacher, or peers for sustenance). While many of the movers may have begun by complying with the class activities and requirements or identifying with the instructor, the outcomes were congruent with their own desired ends and, thus, the student could internalize openness to risk, trying new things, and creative problem-solving.

This touches on the point of the teacher's salience as a role model for the students. The movers seemed to identify with and relate to the teacher to a greater extent than the nonmovers. Although the nonmovers seemed to like her as much, her influence did not effect their values or goals. Feldman and Newcomb (1969) and Feldman (1972) find this latter response typical of college students, as faculty have somewhat more influence over intellectual development and career choice while peers have greater

influence over social and interpersonal student development. This sort of classic division remained for the nonmovers in G-350, yet the dichotomy broke down for the movers. Clearly, the more the students could internalize (not just comply or identify with) the instructor's goals for the course, the more they were able to change their levels of Risk, Esteem, and Nonconformity.

The theories about group influence on individuals also help to explain why many students became Risk and Esteem movers. Bion (1959), Brown (1965), and Festinger (1957) have proposed theoretical models which conceptualize the power a group can exert over its individual members to change in a particular direction. In terms of G-350, the conclusion is that: 1) creative risk-taking was valued by most women as a direction they would like to move in; 2) the social reality of a sexist society made this a desired goal; 3) the teacher, the class, the exercises, and the presence of students perceived as high risk-takers reaffirmed this goal and consciously or unconsciously existed as a pressure to change in this direction; and 4) within the supportive group environment, a majority of the class was motivated to make this change. For the movers in this study, consonance within the class led to consonance outside of the class, as life situations were positively changed by taking some risks. In a mutual giving and sharing, the movers affected themselves, other peers, and the course of G-350. For the nonmovers, the

dissonance within the class was either too little or too much of a challenge to result in change.

Point #5: What explains the delayed reactions of the $T_2T_3$ movers?

Bateson, Festinger, and Rokeach, among others, provide research to this point. Bateson, as previously mentioned, studied the effect of familiarization on risk, and found that much initial caution is due to the newness of a situation; once the uncertainty can be reduced, growth in risk follows (1966). It would seem, then, that the $T_2T_3$ movers had to familiarize themselves with either the risky attitudes or behaviors implied by the course before they could make these changes themselves. This familiarization seems to have taken longer than their four-month period of enrollment in G-350.

As Festinger has explained, environmental dissonance results in individual efforts to reduce dissonance by avoiding situations and information which could increase dissonance (1957). Because four of the five $T_2T_3$ movers were coping with fairly turbulent environments outside of the class, they had to postpone creative risk-taking until their other states of psychological discomfort could be reckoned with. While they did not avoid the class, they did control the degree of internalization and change they wanted to make.

Rokeach's theory that resistance to change is likely when the beliefs in question are centrally rooted also

helps to explain why G-350 had a delayed effect on some students (1963). Certain beliefs, such as virginity, were so central to $T_2T_3$ movers, that the process of change was slow and very conscious. Once the belief was modified, very great changes could take place, as the case study of Susan exemplifies.

The $T_3$ movers had to cope with the stresses they were undergoing while in G-350 before they could use its offerings. Whether their reactions were delayed because of the magnitude or the newness of the change does not seem to matter, for the result was the same—deferred growth. The important point is that when they were ready, the $T_3$ movers chose to change.

This study has raised many issues for future research. The following section will highlight some of the educational, cultural, and individual ramifications of creative risk-taking for women. Future work in these areas may refine both the concept and applicability of creative risk-taking.

## Conclusion: Implications for Use and Future Research

From an educational perspective, the typical college classroom would have to change if an increase in creative risk-taking was a desired goal. The one-way lecture format would generally have to be eliminated. The impersonal faculty-student relationship would not facilitate professional or personal role-modeling. Content presented only

from a male perspective, devoid of the roles, feelings, and contributions of women in the past and present, would not help to change the current images and future goals of female students. Discussions without structure and real-life application points might have cognitive impact but would not aid in changed behavior. It is obvious that these types of changes would not only benefit the increase of creative risk-taking in many women, but could have parallel effects on males as well.

From a cultural perspective, the traditional socialization process that breeds women to be uncreative and non-risky demands reconsideration. The findings of this study stress the magnitude of such socialization in that many women have to learn creative and risk-taking behavior. If parents, teachers, toy makers, and T.V. producers had more positive images of and more exciting goals for female children, perhaps the need for a class to increase risk-taking would not be necessary.

The conclusions of this study point to three paradoxes that need to be studied in order to understand and promote creative risk-taking. The women in this study who did not significantly change in Risk, Self-esteem, and Nonconformity shared these traits:

1) they seemed to live their lives independently, yet it was more difficult for them to learn or implement learnings on their own;

2) they appeared more intellectually open than the movers, yet they were less interpersonally open with other people; and

3) they began with riskier histories, yet they seemed to be choosing less risky futures than the movers.

To respond and probe these paradoxes, other research efforts are necessary. While this study has explored the relationship of one course to the increase of creative risk-taking in several types of women, future research should focus on some of the following topics:

1) What are the causal and sequential relationships among self-esteem, nonconformity, and risk-taking?

2) How can G-350, or any other experience focused on similar goals, better serve the needs of those already high in risk and self-esteem? Can their horizons continue to be expanded?

3) What insights would be gained by duplicating this study with the addition of a non-women's studies class as a reference group?

4) Can the teacher's enthusiasm, caring, and teaching techniques which fostered student learning in G-350 be duplicated by other teachers?

5) How can student learning needs and their relationships to the teacher be assessed early in classes like G-350 to maximize the fit between the class and its students?

6) Do women's colleges do any better at encouraging creative risk-taking in female students than do coeducational institutions? If so, how and why?

