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CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The concept of human relations training has undergone an evolutionary change since its inception. Psychological Abstracts did not give the topic of human relations a subject heading of its own until 1978. Prior to that time, human relations subjects were listed under the heading of sensitivity training. It has been in recent years that human relations training has been viewed as a vehicle to deal with bias, discrimination, prejudice, and sexism in the educational setting. It has only been since the early to mid-seventies that human relations training has been looked upon as a means of implementing multicultural nonsexist education.

The most definitive work in the pre-multicultural human relations era was done by Robert Carkhuff (17) with others. Carkhuff identified a number of what he termed to be core conditions that are necessary interaction skills for effective teaching. These skills include empathy, respect, warmth, genuineness, self-disclosure, confrontation, and immediacy of relationship. These core conditions, as developed by Carkhuff, have been the foundation of a good deal of additional research in the field of human relations.

Subsequent studies have established that the presence of these core conditions can result in positive outcomes in the classroom. Higher levels of academic achievement, better adjustment to school, better student self-concept development, and other relative outcomes have been attributed to the presence of Carkhuff's core conditions in classroom teachers.
During the period Carkhuff's core conditions were being developed, societal changes and pressures were causing bias, discrimination, prejudice, and sexism to become issues to be dealt with in the educational setting.

As early as 1971, Minnesota became the first state to require a program of human relations training for preservice and inservice teachers. During this year, the Minnesota State Legislature passed a bill labeled Edu 521, the Minnesota human relations regulation. Having a human relations title, this requirement was intended to foster appreciation for the contributions of various cultural subgroups; deal with bias, discrimination, and prejudice; respect human differences; and create learning environments which develop self-esteem and positive interpersonal relations. The intention of this regulation as a human relations requirement is an indication of how the concept of human relations has broadened from the sensitivity training orientation of Carkhuff. This is not to say that the transition of human relations training to include multiculturalism and nonsexism is illogical. Understanding and trying to eliminate bias and prejudice, appreciating pluralism, and respecting human differences seem a logical extension of the attributes of warmth, empathy, respect, and genuineness that earlier proponents of human relations training like Carkhuff were trying to develop in good teachers.

In 1975, the Iowa State Board of Public Instruction adopted state guidelines for multicultural nonsexist education in Iowa. In an effort to prepare the teachers of Iowa to make the transition to the multicultural nonsexist approach to teaching, the board in 1976 adopted the Iowa human
relations requirement (670.13 of the Iowa Administrative Code) requiring that all persons on or after August 31, 1980, applying for Iowa teaching certification or renewal must have successfully completed a human relations training course approved by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction. In 1978, the Iowa General Assembly reinforced the state board with HF 254, which revised 257.05 of the Iowa Code to include: "The state board shall promulgate rules to require that a multicultural nonsexist approach is used by school districts. The educational program shall be taught from a multicultural nonsexist approach."

The criteria of the human relations requirement (670—13.18 through 670—13.22 of the Iowa Administrative Code) include the following components:

13.21 (1) Be aware of and understand the various values, life styles, history, and contributions of various identifiable subgroups in our society.

13.21 (2) Recognize and deal with dehumanizing biases such as sexism, racism, prejudice, and discrimination and become aware of the impact that such biases have on interpersonal relations.

13.21 (3) Translate knowledge of human relations into attitudes, skills, and techniques which will result in favorable learning experiences for students.

13.21 (4) Recognize the ways in which dehumanizing biases may be reflected in instructional materials.

13.21 (5) Respect human diversity and the rights of each individual.

13.21 (6) Relate effectively to other individuals and various subgroups other than one's own.
Statement of the Problem

The Iowa Department of Public Instruction has mandated human relations training for all persons who are granted initial teaching certification and for all those who renew certification on or after August 31, 1980. This regulation has caused teacher training institutions and area education agencies to develop human relations courses and inservice training modules designed to enable practicing teachers and students preparing to teach to meet the requirement.

For a period of five years or more, this training has been given to prospective teachers as part of their undergraduate preparation and to practicing teachers who are earning graduate credit toward an advanced degree or credit toward teaching certificate renewal.

Now that the process of compliance has been implemented, this study sought to determine whether the human relations requirement is having any effect on the teachers of Iowa who have received the training, whether the outcomes are those intended by the requirement, if the outcomes of preservice and inservice training differ, and what differences there may be between teachers trained at the college or university level for credit and those who fulfill the requirement in an approved workshop setting without receiving college credit.

Purpose of the Study

The human relations requirement, as mandated by the Department of Public Instruction, has resulted in a massive commitment of time, money, and human resources in its implementation. It has required changes and additions to the teacher preparation programs of all the colleges and
universities that train Iowa teachers. Providing the training has necessitated the development or modification of courses and the training of instructors qualified to teach human relations. It has also created an obligation for teachers in the field who do not have a permanent professional certificate to meet the requirement in some way before renewing their certificates when they expire. For teachers in rural areas or those with summer contracts, meeting this requirement can take some extra or additional effort and cost.

Because the system for meeting this requirement is now in place and has been functioning for a period of more than 4 years, this study has attempted to examine the outcomes to date to determine whether human relations training is producing any change in Iowa teachers and whether that change, if any, is realized more in teachers who meet the requirement in formal classroom training for college credit than in those teachers trained through approved training courses that meet for a specified number of hours, but do not require grading, outside work, or semester hour credit.

The finding of this study might serve as useful feedback to those who are administering human relations training in teacher preparation programs and for those providing training modules for inservice teachers. The findings may also be useful to the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, which is the agency that has implemented the Iowa human relations requirement. As this study was made independently of the Department of Public Instruction, and it was intended to be objective and impartial, any positive findings that might result could serve as a public relations tool
in dealing with negative reactions over a mandated requirement such as this. Any negative outcomes might provide indications of what parts of the accreditation criteria need to be changed or upgraded. Although no comparison was made between specific human relations training programs, the results of this study might still provide some insight to institutions and agencies that provide such training as to whether training through inservice or workshop modules which do not offer post-secondary credit are equal or different in their effects on teachers trained when compared to those trained in formal classes for credit at a college or university.

This study sought to quantify the concepts, attitudes, and behaviors that the human relations requirement seeks to shape in Iowa teachers and objectively compare the presence, or lack of presence, of these characteristics in teachers who have had the training with those who have not, those who have been trained in regular classes with those who have not, and those trained before teaching with those trained while in service.

The study focused on comparing teachers who met the requirement through courses for college credit and those who met the requirement through approved workshop modules, such as those offered through the 15 area education agencies. Also compared were those who were trained as undergraduates (preservice teachers) and those who were trained while teaching (inservice teachers).

In interpreting the data for this study, the appropriate statistical tools were selected to analyze the variables of:
1. teachers who have had human relations training compared with teachers who have not had human relations training;

2. teachers as undergraduates before teaching compared with teachers trained after beginning to teach;

3. teachers trained in a class for academic credit with teachers trained in a workshop or inservice module without academic credit;

4. elementary teachers (K-6) compared with secondary teachers (7-12);

5. trained male teachers compared with trained female teachers; and

6. teachers with 1 to 4 years experience compared by teachers with 5 to 9 years experience compared by teachers with 10 plus years experience.

Hypotheses Tested

1. There are no differences in the attitudes of teachers trained in human relations and those untrained in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six criteria considered as a whole.

2. There are no differences in the attitudes of teachers trained in human relations as undergraduates prior to teaching (preservice) and those trained after they began teaching (postservice) in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.

3. There are no differences in attitudes of teachers trained in human relations in a class for academic credit and those who met the requirement through a workshop or inservice module without credit in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.
4. There are no differences in attitudes of elementary teachers (K-6) and secondary teachers (7-12) who have met the human relations requirement in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.

5. There are no differences in attitudes of males who have met the human relations requirement and females who have met the requirement in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.

6. There are no differences in attitudes of teachers who have had 1 to 4, 5 to 9, or 10 plus years of teaching experience in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.

Basic Assumptions

1. It is assumed that the development of better human relations skills will result in some sort of change in educational programs.

2. It is assumed that since all human relations training courses meet Department of Public Instruction standards for approval, all these courses have made some attempt to address the six criteria in the Iowa requirement.

3. It is assumed that the conditions of bias, prejudice, and sexism do exist in our society, and that they are reflected in the educational system as well as among the teachers and students of Iowa schools.

Delimitations

This study was concerned with the effects of the Iowa Department of Public Instruction requirement of human relations training for Iowa teachers. The findings will be applicable to Iowa only and subject to the unique characteristics of Iowa teachers and schools.
The measuring instrument was designed to speak to the criteria of 670—13.21 of the Iowa Administrative Code and measured in relation to that criteria.

Since this program has recently been developed, very few teachers have a great number of years of teaching experience following human relations training. This means that since the measurement of teachers with the training has been taken shortly after all have received training, little indication will be given as to how resultant attitudes are tempered or affected after additional years of teaching experience.

Organization of the Study

This study is presented in five chapters. The first contains a statement of the problem, purpose and objectives for the study, hypotheses, basic assumptions, delimitations, and organization of the study. Chapter II contains a review of related literature. The method of collecting data is discussed in Chapter III, and the findings are reported in Chapter IV. Chapter V contains the summary, conclusions, and recommendations.

Summary

The area of human relations has evolved from a study of interpersonal relationships to a more inclusive concept that includes the means of implementing multicultural and nonsexist educational instruction. The state of Iowa was among the earliest states to establish and implement required human relations training for all teachers in the state who are certified to teach in Iowa. The only exception to the Iowa requirement is
comprised of those who had been granted permanent certification before the requirement went into effect. Compliance with this requirement represents a massive commitment of time and resources by the Iowa Department of Public Instruction, the institutions preparing Iowa teachers, and the preservice and inservice teachers of the state.

Now that this requirement for human relations training has been in place for a period of several years, this study has sought to assess what the resultant effects have been by comparing teachers who have been trained with those who have not. Additional comparisons were also made between teachers trained before teaching and those trained while in service and between inservice teachers who were trained as part of a college or university graduate or extension program versus those trained as part of an inservice module that meets the requirement but does not offer credit hours for participation.
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The topic of human relations becomes a very broad one when taken in the context of a literature review such as this. It has been a subject that has evolved from an interpersonal relationship focus in its earlier years to the focus in recent years on human relations training as a vehicle to deal with bias, discrimination, prejudice, and sexism in the educational setting. It is also a broad topic to review because the concept does not have an entirely specific definition as it has been dealt with over the years.

Since this study is dealing with the effects of human relations training on Iowa teachers, the emphasis of this review will focus on the effects of multicultural nonsexist human relations training on teachers and the students in their classes. Some of the chapter will also address the historical development of human relations training and some of the issues that have developed concerning teacher training in the human relations area and the effects of a multicultural teaching approach on students.

In order to present the summary of related literature in this chapter in a manner that will logically relate to and support this study, the material will be categorized under the following main headings: (1) An Overview of the Development of Human Relations Training; (2) Inservice and Preservice Teacher Training in Human Relations Training; (3) Curriculum Practices and Pupil Outcomes Related to Human Relations Training; and (4) Issues in Multicultural Education.
An Overview of the Development of Human Relations Training

Human relations training has been studied for use by business organizations, mental health workers, clergymen, as well as teachers dating back to at least the late 1940s. At this time, the National Training Laboratory was established in Bethel, Maine, and marked the first time that human relations training was studied on a large scale. During this time and in the years that followed, the focus of human relations training was on group processes. Much of the training centers on the dynamics of why people behave as they do in groups and techniques for tempering individual attitudes to make them compatible within group settings (12).

Subsequent developments of the evolution of human relations training have included training groups or "t-groups," who meet under the guidance of a trained leader with a high level of intimacy being developed over a period of time. "Encounter groups" were developed by Carl Rogers in the late fifties and early sixties and incorporated Rogers' nondirective approach in the exploration of personal feeling in the group setting.

Attention to human relations in the school setting was first indicated in 1960 with two national surveys conducted by the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools. The surveys were conducted among professors of education and classroom teachers. The results indicated that little human relations training was being provided as part of the preparation of teachers and those teachers indicated this to be a viable need in their preparation. The North Central Association, in a publication entitled *Human Relations in the Classroom—A Challenge to*
Teacher Education, urged at this time that teachers should be inservice trained in human relations skills (71).

As the need and acceptance of human relations training in the educational setting grew, a few names are in the forefront of the research that was the foundation of the teacher training in human relations that was developed in the late sixties and early seventies. Robert R. Carkhuff, working in the area of guidance, counseling, and psychotherapy, teamed with B. G. Berenson and C. B. Truax among others to expand his concept of core conditions that he found to be characteristic human relations traits that result in effective teaching (21).

Human relations research done in the decades of the sixties and early seventies focused on teacher interaction skills and their resultant effect on students in the classroom. Carkhuff (17) identified a number of what he termed to be core conditions that were necessary interaction skills for effective teaching. These skills included empathy, respect, warmth, genuineness, self-disclosure, confrontation, and immediacy of relationship. Brooks (14) found that student teachers with human relations training had higher regard toward their pupils and established better teacher-pupil relationships with their students. Heinrich (45) reviewed human relations training between 1965 and 1970 and comments that many of the procedures included sensitivity training and role playing. The use of t-groups, therapy groups, and encounter groups was common during this period (69).

There is research, cited later, to support the premise that positive human relations skills practiced by teachers can result in greater
achievement by the students of those teachers. Human relations literature of the sixties and seventies centers on human relations training within the context of improving teacher effectiveness through the development of interpersonal skills. Infrequent connection is made during this period about human relations training dealing with the problems of racism, prejudice, and bias in the educational setting.

The courts and government policy through the fifties, sixties, and seventies have served as a strong influence for the integration of previously separated cultural groups. This influence has been a decidedly important factor in the development of the multicultural focus in human relations training as we know it today. Controversy about racial prejudice is nothing new to the American society, and the schools have had their share of attention relative to this issue. Racism is an educational issue that once again came to prominence with the 1954 Supreme Court decision in the case of Brown v. the Board of Education of Topeka, 347 U.S. 483 (1954). The Court in Brown I and Brown II, 349 U.S. 294 (1955), determined that schools should be desegregated, "with all deliberate speed." This decision was reinforced in 1971 in the case of Swann v. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Board of Education, 402 U.S. 1 (1971), when the Supreme Court inferred that students should attend a school that approximates the racial proportions of the district as a whole in order to prepare students to live in a pluralistic society. This decision which focused upon school busing to facilitate desegregation served to motivate districts that had not moved toward desegregation as quickly as they might following the Brown decision. The court said that segregation in a
district that is the result of the geographic settlement of ethnic groups (defacto segregation) is not acceptable, and that students should be bused to other areas of the district to achieve racial balance.

The court further encouraged busing as a viable means to desegregate in the order made in the case of Davis v. School District of City of Pontiac in 1971, 404 U.S. 913 (1971). The point of busing again supported the Swann v. Mecklenburg case, as the court said that since bus transportation is already an integral part of public education, busing to achieve integration is not discriminatory or a hardship.

Multicultural education evolves

In 1974, the Supreme Court in Lau v. Nichols, 414 U.S. 563 (1974), held that failure to provide special instruction to students who do not understand English was discrimination against those students. This decision acknowledges that those students who may represent a minority group are entitled to recognition and special treatment in the public schools. This decision was somewhat contrary to the melting-pot theory that all ethnic groups are to be absorbed into the predominant American culture.

The federal government applied pressure to schools to desegregate with the 1964 Civil Rights Act. The result of this act was to prohibit federal financial aid from being granted to any school that was discriminating on the basis of race.

The courts and government policy through the fifties, sixties, and seventies have acted to force the integration of previously separated cultural groups. While it is one thing to pressure, require, or force the
integration of the nation's schools, it becomes another problem to help the resultant new mixture of students learn to get along together and, perhaps more importantly, be able to live together as productive members of our society when they become adults. It was the realization of this need not only to put the various ethnic and minority groups together to make our society stronger, but the need for us all to understand and appreciate those who may differ from us that precipitated the shift of the human relations movement focus from group dynamics and studying the self in relation to groups to the multicultural approach. The multicultural approach enlarges the human relations concept to deal with such things as recognizing and dealing with bias, understanding and dealing with other subgroups, and respecting human diversity and individual rights. Those realizing this need have used the courts and government policy as a tool to influence the educational system to become more responsive to the multicultural viewpoint.

The events which led to the evolvement of multicultural education preceded its development by many years. Suzuki (83), in chronicling the historical antecedents of multicultural education, went back to the period of 1880 to 1920 when the period of massive migration from Eastern and Southern Europe was taking place. During and following this period, the native, white, Anglo-Saxon protestant (WASP) majority sought to eliminate the cultural identities of these immigrant groups by using the school system to assimilate them into the mainstream of American culture. While the melting-pot metaphor prevailed during the first 60 years of this century as an incentive to immigrant groups for upward mobility, it
perhaps existed more so because the largest ethnic group, the WASPSs, feared losing control.

When the social upheaval of the sixties occurred, most white ethnic groups had been assimilated into the American culture, but the racial minorities had not. The urban riots of the sixties paralleled the period when the courts and the federal government were forcing the desegregation of schools. This action served to reinforce the militance and ethnic-consciousness of racial minorities that manifested itself at that time. It was during the period of the late sixties that colleges, universities, and secondary schools were pressured to initiate ethnic studies programs.

Banks (7) related that these programs were developed in schools with significant minority enrollment and the classes were composed of minority members and taught by minority members. The assumption at the time was that only Blacks needed to study about Blacks and only Mexican-Americans needed to study about Mexican-Americans. Banks went on to point out that while this result may help ethnic groups become more aware of their own heritage and culture, it did little to develop the pluralistic concept in the society since each ethnic group remains unaware of the other groups.

Banks proposed that the key to multiethnic education is for the content of American history and social studies curriculum to be the same for all students regardless of their ethnic background, race, or social class. The content of this curriculum should include the heritage and culture of all ethnic groups so that each group can come to know and understand the other.
The melting-pot concept that prevailed through the first half of this century, as immigrant groups were assimilated into the American culture, had a tendency to devalue the cultural characteristics of those minority groups who were being assimilated (66). The ideal represented was that white middle class values were good and all others were bad. As the multicultural concept has developed, ethnic and racial groups are rejecting this notion saying that their values and culture may be different but not inferior.