7) Which theories about creative risk-taking apply only to women? Are there other principles or theories which encourage creative risk-taking in men? Would the G-350 teaching techniques work for men as well as for women? Are male and female needs the same and would they be compatible in one class?

8) Which theories about creative risk-taking are true only in the American culture? What insights would be gained from cross-cultural study?

These are only some of the questions which would clarify and extend the results of this study. Until such issues can be pursued, support and nurturance of creative risk-taking in women should continue, whether the forum is a personal relationship, an entire school dedicated to this end, or a single class like G-350.

APPENDICES


APPENDIX A G-350 Reading List . . . . . 171

APPENDIX B W.S. 340 Reading List . . . . . 175

APPENDIX C Feminist Awareness Questionnaire . . . . . 178

APPENDIX D Jackson Personality Inventory . . . . . 180

APPENDIX E Personal Orientation Inventory . . . . . 182

APPENDIX F The Rokeach Belief (Dogmatism) Scale . . . 185

APPENDIX G Biographical Data . . . . . 188

APPENDIX H Peer Rating Questions . . . . . 189

APPENDIX I Final Exam for G-350 . . . . . 191

APPENDIX J $T_2$ Student Interview . . . . . 193

APPENDIX K $T_3$ Follow-up Interview . . . . . 196

APPENDIX L Independent Interviewer's Comments . . . . 198

## APPENDIX A

## G-350 READING LIST

G-350 WOMEN'S POTENTIAL & HIGHER EDUCATION

Instructor: Peg Talburtt

The texts for this course are:

1. Psychology of Women by Judith Bardwick, Harper & Row Publishers: New York, 1971.

2. A Dangerous Experiment: 100 Years of Women at the University of Michigan by Dorothy McGuigan. CEW: Ann Arbor, 1970.

3. Sisterhood is Powerful by Robin Morgan, ed. Random House: New York, 197

   or

   Masculine/Feminine by Betty Roszak & Theodore Roszak. Harper & Row: 1969.

In addition, the following bibliography is to be used as the basis for your journal writings. One book from each of the five sections should be read, and your impressions recorded in a journal. The journals will be discussed at mid-term in small groups. Additions to the bibliography are welcome.

### Human Potential

Freedom to Learn by Carl Rogers. Charles Merrill Publishing: Columbus, Ohio, 1969 (and/or others by Rogers).

Man for Himself by Eric Fromm. Bantam: New York, 1947 (and/or others by Fromm).

Love and Will by Rollo May. Norton: New York, 1969 (and/or others by May).

Joy by William Schutz. Grove Press: New York, 1967.

Please Touch by Jane Howard. McGraw-Hill: New York, 1970.

Notes to Myself by Hugh Prather. Real People Press: Moab, Utah, 1972.

I'm OK, You're OK by Thomas Harris. Harper & Row: New York, 1971.

Psycho-Cybernetics by Maxwell Malty. Pocket: New York, 1971.

Human Potentialities, Challenge and Province by Herbert Otto, ed. Green: St. Louis, 1968.

The Portable Nietzsche - Nietzsche. Vicking Press: New York, 1969.

## Schooling/Deschooling: New Education

Toward Humanistic Education by Gerald Weinstein & Mario Fontini. Praeger Press: New York, 1970.

The Lives of Children by George Dennison. Random House: New York, 1969.

Human Teaching for Human Learning by George Brown. The Viking Press: New York, 1971.

Free Schools by Jonathan Kozol. Houghton Mifflin Co.: Boston, 1972.

Tolstoy on Education by Leo Tolstoy. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1967.

This Book Is About Schools by Satu Repo. Random House: New York, 1970.

De-Schooling Society by Ivan Illich. Anchor Books: New York, 1971.

Values and Teaching by L. Rath, M. Harmin, and S. Simon. Merrill Press: Columbus, Ohio, 1966.

Education and the Significance of Life by J. Krishnamurti. Harper: New York, 1953.

Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery by Ivar Berg. Praeger: New York, 1970.

## Higher Education

Culture Out of Anarchy: The Reconstruction of American Higher Learning by Judson Jerome. Herder & Herder: New York, 1970.

Toward a Community of Seekers by Walter Tubbs. Nebraska Curriculum Development Center, 1972.

Reform of Undergraduate Education by Arthur Levine and John Weingart. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1973.

Black Mountain: An Exploration in Community by Martin Duberman. Dutton: New York, 1972.

Academic Values and Mass Education by David Riesman, Joseph Gusfield and Zelda Gamson. Doubleday: New York, 1971.

The Creation of Settings and the Future Societies by Seymour Sarason. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1972.

A Century of Higher Education for Women by Mabel Newcomer. Harper & Row: New York, 1959.

Education and Identity by Arthur Chickering. Jossey-Bass: San Francisco, 1969.

Community of Scholars by Paul Goodman. Random House: New York, 1964.

How to Change Colleges by Harold Taylor (or other books by Taylor as Students Without Teachers). Holt, Rinehart & Winston: New York, 1971.

## Women and Fiction

The Affair of Gabrielle Russier by Mavis Gallant. Knopf Publishers: New York, 1971.

The Bell Jar by Sylvia Plath. Harper & Row: New York, 1971 (and/or other works).

The Golden Notebook by Doris Lessing. New York: Ballentine, 1962.

A Room of One's Own by Virginia Woolf. New York: Harcourt, 1929 (and/or other works).

Madame Bouvary by Flaubert. New York: Viking.

The Awakening by Kate Chopin. New York: Garret Press, 1964.

Memoirs of an Ex-Prom Queen by Alex Kates Shulman. New York: Knopf Publishers, 1972.

My House by Nikki Giovanni. William Morrow: New York, 1972.

Midnight Was My Cry by Carolyn Kizer. Doubleday: New York, 1971.

Thinking About Women by Mary Ellmann. Harcourt, Brace: New York, 1968. (Literature Critique).