During the time of the sixties, which saw urban riots in the cities, demonstrations on college campuses and in Washington D.C., as well as peace marches in the South, there came to be a significant backlash from ethnic and racial minorities whose cultures had been repressed by the white Anglo majority for so many years. There came a new wave of pride among ethnic groups as a reaction against the longstanding condescending attitudes of the white Anglo-Saxon majority.

Suzuki (83) observed how the feminist movement started during this period as a reaction to sex role stereotyping that had resulted in discrimination against women in the educational system, in the working world, and in the social setting.

The concept of multicultural education emerged during the decade of the seventies as a recognition that the society should be more democratic in its treatment of all ethnic groups. Multicultural education was a realization that the problems of racism, sexism, and inequality in education could not be understood by studying each of these groups in isolation. The problems to be addressed could best be dealt with by
having all the ethnic groups, including the white Anglo-Saxons, study about all groups. This meant that what was to be taught in the educational system must incorporate the background and view from each ethnic minority.

**Multicultural nonsexist and education mandated**

Minnesota was the first state to deal with the challenge of multicultural education in its educational system. Following racial incidents in Minneapolis and St. Paul in 1967 and 1968, the Minnesota State Legislature mandated and funded a program to provide human relations inservice education for teachers in the major urban areas of the state (12). The outcomes of the evaluation of this program led to the foundation of Minnesota's Edu 521. It was the nation's first statewide mandate that all teachers have human relations training as part of the state certification requirement. This requirement was passed in 1971. The criteria for the Minnesota human relations requirement, which have a good deal of similarity to the Iowa criteria, are:

- **AA** understand the contributions and life styles of the various racial, cultural, and economic groups;
- **BB** recognize and deal with dehumanizing biases, discrimination, and prejudices;
- **CC** create learning environments which contribute to the self-esteem of all persons and to positive interpersonal relationships;
- **DD** respect human diversity and personal rights.

Iowa is among a few states, which include Wisconsin and Georgia, to implement a human relations training requirement for teacher certification and recertification.
In 1975, the Iowa State Board of Education adopted multicultural nonsexist curriculum guidelines which were to be implemented at all grade levels in every school district. Tom Anderson, DPI Urban Education Consultant, who was involved with the development of these guidelines and with 670: 13.18-22 of the Iowa Administrative Code, the Iowa Human Relations Requirement, pointed out that once the curriculum guidelines were adopted, the teachers still did not know what to do about it. This stands to reason as there were teachers who were products of, and part of, an educational system that had been a part of, and a proponent of, the melting-pot theory for many years. This system taught white middle class culture and values while ignoring ethnic minorities.

To equip teachers to teach effectively from a multicultural nonsexist perspective, the state board developed the Human Relations Requirement for Teacher Education and Certification, which was approved by the board on January 8, 1976. This requirement was written by a task force of five DPI members and a statewide advisory committee of 21 persons.

The substance of this requirement (670-12:18 to 670-13:22 of the Iowa Administrative Code) requires that all teachers applying for certification or recertification after August 31, 1980, must have fulfilled the human relations requirement; provides for agencies other than teacher preparation institutions (such as area education agencies) to develop teacher training components; requires advisory committees to develop training components; and outlines the six criteria by which training components will be approved by the state board. These six criteria are the basis for this study.
In 1977, the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education culminated a 5-year effort to include multicultural education as a part of the preparation of teachers. The revised standards include evidence that the accredited institution "gives evidence of planned provision for education curriculum including both the general and professional studies component" (65, p. 30). The new standards provide that the multicultural concept should be integrated throughout the teacher education curriculum as opposed to being set aside as a separate course of study. This standard by NCATE represents a significant step in the multicultural cause for two reasons. First, it gives recognition and sanction to the legitimacy of multiculturalism as a need in an educational system. Secondly, as the standard affects teacher preparation on a nation-wide basis, it will address the problem through training and changing the teachers of our schools. Teacher training must preclude any change in students.

Inservice and Preservice Teacher Training in Human Relations

When proposing a requirement of human relations training for all teachers in a state as a requisite for a teaching certificate, a logical question to ask might be whether there is a research base that indicates that such training results in desired changes in values and attitudes. Blackburn, in an interview with Minnesota State Department official Donald Hadfield, and this writer, in an interview with Iowa Department of Public Instruction Urban Education Consultant Tom Anderson, found that neither state did an extensive review of the research done in this area as a basis
for developing their respective human relations programs. Both states did include members on their statewide advisory committees who were somewhat knowledgeable in this area and aware of the research that had been done.

In his study on the effects of mandated human relations in Minnesota, Blackburn (12) compared trained and untrained teachers and found positive results with trained teachers in one of the three Minnesota criteria he was measuring. He found trained teachers more able to recognize and deal with bias, discrimination, and prejudice. There were no differences in his study in the ability to create learning environments that contribute to self-esteem and positive interpersonal relations, or to the willingness to respect human diversity and personal rights.

There is a body of research to indicate that the training of teachers in human relations skills does make a positive difference in those teachers. Robert R. Carkhuff did research on the effectiveness of counselors through human relations skills which has become the foundation of a good share of the human relations research done through the decade of the seventies. The work of Carkhuff and Truax (21), Carkhuff and Berenson (20), and Carkhuff (17, 18) is frequently cited as related literature to research in the area of human relations that has been done since that time. As previously mentioned in this writing, the work done by Carkhuff and others established the interaction skills of empathy, respect, warmth, genuineness, self-disclosure, confrontation, and immediacy of relationship as skills that result in effective teaching.

Khanna (59) described a human relations training program that was conducted under the sponsorship of the U.S. Office of Education involving
150 educators in Tennessee. This study revealed that over a period of time, educators exposed to human relations training became less authoritarian and more self-actualized. These educators were also perceived more positively by their students and their supervisors.

In a study to determine whether student teachers who received human relations training as part of their professional preparation functioned differently from student teachers who had not been trained, Childers (24) found that those who were trained tended to behave more humanistically in the classroom. The experiment included a group of 19 student teachers who had received 15 hours of human relations training and a control group of 19 student teachers who had not. The students were observed and rated using the Flanders System of Interaction Analysis. It was found that trained student teachers were less critical, spent less time justifying authority, and stimulated more student talk. Trained teachers also indicated more acceptance of feeling and praise as well as offering more encouragement.

Brooks (14) also studied the effects of human relations training on the attitudes of student teachers. This study compared 42 student teachers who were divided into an experimental and control group. The experimental group received 26 hours of specialized human relations training. Pre- and posttests were given using the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory. The data indicated that the student teachers who were trained had a higher regard toward their pupils, demonstrated a greater congruence with the students, and were more open toward the pupils in their classes.
Mack Henington (46) followed the revision of the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) multicultural nonsexist standards in 1979 with a study to determine whether multicultural nonsexist instruction could positively modify the knowledge, attitudes, and personal values of secondary student teachers toward children perceived as disadvantaged by race, color, ethnic background, and/or sex. He studied 73 secondary student teachers, 26 of whom had received human relations training and 47 who had not. The experimental group received a concentrated week of multicultural nonsexist instruction from five university curriculum specialists. Henington not only wanted to determine whether training resulted in a change in student teachers, he also wanted to determine if the change was lasting. He administered a posttest following treatment and another 26 days later. Using the Personal Orientation Inventory, the Wilson Multi-Factor Attitude Inventory, and the revised White's Knowledge Scale, Henington found that the human relations training had increased the knowledge and improved the attitudes of the trained group, but their personal values were not significantly altered. Retesting 26 days later indicated that the student teachers in the experimental group had retained a significant increase in knowledge, but their attitude change was no longer significant.

The Iowa human relations requirement provides that preservice teachers may meet the requirement as part of their undergraduate teacher preparation, and that inservice teachers may meet the requirement as part of the additional training needed for certificate renewal. One of the questions this study will address is whether there is any difference in
the resulting effects human relations training has on preservice teachers as compared with inservice teachers.

In 1973, Hartzell, Anthony, and Wain did a study that compared student teachers who were trained before the student teaching experience with a group trained during student teaching. The experiment included 44 elementary level student teachers. Twenty hours of human relations training was given to 13 of the teachers a month before student teaching, nine received 20 hours of training while student teaching, and 22 served as the control group which received no training.

The effect of the human relations training was assessed by having the student teachers respond to a series of taped student statements. The responses were rated by two experienced raters. The subjects were all rated before and after their student teaching experiences. The assessment rated the subject's skills in empathy, respect, genuineness, immediacy, and confrontation.

The results indicated that the trained student teachers scored higher than the control group both before and after student teaching. The preservice group scored higher initially but showed a marked decrease in skills by the end of the student teaching experience. The group trained concurrently with student teaching maintained their skill level. The results of this study might indicate that teachers who are given human relations training during inservice carry more of the training and skills with them after the training experience (43).

Banmen and Capelle (9) attempted to determine if changes that result from human relations training have a lasting effect. The subjects of
their study included a group of 50 teachers, administrators, counselors, and aids from three rural Manitoba high schools. The participants were given a concentrated 27-hour training program and were given a pretest before the training, a posttest following the training, and a follow-up assessment 3 months after the training. The measure focused on values and behaviors important to the development of self-actualization, which were measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory and teacher beliefs about the teaching process as measured by the Educational Process Opinionnaire. The results showed positive changes in both areas evaluated as a result of the training. The follow-up indicated that the changes in self-actualization were maintained while the beliefs about the teaching process had disappeared. Their findings bear some similarity to those of Hartzell, Anthony, and Wain, who found that the training of inservice teachers produced lasting results.