## Women and Nonfiction

The Second Sex by Simone de Beauvoir. Knopf Publishers: New York, 1953.

The Female Eunuch by Germaine Greer. McGraw-Hill: New York, 1971.

Sexual Politics by Kate Millet. Doubleday: New York, 1970.

The Dialectic of Sex by Shulamith Firestone. William Morrow: New York, 1970.

Women and the Public Interest by Jesse Bernard. Aldine-Atherton: Chicago, 1971.

Zelda by Nancy Milford. Viking: New York, 1970.

The Black Women. Special issue of The Black Scholar. December, 1971.

Man's World, Woman's Place by Elizabeth Janeway. Dell Publishing Co.: New York, 1972.

Women and Madness by Phylis Chesler. 1972.

Born Female by Caroline Bird. David McKay: New York, 1970.

Diaries (4 Vol.) by Arais Nin. Harcourt, Brace: New York, 1972.

## APPENDIX B

## W.S. 340 READING LIST

WOMEN'S STUDIES 340/002
Winter 1974

Basic Texts (* = Required)

*Sherman, Julia ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN Springfield, Ill.: Charles Thomas, 1971.

*Boston Women's Health Collective OUR BODIES, OUR SELVES New York: Simon & Schuster, 1972.

Bardwick, Judith PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Suggested Anthologies

Gornick & Moran WOMAN IN SEXIST SOCIETY

Bardwick, Judith READINGS ON THE PSYCHOLOGY OF WOMEN

Garskoff, M. ROLES WOMEN PLAY: READINGS TOWARDS WOMEN'S LIBERATION

THE FEMALE EXPERIENCE edited by Psychology Today, CRM, Inc.

For each section you will be expected to read the general survey of the area in Sherman, and Bardwick where relevant. You will also be expected to then choose some other reading to pursue in the area. It can be a reference suggested by Sherman, me, or anything you've heard of or are interested in.

I SETTING THE STAGE (Jan. 7)

*Weisstein, Naomi "Psychology Constructs the Female" in WOMAN IN SEXIST SOCIETY

UP AGAINST THE WALL, MOTHER (on reserve for Women's Studies 240)

Freeman, J. "The Social Construction of the Second Sex" in Garskoff

Bern & Bern "Training the Woman to Know Her Place" in Garskoff

II INFANCY (Jan. 14-16)

*Sherman, chapters 1 & 2

Bardwick, pp. 90-92

III SEX DIFFERENCES (Jan. 21)

*Anastasi, Anna DIFFERENTIAL PSYCHOLOGY New York: Macmillan; chapter on sex differences; OR

*Tyler, Leona THE PSYCHOLOGY OF HUMAN DIFFERENCES New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965; chapter on sex differences.

Montagu, Ashley THE NATURAL SUPERIORITY OF WOMAN

Astrand, O. WORK PHYSIOLOGY

IV SOCIALIZATION

Mischell, Walter "A Social Learning View of Sex Differences in Behavior" in Macooby, Eleanor DEVELOPMENT OF SEX DIFFERENCES Stanford Univ. Press, 1966.
(This book also contains chapters on sex differences in the development of sex differences, sex differences in intellectual functioning, a cognitive-developmental analysis of children's sex-role concepts and attitudes, sex differences and cultural institutions, and an annotated bibliography.)
"The Story of X" in the December 1972 issue of MS.

V ADOLESCENCE (Jan. 28 - 31)

*Chapter in Sherman
*OUR BODIES, OURSELVES on anatomy and menstruation
Bardwick, chapter 2, especially first few pages explaining the sex hormones
Horner, Matina "Toward an Understanding of Achievement-Related Conflicts in Women" J.Soc.Issues, 1972, 28:2, pp. 57-175. (Should be on reserve. This whole issue is on women and there may be other articles in it you'd like to read.) OR
Horner, Matina, chapter in FEMININE PERSONALITY AND CONFLICT by Douvan, Bardwick, Horner and Guttman. Bardwick's chapter in this book summarizes her research and writing on hormones in women.
Paige, Karen, article in September 1973 PSYCHOLOGY TODAY on menstruation.
Money, John MAN AND WOMAN, BOY AND GIRL on cycles in men.
Ramsey, Estelle, article in first copy of MS (Spring 1972).
Coffey, Marilyn "The Day Marcelle Fell off the Roof" MS, November 1973.

VI ADULT

A. SEXUALITY (Feb. 11)

*Sherman, chapters 7 & 8
OUR BODIES, OUR SELVES, relevant material
"Men's Cycles—They Have Them Too, You Know" and "Life Has Its Ups & Downs: The Inner Clock Trip" in HUMAN BEHAVIOR, April 1973, pp. 8-15.
Brecher, R. AN ANALYSIS OF HUMAN SEXUAL RESPONSE Boston: Little, Brown, 1966.
Masters & Johnson HUMAN SEXUAL RESPONSE 1968
Kinsey, Pomeroy, Martin & Gebhard SEXUAL BEHAVIOR IN THE HUMAN FEMALE New York: Pocket Books, 1965.
Sherfey, Mary Jane THE NATURE AND EVOLUTION OF FEMALE SEXUALITY New York: Vintage Books, 1972.

B. CHILDBIRTH (Feb. 25)

*Sherman, chapters 9 & 10
OUR BODIES, OUR SELVES, relevant material
Bing, Elizabeth SIX PRACTICAL LESSONS FOR AN EASIER CHILDBIRTH New York, Bantam Books, 1969 (Nursing Library)
Betts, Doris "Still Life with Fruit" MS, January 1974.

C. PARENTHOOD (March 11)

Rossi, Alice TRANSITION TO PARENTHOOD J.Marr.&Fam., 1968, 30/26-39.

Rainwaiter, L. & Karol, K. W. AND THE POOR GET CHILDREN Chicago: Quadrangle, 1960.

D. CAREERS

E. MENTAL HEALTH

Broverman, I. et al. "Sex-Role Stereotypes and Clinical Judgments of Mental Health," J. Consult. & Clin. Psychol., 1970, 34/1, 1-7.

Chesler, Phyllis "Patient & Patriarch: Women in the Psychtherapeutic Relationship" in Gornick & Moran, op. cit.

VII MIDDLE AGE, MENOPAUSE (March 18)

*Sherman, chapter 11

Bart, Pauline "Depression in Middle-Aged Women" in WOMEN IN SEXIST SOCIETY

OUR BODIES, OUR SELVES, relevant material

COURSE REQUIREMENTS (March 25)

Regular journal entries will be collected every other week and circulated to the class. The journals should be an opportunity to explore thinking that the class and readings have stimulated. For those who don't want to do journals, you have the option of doing 3 papers in which you'd discuss your reading. You may do other things you feel would be useful to you, but discuss it with me first.

Special Projects: About the second half of class will be devoted to presentations. This is designed to enable you to delve more deeply into one particular area. Possible topics: Aggression; dependency; review the last three years of Psychological Abstracts with an eye to analyzing the kinds of articles that are currently being published about women; design an experiment to find out more about a particular subject that you're interested in—you would review the literature in the area and describe the design, it would not be expected that you would actually carry it out; design an interview about a particular area and collect information; or a questionnaire; or make behavioral observations on a topic such as children's play behavior.

## APPENDIX C

## FEMINIST AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

1 List all the women authors you have read in the last year.

2 Each of the women below founded an institution or organization that is still in existence. Can you name the institution next to the woman's name?

a. Mary Lyon

b. Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell

c. Mary Baker Eddy

d. Mary McLeod Bethune

3 Match author to title by drawing lines to connect the correct name and title.

| | |
|---|---|
| Elizabeth Barrett Browning | Blackberry Years |
| Black Women in White America | Unbought and Unbossed |
| Lesbian Nation | Margaret Bourke-White |
| Margaret Mead | Gerda Lerner |
| Emily Douglas | Living My Life |
| Emma Goldman | Aurora Leigh |
| Sappho Was A Right On Woman | Margaret Sanger |
| Shirley Chisholm | Jill Johnson |
| The Unfinished Woman | Lillian Hellman |
| Portrait of Myself | Sidney Abbott et al. |

4 Complete this sentence: To me, the Women's Movement means . . .

5 Directions: In the blank space in front of each item place the letter(s) that indicate the extent to which you agree with the statement:

SA - Strongly Agree
A - Agree
D - Disagree
SD - Strongly Disagree

____1. Women should always have the right to abortion on demand.

____2. Free day care for children is a right which all women should be able to demand.

____3. Marriage is an institution that benefits males primarily.

____4. Today's divorce laws are demeaning to women.

____5. Employment practices in the U.S. are discriminatory regarding women.

____6. The use of female sex appeal in advertising should be stopped.

____7. Job vacancy notices should not mention sex.

____8. More women should be involved in policy formation both in business and government.

____9. Women should receive preferential treatment right now as indemnity for past discrimination.

___10. Family patterns and attitudes should allow and often encourage married women to follow their own interests, even if they have young children.

___11. Professional women should have the same benefits and opportunities as their male colleagues.

___12. A woman should be able to have herself sterilized without her husband's permission.

___13. The charge that women are overly emotional is a male smoke screen.

___14. Birth control information and devices should be readily available to any female over age fourteen who requests them.

___15. Women, because of their sensitivity, are superior to men.

## APPENDIX D

### JACKSON PERSONALITY INVENTORY

| Trait | Description of a High Scorer |
|---|---|
| Anxiety | tense, restless, uneasy; tends to worry over inconsequential matters; more easily upset than is the average person; apprehensive about the future. |
| Breadth of Interest | attentive, involved; motivated to participate in a wide variety of activities; interested in learning about a diversity of things. |
| Complexity | seeks intricate solutions to problems; is impatient with oversimplification; is interested in pursuing topics in depth, regardless of their difficulty. |
| Conformity | compliant, acquiescent, cooperative; is susceptible to social influence and group pressures; tends to modify behaviour to be consistent with standards set by others. |
| Energy Level | active, vigorous, spirited; possesses reserves of strength; does not tire easily; capable of intense work or recreational activity for long periods of time. |
| Innovation | creative, inventive, capable of originality of thought; motivated to develop novel solutions to problems; values new ideas. |
| Interpersonal Affect | affectionate, tender, compassionate, tends to identify closely with other people and with their problems; values close ties with others. |
| Organization | efficient, planful, systematic; makes effective use of time; completes work on schedule; is not easily distracted. |
| Responsibility | trustworthy, reputable, civic-minded; feels a strong obligation to be honest and upright; experiences a sense of duty to other people; has a strong and inflexible conscience. |

| | |
|---|---|
| Risk-Taking | venturesome, daring, rash, enjoys gambling and taking a chance; willingly exposes self to situations with uncertain outcomes; enjoys adventures having an element of peril. |
| Self-esteem | self-assured, confident, self-sufficient; poised in dealing with others; not easily embarrassed or influenced by others; imperturbable in interpersonal situations. |
| Social Adroitness | socially intelligent, influential, tactful; is skillful at persuading others to achieve a particular goal, sometimes by indirect means; occasionally may be seen as manipulative of others, but is ordinarily diplomatic. |
| Social Participation | sociable, friendly, gregarious; will eagerly join a variety of social groups; seeks both formal and informal association with others; values positive interpersonal relationships. |
| Tolerance | broad-minded, undogmatic, open-minded; accepts people even though their beliefs and customs may differ from his own; open to new ideas; free from prejudice. |
| Value Orthodoxy | traditional, moralistic, conventional; values traditional customs and beliefs; his values may occasionally be seen by others as "old fashioned"; takes a rather conservative view regarding contemporary standards of behavior. |

## APPENDIX E

### PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

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

Circle the statement that is true for you, or mostly true for you. Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

---

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

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

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

4. a. Times I am cross when I am not feeling well.
   b. I am hardly ever cross.