In an effort to make human relations training available to Minnesota teachers who needed to meet the state's requirement for recertification, the University of Minnesota's College of Education developed a training program that was administered to provide inservice training for teachers through the Continuing Education Division. The model for this training program was developed to meet the four criteria of the Minnesota requirement. These four criteria closely parallel the six criteria of the Iowa Human Relations Requirement. The training involved 10 weekly sessions of about 5 hours each in large-group sessions, 2 additional hours of small-group work, and field study projects developed by the small group which were designed to be carried out in the teacher's own school setting.
Redman (75) sampled participants in this program for the amount of empathy for minority persons. He found that empathy increased for participants in the training program, and that a follow-up 10 weeks later indicated no decline in the degree of empathy.

Not all research done has shown that human relations training results in the outcomes intended. Heinrich (45) analyzed 43 human relations training programs being practiced in public schools between 1965 and 1970. She concluded that there was little evidence that human relations training had produced positive results in public school settings.

Miller (64) studied the effects of a human relations component in an introduction to educational course on the self-concept and interpersonal relations of the preservice teachers. Miller found no significant differences between the experimental and control groups as a result of the training.

In a study measuring prospective teachers, Bailey (4) found trained subjects to be better in communications skills, but no different in the dimensions of openness, flexibility, and attitude.

Fauth (32) measured a group of 117 inservice teachers and 26 teacher aids who enrolled in human relations laboratory training. She sought to determine three things: (1) Whether such training would change attitudes of racial prejudice, acceptance of self and others, and classroom teaching behaviors. (2) Whether white participants' change would be different from the change of minority participants. (3) Whether the changes would be long-lasting. The measuring instruments were administered before training, after training, and 6 months later. A random sample of 25 of
the teachers were videotaped in their classrooms during the 6 months following training to observe their classroom behavior. Fauth found that 6 months after the training, racial prejudice was significantly decreased, the acceptance of self and others was increased, and that white teachers showed greater change than Black teachers. The results of the study found significant lasting change in teacher attitudes, but no significant changes in classroom behavior by the teachers.

In a study to determine whether human relations training is more effective with males or females due to the differing emotional tendencies of the two, Hippie (50) studied a group of 40 males and 39 females who participated in a human relations training laboratory. The participants were measured with the Interpersonal Relationship Rating Scale, the Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation Behavior Scale, and the Self-Disclosure Questionnaire. In addition, a significant other was used to evaluate behavior changes in the home environment of each subject. While Hippie found significant differences in the students who had been trained over those in the control group, contrary to his original hypothesis, he found that the sex of the participants had no relationship to the outcomes. This conclusion was supported by the measures given to the participants and the evaluations by the significant others.

There are indications based on research that the attitudes of teachers can be changed with human relations training. The evidence is not as clear as it might be since each researcher measures a different aspect of or combination of aspects of the human relations concept. The fact that human relations training is without a clear definition makes the
comparison of existing research more difficult since each researcher
develops his or her research from the perception he or she has of what
human relations training is. Human relations as a means to cultural
pluralism is a relatively recent direction that human relations training
has taken. Much of the available research is centered on the
communication and interpersonal relations part of human relations rather
than the aspect of cultural diversity, bias, and prejudice.

Curriculum Practices and Pupil Outcomes
Related to Human Relations Training

The study by Fauth reviewed in the last section has an important
implication about the role of curriculum in multicultural education.
Fauth found that human relations training changed the attitudes of
teachers but did not change their behavior in the classroom. Other
sources reviewed in this section refer to the same problem in various
ways. Others are saying that attitude change or increased awareness on
the part of teachers does not assure that what is being done in the
classroom, where the students are contacted, will be changed or improved.
And yet, there is information that does document higher pupil growth and
achievement in classrooms taught by teachers who have had human relations
training.

Katz and Ivey (58), in addressing the issue of how programs dealing
with racism should be developed, feel there is no systematic training
method that assures both attitude and behavior change in teachers.
Implications that human relations training programs were not getting the
job done were the result of a survey Cross and Deslonde (27) made of 82
southern California teachers. Of those surveyed, 40 percent did not feel they increased their knowledge and understanding. Forty-one percent did not feel they increased their understanding of racism or sexism. Forty-eight percent did not feel they increased their knowledge of current problems and needs of minority students. It was felt that some of the negativism and resentment that was generated from this survey came from the mandated nature of the training. California requires multicultural education in districts comprised of at least 25 percent minority students. Whatever the case, the indications are that these teachers did not feel they were making a positive impact upon their students as a result of this training.

Arciniega (1) related multiculturalism to the curriculum with a comparison of the equal opportunities of the American educational system to the equal benefits of the system. He claims that all students may have a reasonably similar access to schools that are approximately equal in staff, materials, and facilities. The problem, as Arciniega identified it, is that this system is a product of and directed toward the white middle class cultural identity; students who come to it from other cultural groups do not receive the same benefits from a system that does not recognize or make any adjustment or accommodation to their values, history, and life style. Arciniega outlined five major problem areas that are creating cultural dysfunction in our school systems:

1. Inadequate treatment and presentation of the historical, cultural, and economic contributions made by ethnic minorities in the curricular programs of the schools.
2. Pejorative and pathological perspective regarding the appropriateness, worth, and status of minority languages or dialects as bona fide media or instruction in the classroom.

3. Underrepresentation of ethnic minorities on school district faculty and staff personnel.

4. Lack of authentic involvement of minority communities in the decision making structures of the school system.

5. Testing, counseling, and guidance programs and processes that are based on a cultural deficit perspective of minority student needs.

Arciniega recommended that multicultural programs should focus on helping minorities to cope more effectively with the disadvantages they face. In his opinion, the teacher is the key to successful multicultural education. This part of training should try to "provide students with authentic basic intellectual knowledge, career guidance and training, along with the necessary human and conceptual skills about the institutional structure of society" (1, p. 61).

The greatest share of those currently teaching in elementary schools, secondary schools, and universities where teachers are being trained are themselves products of an educational system that was developed from the melting-pot theory. The system is still based strongly on rural orientation, since this was a rural society when the educational system was developed. Our students continue to experience content and instructional techniques that were appropriate and met the needs of a rurally homogeneous society (6).

Frazier (33) pointed out quite strongly that a real change toward multicultural education can only result when the attitudes of inservice
teachers are significantly modified and when preservice teacher education is turning out teachers with the appropriate attitudes. He claimed that the most difficult of these two will be to change the attitudes of inservice teachers. He asserted that the key to achieving multicultural education is with the teacher. Frazier is correct as far as he goes in emphasizing the importance of attitude change in the achievement of multicultural education. Other studies previously cited indicate that teacher classroom behavior must also be a part of an educational environment that is multicultural and without bias.

Upon identifying what he considered to be four exemplary multicultural teacher training programs, Baker (6) sought to determine some of their common characteristics. The four included San Diego State University, University of Houston, University of Wisconsin at Milwaukee, and the University of Michigan. From these programs, Baker developed a model summarized as:

**Knowledge.** (1) Students should examine their own culture and have an understanding of the importance of all cultures. (2) Students should be exposed to the diversity of the United States. (3) Students should have experience that will encourage and develop positive and supportive attitudes about ethnic/cultural diversity.

**Experiences.** Students should be involved in situations that will provide them opportunities to have direct contact with individuals who differ from them.

**Language.** Students should understand the importance of language to culture.

**Proficiency language.** Students should be familiar with a second language and the culture from which that language emanates.
Specific cultural exposure involvement. Students should have the opportunity to specialize in one or more ethnic/minority cultures of their choice.

Methodology. (1) Students should be able to design, implement, and evaluate multicultural instruction materials. (2) Students should be able to analyze, evaluate, and select for use commercial materials. (3) Teaching strategies and techniques should be developed that will allow for cultural individualized teaching/learning environments.

Philosophy and commitment. (1) The entire institution must be committed to the goals of multicultural education. (2) The faculty must represent ethnic/cultural diversity as well as both sexes. (3) Financial support would be part of the total financial support structure. (4) The multicultural program must be an integral part of the entire training process and the total curriculum.

Baker pointed out that most teachers are products of middle class homes and communities. These teachers have limited contact with lower social-economic groups or minorities and they possess the traditional biases that have been built into the current educational system. A key to Baker's model for multicultural training seems to be the experience of direct contact with individuals of other ethnic backgrounds.

At the college and university level, efforts to implement multicultural education began as early as 1972. Mohr (65) described the eventual adoption of multicultural content standards by NCATE. As he described it, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) in 1972 had recommended a modification of NCATE's curriculum standards to include multicultural education. At this time, the AACTE had been developing standards for NCATE, as NCATE had no committee on standards. A difference of opinion between the National Education
Association (NEA) and AACTE, which was eventually resolved by the establishment of a committee on standards for NCATE, was part of the reason that five years elapsed from the time multicultural curriculum standards were recommended and finally adopted by NCATE in April of 1977. The standards went into effect January 1, 1979. The NCATE standard is a broad one that is intended to permeate all aspects of accredited teacher preparation programs, as implied by this statement from the standard:

Thus, multicultural education is viewed as an intervention and ongoing assessment process to help institutions and individuals become more responsive to the human condition, individual cultural integrity, and cultural pluralism in society.