5. a. I trust the decisions I make on the spur of the moment.
   b. I do not trust the decisions I make on the spur of the moment.

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

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

8. a. I believe that people are essentially good and can be trusted.
   b. I believe that people are essentially evil and cannot be trusted.

9. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
   b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.

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

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

12. a. The truly spiritual person is sometimes sensual.
    b. The truly spiritual person is never sensual.

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

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

15. a. I feel dedicated to my work. (studies).
    b. I do not feel dedicated to my work. (studies).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

24. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.

    b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy.

25. a. People are both good and evil.

    b. People are not both good and evil.

26. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.

    b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.

27. a. People are basically good.

    b. People are not basically good.

28. a. I put others' interests before my own.

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

APPENDIX F

THE ROKEACH BELIEF (DOGMATISM) SCALE

NAME: _____

DATE: _____

The following is a study of what the general public thinks and feels about a number of important social and personal questions. The best answer to each statement on the attached pages is your personal opinion. We have tried to cover many different and opposing points of view; you may find yourself agreeing strongly with some of the statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others, and perhaps uncertain with others; whether you agree or disagree with any statement, you can be sure that many people feel the same as you do.

DIRECTIONS: Mark each statement on the line in the left margin below according to how much you agree or disagree with it. PLEASE MARK EVERY ONE.

Write +1, +2, +3 or -1, -2, -3, depending on how you feel in each case.

| | |
|---|---|
| +1 = I agree a little | -1 = I disagree a little |
| +2 = I agree on the whole | -2 = I disagree on the whole |
| +3 = I agree very much | -3 = I disagree very much |

_____1. The United States and Russia have just about nothing in common.

_____2. The highest form of government is a democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

_____3. Even though freedom of speech for all groups is a worthwhile goal, it is unfortunately necessary to restrict the freedom of certain political groups.

_____4. It is only natural that a person would have a better acquaintance with ideas she/he believes in than with ideas she/he opposes.

_____5. Humans on their own are helpless and miserable creatures.

_____6. Fundamentally, the world we live in is a pretty lonesome place.

_____7. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

_____8. Most people don't give a "damn" for others.

_____9. It is only natural for a person to be fearful of the future.

_____10. There is so much to be done and so little time to do it in.

_____11. Once I get wound up in a heated discussion, I just can't stop.

_____12. In a discussion I often find it necessary to repeat myself to make sure I am being understood.

_____13. In a heated discussion I generally become so absorbed in what I am going to say that I forget to listen to what the others are saying.

_____14. It is better to be a dead hero than to be a live coward.

_____15. While I don't like to admit this even to myself, my secret ambition is to become a great woman/man, like Einstein or Beethoven or Gertrude Stein or Marie Curie.

_____16. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

_____17. If given a chance I would do something of great benefit to the world.

_____18. In the history of mankind there have probably been just a handful of really great thinkers.

_____19. There are a number of people I have come to hate because of the things they stand for.

_____20. A person who does not believe in some great cause has not really lived.

_____21. It is only when a person devotes her/himself to an ideal or cause that life becomes meaningful.

_____22. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world, there is probably only one which is correct.

_____23. A person who gets enthusiastic about too many causes is likely to be a pretty "wishy-washy" sort of person.

_____24. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to a betrayal of our own side.

____25. When it comes to differences of opinion in religion, we must be careful not to compromise with those who believe differently from the way we do.

____26. In times like these, a person must be pretty selfish if he/she considers primarily his/her own happiness.

____27. The worst crime a person could commit is to publicly attack the people who believe in the same thing that she/he does.

____28. In times like these, it is often necessary to be more on guard against ideas put out by people or groups in one's own camp than by those in the opposing camp.

____29. A group which tolerates too much differences of opinion among its own members cannot exist for long.

____30. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit she/he's wrong.

____31. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

____32. A person who thinks primarily of her/his own happiness is beneath contempt.

____33. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

____34. In this complicated world of ours, the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.

____35. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one has had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

____36. In the long run, the best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

____37. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

____38. If a man or woman is to accomplish his/her mission in life, it is sometimes necessary to gamble "all or nothing at all."

____39. Unfortunately, a good many people with whom I have discussed important social and moral problems don't really understand what's going on.

____40. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

APPENDIX G

BIOGRAPHICAL DATA

1. Name:_____AGE:_____

2. Major:_____(OPTIONAL, Gradepoint:____)

3. Employed?_____YES _____NO If yes, give your job title below.

4. Married?_____YES _____NO

5. Dependents?____YES _____NO If yes, please list them by their relationship to you (as daughter, parent, etc.).

6. Have you previously had any women's courses?_____YES _____NO
If yes, please list their titles below.

7. Have you previously had any group dynamics experience (as therapy, an encounter week-end, an interpersonally-oriented psychology class, etc.)

_____YES _____NO If yes, please describe below.

8. How many pass/fail college courses have you had before this term?

How many "contract" college courses have you had before this term?

How many small-group discussion (30 people or less) college courses have you had before this term?

How many college courses have you had before this term which dealt with your personal experiences?

## APPENDIX H

## PEER RATING QUESTIONS

1. The person I am rating is _____

   whom I have known for _____(months, years).

   Our relationship is one of _____
   (marriage, roommates, co-workers)

2. Three words or phrases I would use to describe her are:

   a.

   b.

   c.

3. The three most significant experiences she has had this semester (as I see it) are:

   a.

   b.

   c.

4. Have you heard her talk of this class (G-350, "Women's Potential in Higher Education)? _____YES _____NO
   If Yes, use as much detail as possible to recall her opinion and experiences in G-350. (Use other side if desired).

5. Over the term, has her awareness of herself as a woman increased?
   _____YES _____NO

   Has the change affected her behavior? _____YES _____NO
   DESCRIBE: (Use other side of paper)

6. Please respond to the following by checking the appropriate space and then giving an example or description to better explain your answer. Use extra paper if necessary.

   a. Does she seem to take more risks (i.e. trying the uncertain) now than she did at the start of the term?

   _____YES _____NO

   Example:

   b. Does she feel better about herself now than she did at the start of the term (i.e. higher self-esteem)

   _____YES _____NO

   Example:

   c. Does she seem to know more about what's important to her now than she did at the start of the term?

   _____YES _____NO

   Example:

   d. Does she seem to act on or publicly affirm her values, goals, or beliefs more than she did at the start of the term?

   _____YES _____NO

   Example:

   e. Does she seem more open to new ideas, people, or experiences now than she did at the start of the term?

   _____YES _____NO

   Example:

   f. Has your relationship with her changed in any way over the course of this term?

   _____YES _____NO

   Example:

   g. In general, what changes have you seen in her behavior or personality over the course of this term?

THANK YOU, THANK YOU, THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP

## APPENDIX I

### FINAL EXAM for G-350

1. Here are a series of whips. Please complete each sentence.

   a. The most important thing I learned in this class was . . .

   b. I would tell someone else to take this class if they wanted to . . .

   c. The most risky thing I did because of or in this class was . . .

   d. The most important thing the university could do for women is . . .

   e. The thing I liked best about Peg, as a teacher, is . . .

   f. The thing I would recommend Peg work on to improve her teaching is . . .

2. Name and address of the person doing my peer rating:

   Name_____

   Address_____

   _____

3. What three class experiences were most meaningful to you and why? (Use extra paper if necessary.)

   a.

   b.

   c.

4. Whether in or out of this class, what have been the three most significant experiences you have had this semester? Please explain in as much detail as possible.

   a.

   b.

   c.

5. Did G-350 increase your level of risk-taking? _____YES _____NO

   If Yes, please explain the circumstance, assignment, people, or exercise contributing to your risk-taking. If a period of time or sequence of events were involved, please describe them thoroughly.

   If No, please detail how the class could have increased your level of risk-taking and why you feel this did not happen for you.

6. Explain why your project was: 1) new for you and 2) related to your education.

## APPENDIX J

### $T_2$ STUDENT INTERVIEW

Following a blurb of a) confidentiality, b) I'm probing the class experience, but don't feel that you have to have had the experiences or feelings that I question.

1. I'm interested in your perceptions of the climate of G-350. What 3 words or phrases would you use to describe your feelings about:

   a. the other people in the class

   b. the class exercises

   c. the class atmosphere

   d. me and my teaching technique

   e. the grading policy/requirements

2. Was there a "turning point" in this class for you, i.e. a point where the class peaked/started making sense/really affected you? (If yes, when, how, what?)

3. a. Because of G-350, have you had any new ideas/values/fantasies?

b. Because of G-350, have you made any decisions differently? (What, how, why?)(What in the class facilitated this?)

c. Because of G-350, has your self-image changed at all? (How, when, to what & what in class related to this change?)

d. Because of G-350, have your relationships with significant others changed in any way? (Who, how, when, what, & from what in class?)

4. a. What people have had a lot of impact on you this term? (Who, how, why?)

b. Have any of these people served as models for you? (Models = a personal quality, action, or lifestyle you'd like to incorporate into your life; not an idol.)

c. Within G-350, have the facilitators served as models?

— have other students?

— have I?

5. Other comments:

APPENDIX K

## $T_3$ FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW

The purpose of this interview is to explore the longer-term feelings and ideas you have about G-350 and your experiences in that class. The focus of the questions will obviously be on the class, but please respond in an honest and frank way.

1. What do you remember most about G-350? Why/What?

2. Did you learn anything in G-350 that has been particularly helpful or necessary in the last 8 months? What? How?

3. Given the nature of G-350, is there a particular skill or idea you wish you had learned better? What? Why?

4. Is there a topic the class didn't cover which you feel should be introduced in future classes? What? Why?

5. Because of your experiences in G-350, have you developed any skills or attitudes that will help you in a professional way? _____YES _____NO If yes, what skills? From what in class? Who else would have noticed this?

6. What are 3 adjectives you would use to describe yourself today?

7. What have been the most significant life experiences you have had in the last 8 months? Why? Are there close friends who have noticed this too?
   —To what extend did you or do you control the outcome of the experiences? Describe.
   —Conscious choices or just happened
   —Why momentous

   —How did you decide what to do (pros, cons)
   —What made you do it?

8. Did your experiences in G-350 relate to the outcomes in any way? Why? How? What in class?

9. Whether directly or indirectly related to G-350, have there been any unexpected outcomes for you due to your involvement in G-350? What?

10. Since the class ended, have you felt the need for a forum or experience like G-350 to help you with a decision, situation, or skill? _____YES _____NO Describe the situation, need, outcome.

11. Thinking back over the last 8 months, have you taken any risks, whether in a job, a decision, a relationship, or within yourself? What? Why a risk? What made you do it? Who else would know about this? Did G-350 relate to your decision to do it?

12. Because of your experiences in G-350, have you significantly changed as a person? _____YES _____NO What changes? From what in class? (Probe decisions made differently, new goals or activities, new friends.)
    —new decisions
    —new relationships
    —new conceptions of yourself
    —other

13. What do you see yourself doing a year from now? Five years from now?
    —work, school
    —relationships
    —hopes

14. What didn't I cover that is important? Explain purposes of this interview.

## APPENDIX L

### INDEPENDENT INTERVIEWER'S COMMENTS

Some Reactions to and Thoughts About Follow-up Interviews
for Peg Talburtt—Class in Women's Potential

1. I am first of all, struck by my recollections of what my undergraduate classmates and I were like in the early 1960's, compared with the young women I talked to for this follow-up to the G-350 class given Winter Term 1974. No doubt this difference is attributable in some degree to the overall change in our culture—women's issues (so-called) are more popular, etc. But, nevertheless, I feel strongly that these women were far more career-oriented, in a real sense, far more mature than I recall my classmates being. And I must say, a large number of those women I was closest to in my twenties are now holding PhD's, though not so many are working for pay in their PhD fields.