Provision should be made for instruction in multicultural education in teacher education programs. Multicultural education in teacher education should receive attention in courses, seminars, directed readings, practicum, and other types of field experiences.

Multicultural education could include but not be limited to experiences which: (1) promote analytical and evaluative abilities to confront issues such as participatory democracy, racism and sexism, and the parity of power; (2) develop skills for values clarification including the study of the manifest and latent transmission of values; (3) examine the dynamics of diverse cultures and the implications for developing teaching strategies; and (4) examine linguistic variations and diverse learning styles as a basis for the development of appropriate teaching strategies (69).

Such a sweeping adoption for teacher preparation standards should have some effect on the need to change teacher attitudes to implement true multicultural education. Research already cited in this chapter has shown that human relations training can change the attitudes of preservice and
inservice teachers and that those changes can be lasting, particularly among those trained while in service.

What the most effective approach might be or where the appropriate emphases may lie for human relations training as a vehicle to implement multicultural education is still in the formative stages. Hernandez (47) indicated that while multicultural education is perceived as a political issue, it will be solved by the changing of value systems.

Katz and Ivey (58) have claimed that racism has been thought of as a Black or minority problem when in reality, it is a white problem. They proposed the study of all races, including whites, as a vehicle for each race to learn about and understand the other by bringing them together since each has a unique racial/cultural background. The participants in the Mahan and Boyle (62) survey acknowledged that multicultural training for preservice teachers was a viable approach, but that half of the training should be field based and at least half of the student teaching experience should be in a multicultural setting.

In assessing the extent of multicultural education in public and private schools, Pate and Garcia (74) polled 150 social studies supervisors across the nation. They found that multicultural programs were not widespread or a viable part of American education. There was little consistency of objectives between programs or general agreement of what courses were appropriate at what grade levels. It seemed that the reduction of prejudice played a small role in most programs. To Pate and Garcia, the state of multicultural education is confusing and lacking in purpose and direction.
Whether the pupil outcomes so far as a result of human relations training have been positive depends somewhat on what outcomes are seen to be important. Ryans (81) found that in elementary classrooms, teacher human relations skills were related to pupil alertness, participation, confidence, responsibility, and self-control.

Hefele (44) discovered that teachers with empathy and high interpersonal skills could communicate more effectively with students and were preferred by students, but that these skills had only a small positive effect on student personal achievement.

Christensen (25) hoped to prove that warmth, permissiveness, and pupil affect-need would result in higher pupil achievement. He found only that warmth increased vocabulary and math achievement.

Evidence that teachers with high degrees of empathy, respect, and warmth engender the same response from their students was determined in a study by Casey and Roark (22). The positive effect empathy and respect can have on student performance is indicated in the following paragraph.

There are some indications that human relations training for teachers can be related to greater academic achievement in students. Aspy and Hadlock (cited in 10) studied the effects of empathy, warmth, and genuineness on elementary reading achievement. Their study showed that the students of teachers who performed at high levels of these characteristics gained 2.5 years in reading achievement, while the students of low performance teachers gained .7 years. This study was similar to one conducted by Aspy in which he found that pupils in
classrooms offering high degrees of empathy, warmth, and genuineness gained an average of 1.6 years in reading achievement per year.

Berenson (10) experimented with 48 student teachers, some of whom were trained in interpersonal functioning. The 12 students in the experimental group were determined to be totally competent in the areas of empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness, and immediacy. The classroom interaction of the student teachers was then analyzed. Berenson found that the teachers with the higher interpersonal skills used more positive reinforcement, were less critical of students, and emphasized less subject matter content. The students of the more highly skilled teachers volunteered more information, interacted more with their peers, and became more involved in classroom activities. The teachers in the control group were more directive and critical. Their students responded more to the teacher than to each other.

A mastery of human relations skills was as essential to a prospective teacher as a mastery of subject matter was concluded by Gazda and others (35). He strongly suggested that students are likely to learn most from teachers who show high levels of understanding and respect for their students. Truax and Tatum (87) reported that pupils receiving high levels of empathy and positive regard demonstrated a greater adjustment to school, teachers, and their peers.

Chiesa (23) showed that teachers trained in behavior analysis and human relations skills can change student academic behavior.
Hefele (44) found that training in interpersonal processes had a significant impact on the ability of teacher trainees to recognize and implement teaching traits that are related to high interpersonal skills.

Academic gains as a result of human relations training may not be directly attributable to the training and skills developed, as implied by Borton (13) in a "Saturday Review" article about Newman Walker, the superintendent who assumed charge of a problem-ridden Louisville school system in 1969. Walker initiated a massive human relations training program and reassigned staff members so that some schools were staffed entirely by teachers who had received the training. At the end of the first year, while academic achievement did not increase, it did not decline in the project schools as it had earlier. Vandalism, suspensions, and dropouts were all much lower in the schools using the human relations approach. This example is one in which a number of beneficial and positive outcomes other than increased academic achievement have resulted from human relations training.

In short, there is a good deal of research that reports positive outcomes as a result of human relations training for teachers. The outcomes show that the level of communication is higher, that the students are more empathetic, they like the teacher, they like school, and they feel better about themselves. Research to show that these students learn to read, write, or calculate better are not as prevalent. The perceptive success of human relations is dependent on where the values are placed on the resultant outcomes with the students.
The research cited in this review is in some ways illustrative of the human relations movement itself. It is fragmented and not clearly defined, like the human relations movement. Human relations as part of a state requirement to achieve multicultural education and to eliminate bias and discrimination in the educational process is relatively recent. This review has shown various bits and pieces to both prove and disprove, support and fail to support, the logic of mandating human relations training for teachers at the state level. Did the Iowa Legislature and Iowa Department of Public Instruction feel that those fragments of positive research, if drawn together by an inclusive mandated training program for Iowa teachers, would transform the Iowa educational system into a system that meets the multicultural nonsexist ideal? In developing and accrediting the methods of training for Iowa teachers, did the state department act wisely in permitting both preservice and inservice teachers to be trained alike? Should this training be given only at the academic level, or can it be just as effective in an informal workshop setting? The research cited in this review points toward the need to seek the answer to these questions.

Issues in Multicultural Education

The previously cited evolution of human relations training has shown how the change in the concept of human relations in education has come to make it synonymous with multicultural nonsexist education. As the attitudes and cultural structure of the American society continue to change, so does the human relations movement continue to change and reflect the changes of the larger society. The review of literature for
this study uncovers several issues in multicultural education that are going to have an impact on future changes in the multicultural movement, depending upon how they are resolved, or not resolved. The section to follow will present some of the controversial issues related to multicultural education without an effort to offer solutions or judgment but simply to present differing viewpoints of issues that are affecting multicultural education today.

The politics of multicultural education

Carl J. Dolce (29), writing in 1973, which was fairly early in the development of multicultural education, expressed surprise at the seeming lack of hostility toward the concept. He felt that there was little evidence that the society as a whole was ready to accept multiculturalism. His opinion was illustrated by the conflict and antagonism that is generated over such inconsequential differences in our society as dress and hair styles between cultural groups. Multiculturalism represents a radical change from the assimilation, or melting-pot, philosophy that has characterized our society for so many years. Dolce implied that there has not been enough realization of what this concept means for it to be taken really seriously. He suggests that the advocates of multicultural education are using it as a vehicle to achieve other ends and that some are using it as a means to increase the power and leverage of minority groups.

Rudman (80) expressed a similar opinion in his claim that the emergence of ethnicity in recent years may be attributed to the convenient use of ethnic groups as voting blocs and as a means of extracting
considerations from government. Rudman also outlined how the dominant group of any complex society will have a set of norms which become the standard of success for all in that society. Other groups who do not succeed, because of difficulty or failure in accepting those norms, may harbor resentment against the dominant group. Ethnicity, Rudman feels, is a manifestation of that resentment.

Minority and ethnic consciousness as a quest for more jobs, greater resources, and increased power for minority groups was cited by Gezi (36) as reasons for the development of multicultural education. Another question Gezi raised is in relation to how multicultural education is approached in the schools. Is the approach a means for minorities to preserve their identity and some of the resultant economic and social limitations that go along with it; or can multicultural education really increase options and upward mobility for minority children?

Also at issue is whether multicultural instruction is in reality remedial instruction that helps to overcome the cultural and educational deficits of minorities. If it is presumed that no culture is superior, then no culture is deprived or in need of help. And yet, when the standard of success is that of the majority, others cannot succeed unless they are brought to that standard, claimed Gezi.

Ornstein and Levine (73) have seen a danger of increased multicultural teaching and awareness resulting in too much emphasis on separatism, which ultimately becomes divisive and disunifying.

Rudman expressed a similar concern that ethnicity has the potential to destroy the very fiber of our nation. He recalled that the
Constitutional Convention was called in 1786 because the Articles of Confederation were not working. They had made the nation too fragmented.

Rudman felt that since 95 percent of the population was born in the United States, they are Americans first even though they may have ancestry with an ethnic minority group. He has contended that America has a 200-year heritage of its own and that its best interests are to build unity.