2. Relationships seemed to me to be quite important to this group of women. And not so much relationships with "a man" as much as relationships with other women, with parents, and in a sense, with themselves. They seemed to feel a pride about being women and a real interest in and respect for other women. They were concerned about their parents as people. And finally, they seemed to have an objectivity about themselves that allowed examination of their motives, behaviors, pleasures, thoughts, and I guess this is what I am speaking to when I mention "relationship with themselves." This is real risk-taking and real self confidence and growth—when one can step aside and look at oneself critically but with appreciation and if you will, some measure of self love.

3. As for character traits of these women, I'm thoroughly impressed with the basic feeling for self confidence and enthusiasm for life and living. Not that there weren't doubts expressed, reasonable doubts, I thought, and one or two who were genuinely discouraged, but in the main, it is a group of eager and excited women.

   In additional, I was struck by the high level of trust and openness expressed to me. After all, they did not know me at all, and were made aware of my relative lack of total objectivity and anonymity, and yet appeared to feel comfortable with sharing rather intimate feelings and occurrences in their lives. This

seemed to me to be less naivete than genuine self trust and perhaps a feeling of trust engendered by Peg (and therefore carried through to her "agent").

The almost total lack of what I will call "dysfunctional naivete" was super. That is, I felt these women were maturing and growing; they are not cynical about life, but neither are they youthfully pursuing Joy and Truth and Happiness with charm and enthusiasm and little else. They display a good deal of ambition for their futures and a significant amount of drive to get them wherever they hope to be heading.

4. Behavior seems to include a fair amount of nondestructive, or creative risk-taking. This is how I describe creative risk-taking, that is. Risks that do not carry such a high potential for "failure" individually or cumulatively, that the individual molds for herself or himself a victim-like role in life. They seem to take on risks that offer challenge and growth. And I truly see this as an important modus operandi for men and women alike, but more needed, perhaps, for women who have been socialized to be passive livers or destructive risk-takers, in the main.

5. My conclusions are as follows: This is an extraordinary group of women, whether by contemporary or previous-decade definitions. I suspect they are somewhat self-selected. I suspect that the significance of role models provided by the class is highly important to their chosen lifestyles at this time. Peg is the most significant role model—a woman who has chosen a serious field of endeavor, who is open, charming, bright, achieving and young enough to relate to if you are twenty (or, in some cases, if you are forty!). But I think all these women provided role models for one another. They nearly without exception mentioned how fascinating the other women in the class appeared. I think they were looking to one another for support and inspiration, and got and gave at the same time. And it strikes me that one of the most significant results of this kind of role modeling is that it provides a far greater richness, far more variety, infinite greater inspiration, than one person alone can do.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY


Bardwick, Judith. Psychology of Women. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.

Bateson, N. "Familiarization, Group Discussion, and Risk-Taking," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1966. 2, 119-29.

Bennett, Charles and Lindskold, Sven. Procedural Artifact in Risky Shift Research, Proceedings of the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, 1971. 6(6) Part I, 249-50.

Bernard, Jesse. Women and the Public Interest. Chicago: Aldine-Altherton, 1971.

Bion, Wilfred R. Experiences in Groups. New York: Basic Books, 1959.

Brown, George. Human Teaching for Human Learning. New York: The Viking Press, 1971.

Brown, Roger. Social Psychology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Burke, Clarence. "Exploration of Some Similarities and Differences in the Inner Experience and Interpersonal Styles of Participants in a Human Relations-Type Graduate Course in 'Growth of Self.'" Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan, 1974.

Byrd, Richard. "Self-Actualization Through Creative Risk Taking: A New Laboratory Model." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. New York University, 1970.

Calsdan, S. and Welsh, G. S. Personality Correlates of Creative Potential in Talented High School Students, Journal of Personality, 1966. 34: 445-55.

Campbell, Donald and Stanley, Julian. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Design for Research. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1966.

Cartwright, Dorwin. "Determinants of Scientific Progress: The Case of the Research on the Risky Shift." American Psychologist, Vol. 28, No. 3, March, 1973.

Feldman, Kenneth (Ed.). College and Student. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc., 1972.

_____ and Newcomb, Theodore. The Impact of College on Students. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Festinger, Leon. "Informal Social Communication," Psychological Review, 1950. 57, 271-82.

_____. A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Palo Alto, California: Stanford University Press, 1957.

Getzels, J. W. and Csikzentmihaly, M. Creative Thinking in Art Students. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.

Gilson, Charlotte. Individual Differences in Risk Taking. Department of Psychology, Yale University, June, 1968.

Goodale, Robert. Methods for Encouraging Creativity in the Classroom, Journal of Creative Behavior, Spring, 1970. 4(2), 91-102.

Helson, R. Sex Differences in Creative Style, Journal of Personality, 1967. 35(2), 214-33.

Himmelstrand, U. "Verbal Attitudes and Behavior," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960. 24, 224-250.

Homans, George. "Social Behavior as Exchange," American Journal of Sociology, 1958. 63, 597-606.

Hunt, J. McVicker. "Traditional Personality Theory in the Light of Recent Evidence," American Scientist, 1965. 53, 80-96.

Huyck, Elnora. "A Test of the Relative Effectiveness of a Didactic Teaching Model versus a Didactic/Experiential Model in Teaching a Complex Behavior." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Minnesota, 1971.