Multiculturalism may fragment the nation. He has warned of a danger of losing the character that made the nation in the first place in order to solve its social problems.

**Bilingual instruction**

The fundamental issue of bilingual instruction seems to be whether instruction should be over a long period (maintenance) or designed for the student to function with English as soon as possible (transitional). How are the needs of limited-English speaking and non-English speaking students reconciled with their potential for entering the mainstream of American life (39)? The maintenance approach seems to hold with the multicultural ideal by enabling the student to preserve part of his or her ethnic heritage and be proficient in both languages.

Ornstein and Levine have questioned the maintenance approach. They claim it discourages students from mastering English and learning to function successfully in the mainstream. Required bilingual instruction also poses the contradiction of bringing students together for instruction in a minority language who were previously dispersed through busing or redistricting in order to achieve racial balance.
Rudman cited a practical issue related to bilingual instruction in that 71 different languages were identified as spoken by people living in the United States as of the 1970 census. If any or all the students who speak these languages desire, or are entitled to, instruction to preserve their cultural identity, how can we produce or fund the textbooks for them? State and federal funding has been used for bilingual programs in Tagalog, Chaldean, and Cree. How do we determine where to draw the line?

Curriculum issues

Ivie (54, p. 25) claimed that "cultural idiosyncrasies--scraps of information presented merely for their own sake--trivialize rather than enrich the curriculum." He suggested that, while the multicultural ideal is that many cultures be included in the school curriculum, all this knowledge is not of equal worth. Cultural traditions and history that do not enhance the opportunities for the members of that culture to participate more fully in the large society do not belong in the school curriculum. Broudy says that any culture group that makes a claim on public schools should have a "literature, science, language, art, technology, or value system so distinctive that not to study it would deprive not only its members but the whole society of an important human resource" (15, p. 75).

Ornstein and Levine also have cautioned about fragmenting or trivializing the curriculum in the process of trying to achieve all the possible goals of cultural pluralism. They claim, "Ethnic identity by itself, a language, cuisine, folk customs and quaint stories about middle class models or super heroes do not necessarily qualify for subject matter
beyond the elementary curriculum in publicly supported schools" (73, p. 245).

In determining the content of multicultural curriculum, Grambs questions how multicultural differences are distinguished from racial, religious, and social class differences. Grambs has talked about the difference between cultural differences, which are interesting but not significant, as opposed to differences that when emphasized because they are significant, are potentially competitive and divisive. Can material that will meet the goals of multiculturalism be acceptable enough to address that goal without engendering further conflict?

Ornstein and Levine have said that separating students for bilingual instruction or ethnic studies creates a remedial program for minority students. Whether such programs are maintenance or transitional in nature, their effect on the students will be a second-rate education because those students are not benefiting from the regular curriculum while in special programs.

Understanding multiculturalism

Earlier, a reference to Carl Dolce cited a lack of hostility to multicultural education because it is not understood and, therefore, not being taken seriously. He claims the spectrum of perception about multicultural education ranges from those who see it as mere tolerance for dress and language differences to those who see radical changes in value systems and behavior patterns.

Katz (57) asserted that educators have not really accepted the multicultural philosophy and sidestepped the real issue with token
efforts. She claimed that educators play "games" by avoiding the primary issue with a focus on culture of other nations; use token "Black History Weeks" or "Mexican Food Days," which seldom study cultural differences in any depth or integrate culturalism into the total curriculum; practice "institutional inertia" with prolonged talk and study of the issue without any action; or do not acknowledge there is any problem if there are no minorities in the local school.

All the issues are not settled about multicultural education. It is a concept that remains in the transition stage. We do know that it is here to stay and that the programs and advocates of programs are growing in number. The questions arise as to how far to go, how much to change, and what of the traditional curriculum is to be sacrificed to make room for the multicultural curriculum? These are questions that will not be solved quickly or easily.

Summary

This chapter has reviewed literature related to human relations in education to provide a history of human relations development, to show some of the effects of training on inservice and preservice teachers, to discuss how curriculum practices and pupil outcomes may be affected by human relations, and to point up some of the issues in multicultural nonsexist education.
CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purpose of this study was to examine how human relations training and the way in which that training was received affects Iowa teachers. To accomplish this purpose, comparisons were made from a statewide sample of Iowa teachers. This chapter describes how the sample of teachers was drawn, how the measuring instrument was developed, how the data were analyzed, and the hypotheses tested.

Selection of the Sample

The sample of teachers measured in this study were drawn from 15 elementary buildings and 15 secondary buildings throughout the state of Iowa, as shown in Appendix A. The sample was drawn from building populations with the cooperation of each building principal. To provide for the completion of the sample from each building, an agreement to assist with the study was obtained from each principal in advance of the actual sampling. An attempt was made to select participating schools at random, but because no building was sampled without the advance agreement of the principal to participate, the sample is not entirely random, as alternate buildings were selected to replace those in which the principal would not agree to participate. In those cases where the building principal did not agree to participate in the study with his or her teaching staff, the next building on the list in alphabetical order was selected and that principal contacted in the same manner. To get agreement from the necessary 30 building principals, 73 were contacted and asked to participate. To make the sample drawn a diverse representation
of Iowa teachers, two buildings, one secondary and one elementary, were selected from each of the 15 area education districts in the state of Iowa.

The demographic responses on the measuring instrument identified the teachers sampled in subgroups of those who had not had the human relations training, those trained as preservice teachers, those trained as inservice teachers, those trained for post-secondary credit, and those trained through Iowa Department of Public Instruction approved inservice modules. The comparisons made in this study were those made by comparing these subgroups.

Instrumentation

The measuring instrument used to collect the data contained 48 statements to which the participants responded on a Likert-type scale indicating the degree to which they agreed or disagreed with the statement. The statements were designed to measure the knowledge and attitudes of the respondent toward the criteria of the Iowa human relations requirement as spelled out in 670—13.22 of the Iowa Administrative Code.

The statements used in the measuring instrument were either statements extracted from statements used by Blackburn in his Minnesota study, with the author's permission, or were generated by this researcher. Part of Blackburn's instrument included a 90-statement Likert-type measurement of three of the four Minnesota human relations criteria. These three criteria closely parallel four of the six Iowa criteria.
Additional statements were generated to relate to the two Iowa criteria that are not included as part of the Minnesota criteria.

The statements extracted from Blackburn's study plus those generated totaled 85. The instrument was then validated for content by submitting the questions to 14 teachers of human relations, all of whom were certified by the state of Iowa to teach courses in human relations to teachers that would meet the Iowa teacher certification requirement. The group involved in this validation included representatives from the university level, the area education agency level, and the Educational Equity Section of the Department of Public Instruction. The questionnaire used is included in Appendix B. The validation questionnaire asked the respondent to indicate whether he or she perceived the statement listed to be a positive or negative statement and then to indicate as to which of the six criteria in the Iowa Administrative Code the statement was most closely related. The respondents could also indicate the statement was not applicable to any of the six criteria.

The potential for varied interpretation by the respondents, the manner in which the six criteria can overlap, and the diversity of the persons responding to the validation survey not surprisingly resulted in a considerable amount of diversity in response to the statements. An agreement of eight of the 14 respondents on any statement represented nearly 60 percent of those responding and was considered to be a strong enough indication that the statement was related to a specific one of the six criteria. The same standard was applied to the indication of whether the respondent felt the statement to be a positive or negative statement.
Positiveness or negativeness was verified so that, on the tabulation for the final survey, an agree or strongly agree response to a positive statement would be a "correct" answer, while a disagree or strongly disagree response to a negative statement would be considered "correct" for that statement. A difficulty encountered in this process of validation, and which may have weakened the ability of the instrument to measure differences effectively, was the tendency of the validating panel to exclude what were thought to be the more subtle and discriminating statements. Many of the statements included in the final instrument may have been so obvious as to make it easy for untrained, as well as trained, teachers to answer correctly.

In applying the preceding criteria to the original 85 statements in the validation survey, 48 of the statements met the standard and were included in the final instrument. All six of the Iowa human relations criteria were represented, however, not in equal numbers. The six criteria were represented by as few as three or as many as 15 statements. Comparisons were then made on the means of the comparison groups of teachers on the questions grouped for each of the six criteria and on all the questions grouped together as a whole.

Collection of Data

The sampling for this study was drawn by school building. One elementary and one secondary building were selected at random from each of the 15 area education districts in Iowa. The building principal in each building was asked to agree to administer the survey instrument to the teachers in his or her building and to return the surveys together. The
letter and postcard response sent to these building principals are included in Appendix C. In cases where the building principal was unwilling to participate, another school was selected from the same area education district.

A packet of survey instruments for the teachers in each selected building was sent with a cover letter of directions for completing the process. See Appendices D and E for copies of the instrument and cover letter.

Data Treatment and Analysis

The demographic questions on the survey instrument divided the participants into the following categories for comparison:

1. Teachers who have not had the required human relations training. These were teachers who had received a lifetime certificate before the requirement was enacted or those with a professional certificate that has not come due for renewal since the requirement took effect in August of 1980.

2. Teachers who received human relations training as part of their preparation for active teaching (preservice).

3. Teachers who received human relations training after having begun active teaching (inservice).

4. Teachers who received human relations training as part of a regular academic class for college or university credit.

5. Teachers who received human relations training to meet the Iowa certification requirement through an inservice training class that meets
for the required 45 hours of training but is not graded or given for college or university credit.

In addition, for the purposes of more detailed comparison, participants were also divided into subgroups composed of:

1. Those with 1 to 4, 5 to 9, or 10 plus years of teaching experience.

2. Those in elementary (grade levels K-6) and those in secondary (grade levels 7-12).

3. Males and females.

To analyze and test the data for this study, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences was used. For comparing the means of two subgroups, the t-test was used with significance determined by the t-statistic. The analysis of variance technique was used to test the three levels of teaching experience compared in Hypothesis 6.

Hypotheses Tested

1. There are no differences in the attitudes of teachers trained in human relations and those untrained and each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six criteria considered as a whole.

2. There are no differences in the attitudes of teachers trained in human relations as undergraduates prior to teaching (preservice) and those trained after they began teaching (postservice) in each of the six Iowa criteria areas and in all six as a whole.

3. There are no differences in the attitudes of teachers trained in human relations in a class for academic credit and those who met the
requirement through a workshop or inservice module without credit in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.

4. There are no differences in attitudes of elementary teachers (K-6) and secondary teachers (7-12) who have met the human relations requirement in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.

5. There are no differences in attitudes of males who have met the human relations requirement and females who have met the requirement in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.

6. There are no differences in attitudes of teachers who have had 1 to 4, 5 to 9, or 10 plus years of teaching experience in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.
CHAPTER IV. FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to present an analysis of the data collected for this study. The study was concerned with the effects human relations might have on the attitudes of Iowa teachers and whether the type of training, academic or nonacademic, or the time of the training, preservice or inservice, had any significantly different effect on those teachers trained. Following the collection of the data, the statistical tests described in the previous chapter were conducted, and the findings, relative to the hypotheses being tested, are reported in this chapter.

Profile of the Respondents

Teachers from 30 elementary and secondary buildings responded to the questionnaire. Table 1 profiles the 441 teachers who returned the questionnaire via their building principal. Of this total, 313 had met the Iowa human relations requirement, 113 had not met the requirement, and 15 responses were missing or invalid responses. Of the teachers who had received the training, 105 had received preservice training and 186 had been trained postservice. Those trained in a regular class for academic credit included 229, while 59 had trained in a workshop without credit. The totals of the preservice and postservice subgroups and the credit and noncredit subgroups do not total the 313 trained teachers because of marking errors by respondents or inconsistent responses. In these instances, the response was treated as missing rather than risk a respondent being included in the wrong variable group.
Table 1. Profile of teachers included in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>71.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or spoiled</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When trained</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postservice</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or not applicable</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic credit</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit fulfillment</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or not applicable</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary (K-6)</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>39.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary (7-12)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or not applicable</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or not applicable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 4</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 plus</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing or not applicable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1 also indicates the grouping of participating teachers by teaching level, by the sex of each respondent, and by the number of years of teaching experience completed.

Questionnaire Reliability

The 48 questions on the survey instrument had been the questions determined valid from a group of 85 questions submitted to a panel of 14 human relations teachers to rank for validity. This process also categorized each of the selected questions into one of the six criteria outlined in the Iowa human relations requirement. The questions in each of the six criteria categories as well as the 48 questions as a whole were tested for a coefficient of reliability, and the results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 shows that when all questions were considered as a whole, the result was an alpha of .83. This coefficient falls within the acceptable range.

The alpha scores for criteria 1 (.55), 2 (.66), 5 (.60), and 6 (.63) are marginal but still fall within acceptable limits.

The coefficients for criteria 3 (.27) and 4 (.22) are too low to be acceptable. These low alpha scores may be attributed to the fact that there are only three questions for each of these criteria. While the findings are reported on criteria 3 and 4, the reader should be advised that the low reliability of the questions in these criteria might make the indicated conclusions invalid.
Table 2. Reliability coefficients for criteria groupings of questions in the survey instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Number of questions</th>
<th>Question numbers included</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10, 14, 16, 19, 21, 24, 30, 32, 33, 35, 39, 45, 49, 52, 54</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9, 11, 15, 17, 31, 34, 36, 37, 38, 41, 44, 50, 51, 55</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20, 48, 53</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12, 22, 46</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18, 23, 27, 28, 40, 42, 47, 56</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13, 25, 26, 29, 43</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All as a whole</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 1

There are no differences in the attitudes of teachers trained in human relations and those untrained in each of the six Iowa criteria areas and in all six considered as a whole.

The t-test procedure was used to compare the means of trained teachers with untrained teachers. The results are shown in Table 3.

In this study, the respondents answered with strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. In the analysis of the data, the values of the responses were coded so that strongly disagree would have a value of four for negative statements and strongly agree would have a value of one. Strongly agree responses have a value of four for positive statements and strongly disagree a value of one. Agree and disagree responses are valued at two or three, depending on whether the statement is positive or negative. A score of four would then be the highest possible score, and the higher the score or mean, the more consistent the attitude would be with the Iowa human relations criteria.

The analysis of the means compared in Hypothesis 1 shows that, while all the means for trained teachers are higher, the only mean that is significantly higher is that for criterion 3, translating knowledge of human relations into attitudes, skills, and techniques which will result in favorable learning experiences for students. This finding must be tempered, as mentioned earlier, with the fact of the low reliability factor for the questions in criterion 3.

Also noted in the testing of the means of trained and untrained teachers is the failure to find any significant difference when considering all criteria as a whole.
Table 3. Means, standard deviations, and t-values between scores of trained and untrained teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2.7221</td>
<td>0.265</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.6967</td>
<td>0.258</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.0360</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>3.0227</td>
<td>0.359</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2.3974</td>
<td>0.509</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.2832</td>
<td>0.540</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>3.0021</td>
<td>0.436</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.9808</td>
<td>0.387</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2.8959</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.8276</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2.5960</td>
<td>0.464</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.5367</td>
<td>0.504</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trained</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>2.8369</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Untrained</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>2.7901</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level.
The result of the testing of Hypothesis 1 was the rejection of the null hypothesis on criterion 3 and the failure to reject on all other criteria and on all criteria considered as a whole.

Hypothesis 2

There are no differences in the attitudes of teachers trained in human relations as undergraduates prior to service (preservice) and those trained after they began teaching (postservice) in each of the six Iowa criteria areas and in all six considered as a whole.

The t-test procedure was used to compare the means of preservice teachers with postservice teachers. The results are shown in Table 4.

The results showed no significant differences in the groups in comparing all six criteria as a whole, but indicated a difference in four of the six individual criteria.

The tests in criteria 1 and 3 showed postservice teachers have more awareness and understanding of the life styles, history, and contributions of subgroups as well as translating knowledge into favorable learning techniques for students. Postservice teachers had a mean of 2.7572 on criterion 1 and preservice teachers had a mean of 2.6758. Postservice teachers scored 2.4355 on criterion 3, with preservice teachers scoring 2.2885.

Preservice teachers showed significantly higher means, 2.9821 and 2.6710, in criteria 5 and 6 than did postservice teachers who scored 2.8629 and 2.5599, respectively. These scores indicate that preservice trained teachers are better at respecting the diversity and rights of each individual and relating to other individuals and other subgroups. For
Table 4. Means, standard deviations, and t-values between the scores of preservice and postservice teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.6758</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>2.58**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postservice</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.7572</td>
<td>0.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.0756</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postservice</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.0615</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.2885</td>
<td>0.563</td>
<td>2.26*</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postservice</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.4355</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>3.0143</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postservice</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>3.0081</td>
<td>0.422</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.9821</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>2.38*</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postservice</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.8629</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.6710</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postservice</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.5599</td>
<td>0.438</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>2.8442</td>
<td>0.244</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postservice</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>2.8398</td>
<td>0.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

**Significant at the 0.01 level.
Hypothesis 2, the null hypothesis was rejected for criteria 1, 3, 5, and 6, but not rejected on criteria 2 and 4 or on all considered as a whole.

Hypothesis 3

There are no differences in the attitudes of teachers trained in human relations in a class for academic credit and those who met the requirement through a workshop or inservice module without credit in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six considered as a whole.

The t-test procedure was used to compare the teachers trained these two different ways with the results being shown in Table 5.

The results show that there seem to be no significant differences shown in any of the criteria areas or in the comparison of all six criteria as a whole. With the exception of criterion 3, the means are slightly higher for those who were trained for credit, but in no case is the difference enough to be considered significant.

There was a failure to reject any of the criteria areas tested in Hypothesis 3.

Hypothesis 4

There are no differences in attitudes of elementary teachers (K-6) and secondary teachers (7-12) who have had human relations training in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six considered as a whole.

The means of elementary and secondary teacher responses who had received human relations training were compared using the t-test procedure. The results are shown in Table 6.