Jackson, Douglas; Hournay, Larry; and Vidmas, Neil. A Four-Dimensional Interpretation of Risk Taking. Research Bulletin No. 185, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, June, 1971. 23 pp.

Joesting, Joan. "Comparison of Women's Liberation Members with their Non-Member Peers," Psychological Reports, 1971. 29 (3, pt. 2), 1291-1294.

Kahn, Robert. Paper presented at the Institute of Continuing Legal Education Conference on Affirmative Action, Ann Arbor, Michigan, June 23, 1972.

Katz, Daniel. "The Functional Approach to the Study of Attitudes," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1960. 24, 163-77.

_____; Sarnoff, Irving; and McClintock, Charles. Human Relations. London: Tavistock Publications, 1956.

Kelman, Herbert. "Processes of Social Change," Public Opinion Quarterly, 1961. 25, 57-78.

Klein, Ronald. "Evolving Creative Behavior." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Massachusetts, 1972.

Klevan, Albert. "An Investigation of a Methodology for Value Clarification: Its Relationship to Consistency in Thinking, Purposefulness and Human Relations." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. New York University, 1957.

Kneller, George. The Art and Science of Creativity. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1965.

Kogan, N. and Wallach, M. A. "Risk Taking as a Function of the Situation, the Person, and the Group." In G. Mandler, P. Mussen, N. Kogan and M. A. Wallach (Eds.), New Directions in Psychology: III. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1967.

Lang, Melvin. "An Investigation of the Relationship of Value Clarification to Underachievement and Certain Other Behavioral Characteristics of Selected College Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1961.

Leatherwood, Helen. "The Effectiveness of Small-Group Procedures in the Classroom as Aids in Movement Toward Self-Actualization in Junior College Students." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, East Texas State University, 1971.

Levitan, Teresa; Quinn, Robert; and Staines, Graham. "Sex Discrimination Against the American Working Woman," American Behavioral Scientist, November-December, 1971. 15(2), 237-254.

Mann, J. H. and Mann, C. H. "The Importance of a Group Task in Producing Group Member Personality and Behavior Change." In Bernard Hinton and H. Joseph Reitz (Eds.), Groups and Organizations. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1971.

Martin, Donald. "A Study of the Relationship of Certain Behaviors of Children to Emotional Needs, Values, and Thinking." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. New York University, 1960.

Maslow, Abraham. Toward a Psychology of Being. Princeton, New Jersey: Van Nostrand, 1962.

_____. "Creativity in Self-Actualizing People." In Creativity and Its Cultivation. Harold Anderson (Ed.). New York: Harper & Row, 1959.

May, Rollo (Ed.). Existential Psychology. New York: Van Nostrand, 1962.

Newcomb, Theodore. "An Approach to the Study of Communicative Acts," Psychological Review, 1953. 60, 393-404.

Nordhoy, F. "Group Interaction in Decision Making under Risk." Unpublished Master's thesis. Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1962.

O'Mahoney, Michael T. and Labbie, Stefan. Dimension of the Image of Nursing in Relation to Academic Success and Factors of Personality. Proceedings of the 81st American Psychological Association Convention, 1973. (8) 25-6.

Paploizos and Stiefel. "Effectiveness of Participative Teaching Methods," Alberta Journal of Educational Research, September, 1971. 17(3), 179-90.

Parnes, Sidney. "Creativity: The Releasing of Your Human Potential," Trend, 1972. 3-5+.

Perls, F.; Hefferline, R.; and Goodman, P. Gestalt Therapy. New York: Julian, 1951

Poe, Bobby Joe. "The Effect of Sensitivity Training on the Relationship between Risk Taking and other Selected Behavioral Factors." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. East Texas State University, 1971.

Riesman, David. The Lonely Crowd. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Rogers, Carl. On Becoming a Person. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1962.

Rokeach, Milton. "The Organization and Modification of Beliefs," Centennial Review, 1963. 7(4), 375-95.

Shostrom, E. L. "An Inventory for the Measurement of Self-Actualization," Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1964. 24(2), 207-18.

Simon, Sidney. "Promoting the Search for Values," Educational Opportunity Forum, 1969 (Fall). 1(4), 75-84.

_____; Howe, Leland; and Kirschenbaum, Howard. Values Clarification. New York: Hart Publishing Co., Inc., 1972.

Stein, Morris. "Creativity and Culture," Journal of Psychology, 1953. 35, 311-22.

Stoner, James. "A Comparison of Individual and Group Decisions Including Risk." Unpublished Master's thesis. School of Industrial Management, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1961.

_____. "Risky and Cautious Shifts in Group Decisions: The Influence of Widely Held Values," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1968. 4(4), 442-459.

Talburtt, Margaret. "Why Women Deny Discrimination." Unpublished paper, 1972.

Tangri, Sandra. "Role Innovation in Occupational Choice Among College Women." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan, 1969.

Taylor, Calvin (Ed.). Creativity, Progress and Potential. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964.

Tidball, M. Elizabeth. "Perspective on Women and Affirmative Action," Educational Record, 1973. 54(2), 3.

Tinker, Irene. "Non-Academic Professional Political Scientists," American Behavioral Scientist, November-December, 1971. 15(2), 206-12.

Torrance, E. Paul. Guiding Creative Talent. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Wallach, Michael and Kogan, Nathan. "The Roles of Information, Discussion, and Consensus in Group Risk Taking," Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1965. 1, 1-19.

White, Marni; Gold, Alice; and Brush, Lorelei. "The Resocialization of Women in Women's Studies Courses." Unpublished paper. Wesleyan University, 1974.

Yu, Miriam. "An Exploratory Study of Women in Traditional Male Professions and Traditionally Female Professions and the Role of Creativity in Their Career Choices." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation. University of Michigan, 1972.

Zahn, Janet. Creativity Research and Its Implications for Adult Education. Boston: The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1966.