In considering the six criteria, the means of elementary teachers were slightly higher in five of the six criteria areas. The exception was in the case of criterion 2, where secondary teachers scored slightly higher.
Table 5. Means, standard deviations, and t-values between scores of teachers trained in human relations for academic credit and those trained without receiving credit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.7225</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.7053</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.0785</td>
<td>0.321</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>3.0355</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.3699</td>
<td>0.526</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.4407</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>3.0095</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.9831</td>
<td>0.417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.9097</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.8408</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.5994</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.5698</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>2.8434</td>
<td>0.241</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncredit</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.8112</td>
<td>0.191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6. Means, standard deviations, and t-values between scores of human relations trained elementary and secondary teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.7260</td>
<td>0.287</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.7220</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>3.0832</td>
<td>0.309</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.0382</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.4905</td>
<td>0.515</td>
<td>2.64**</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.3365</td>
<td>0.498</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.9941</td>
<td>0.439</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.0115</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.8544</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.9137</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.5671</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.6206</td>
<td>0.425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.8408</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>2.8306</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the 0.01 level.
The only significant difference, however, was on criterion 3, which showed elementary teachers significantly higher at the 0.01 level of significance. This finding is qualified again by the fact that criterion 3 included only three questions and those had a low reliability coefficient.

In considering all criteria as a whole, the test showed no difference in the attitudes of elementary and secondary teachers.

For Hypothesis 4, the null hypothesis was rejected for criterion 3 with a failure to reject any other of the tested criteria area comparisons.

Hypothesis 5

There are no differences in attitudes of males who have had human relations training and the females who have been trained in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.

Male and female means were compared with the t-test procedure. The results are described in Table 7.

Analysis of male and female responses showed the female scores to be higher in all six criteria areas as well as the six considered as a whole. In three instances, there were significant differences with two of these four being significant at the 0.001 level and the others at the 0.01 level.

Higher female scores were found to be highly significant (t-value 3.63) on criterion 2, which includes recognizing and dealing with bias and being aware of the impact of bias on interpersonal relations.
Table 7. Means, standard deviations, and t-values between scores of
trained male and female teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>2-tail probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.6974</td>
<td>0.255</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.7351</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.9700</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>3.63***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3.1114</td>
<td>0.290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.2555</td>
<td>0.514</td>
<td>3.62***</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.4713</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.9377</td>
<td>0.447</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>3.0359</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.8532</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.9178</td>
<td>0.415</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.5715</td>
<td>0.440</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.6065</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>2.7777</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>3.26**</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>2.8674</td>
<td>0.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the 0.01 level.

***Significant at the 0.001 level.
Females were significantly higher at the 0.001 level on criterion 3. This comparison shows a t-value of 3.62 on the mean comparison of criterion 3.

In comparing the two sexes on all criteria as a whole, the female mean of 2.8674 was significantly higher than the male mean of 2.7777 at the .01 level of significance.

The null hypothesis was rejected on criteria 2, 3, and on all criteria considered as a whole in the comparison of males and females. There was a failure to reject on Hypotheses 1, 4, 5, and 6.

Hypothesis 6

There are no differences in attitudes of teachers who have had 1 to 4, 5 to 9, or 10 plus years of teaching experience in each of the six Iowa criteria and in all six as a whole.

To compare teachers who had met the human relations requirement grouped by these three categories, the analysis of variance technique was used. The results of these comparisons are shown in Table 8. Significant differences between groups were determined by the F-ratio.

The analysis of teacher responses by experience level showed differences between groups on criteria 1 and 3. The Scheffe' multiple comparison procedure was used to determine which pairs of groups within the three were significantly different. Significantly different pairs of mean scores are denoted by footnote "a" in the summary in Table 8.

In the testing of criterion 1 responses, the Scheffe' procedure indicated that the mean of 2.778 for teachers with 5 to 9 years experience was significantly higher than the mean of 2.666 for teachers with 1 to 4 years experience. Criterion 1 includes the awareness and
Table 8. Means and tests for significant differences between human relations trained teachers with 1 to 4, 5 to 9, and 10 plus years of experience on each of the six criteria areas and all criteria as a whole

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria tested</th>
<th>1 to 4 years experience</th>
<th>5 to 9 years experience</th>
<th>10 plus years experience</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 1</td>
<td>2.666^a</td>
<td>2.778^a</td>
<td>2.719</td>
<td>3.281*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 2</td>
<td>3.084</td>
<td>3.093</td>
<td>3.038</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 3</td>
<td>2.253^a</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>2.435^a</td>
<td>3.455*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 4</td>
<td>3.022</td>
<td>3.049</td>
<td>2.977</td>
<td>0.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 5</td>
<td>2.992</td>
<td>2.899</td>
<td>2.852</td>
<td>2.777</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criterion 6</td>
<td>2.686</td>
<td>2.605</td>
<td>2.549</td>
<td>2.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All criteria</td>
<td>2.846</td>
<td>2.867</td>
<td>2.817</td>
<td>1.269</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^aSignificantly different.

*Significant at the 0.05 level.
understanding of various life styles, history, and contributions of various subgroups in our society.

The Scheffe' procedure for criterion 3 showed significant differences between teachers with 10 plus years experience, with a mean of 2.435, and teachers of 1 to 4 years, with a mean of 2.253. Criterion 3 involves translating human relations knowledge into favorable learning experiences.

The null hypothesis was rejected on criteria 1 and 3 for Hypothesis 6 with a failure to reject all other criteria comparisons. The differences were not frequent or consistent enough to indicate any generalizations that could be made about human relations training affecting Iowa teachers of various experience levels.

Summary

This chapter has presented an analysis of the data gathered from the responding teachers in 30 buildings involved in this study. The findings, as they relate to the six hypotheses in this study, were reported. These findings are discussed in more detail in the following chapter in addition to the conclusions and discussion that relate to these findings.
CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study has taken human relations training as a mandated requirement for all Iowa teachers who have been certified, or recertified, after August 31, 1980, and examined the resultant effects on a sample of Iowa teachers. Iowa was among the earliest states to implement such a requirement, a requirement which has been, and continues to be, developed and implemented by more and more states. Such a commitment by Iowa, or any state, to a program such as the human relations requirement, represents a commitment of great amounts of time and resources to enable tens of thousands of teachers to meet the requirement.

A period of several years has elapsed between the time this mandate went into effect and the time of this study. A logical question to result when a program of this magnitude is implemented is to ask whether this training has made any real changes in the teachers who have been trained. The research available indicates that human relations training focused on interpersonal skills and characteristics, such as was prevalent before the multicultural emphasis in human relations training evolved, does result in scattered positive results in trained teachers. Has this been the result of the Iowa method of human relations training?

The Iowa requirement is in place and will remain so for the time to come. As the requirement is here to stay, this study has sought to go beyond the question of the result on trained and untrained teachers and address the questions of whether the time teachers are trained affects the outcome or whether the manner in which they are trained makes a difference. Is the result of the training better when teachers are
trained as undergraduates before teaching or after they have some teaching experience? Postservice teachers have been permitted to meet the requirement through 45 hour workshop sessions conducted by state approved teachers, but without the assignments, papers, and examinations of a regular college credit class. Is this noncredit alternative for human relations training as effective as a traditional academic class?

The sample of teachers was drawn from one elementary and one secondary building from each of the 15 merged area districts in the state of Iowa. The sample resulted in 441 responses which were then separated into the appropriate subgroups for the comparisons needed in the study.

The responding teachers completed a 48-statement survey instrument with Likert-type responses (see Appendix E). The questions were developed to relate to the six criteria of the Iowa human relations requirement spelled out in 670--13.18 through 670--13.22 of the Iowa Administrative Code.

In addition to the three basic questions listed above, the demographic information elicited from the respondents enabled the comparison of elementary and secondary teachers, males and females, and teachers of 1 to 4, 5 to 9, and 10 plus years of teaching experience.

Discussion

For the purposes of scholarly research, the questions addressed have been stated in Chapters I, III, and IV in the form of a null hypothesis. For easier understanding, each is now expressed as one of the six questions in this study and accompanied with a discussion of the findings.
Question 1

Has human relations training made any difference in the Iowa teachers who have completed it?

The 313 teachers in this study who had completed human relations training were compared with the 113 who had not. Seven comparison tests were made, one for each group of questions related to each of the six criteria outlined in the Iowa Administrative Code and one considering all the questions grouped together as a whole.

While the mean scores were slightly higher for trained teachers on all seven comparisons, the tests showed the only higher score to have any significance to be that of criterion 3. Since criterion 3 included only three questions of a low reliability index, this finding has minimal weight.

The overall conclusion to Question 1 is that human relations training has made no difference in Iowa teachers. This could imply that the entire effort has failed, or it could mean that this program, being implemented in the context of the times in which we live, has been successful enough to influence untrained as well as trained teachers.

The review of literature in Chapter II outlined how the courts, legislation, and a rising ethnic consciousness through the sixties and seventies have created a widespread awareness and pressure for the recognition and equitable treatment of minority groups. Iowa schools have also implemented 5-year multicultural nonsexist plans that involve the screening of teaching materials, rewriting of curriculum to make it multicultural, and inservice training of teachers, even those teachers who have not had the training to meet the Iowa human relations requirement.
It is virtually impossible for any Iowa teacher active in the years between 1978 and the time of this study not to have been exposed to multicultural nonsexism.

Is it possible that the trained teachers are influencing untrained teachers and that other related events are influencing untrained teachers to the extent that their scores on a comparison such as used in this study are not significantly lower? If such is the case, the Iowa mandate has not been a failure.

Another point of view would be to consider the mean score of the trained teachers rather than the difference between the mean of trained teachers and the mean of untrained teachers. The survey responses were on a four-point scale, making an answer of three or four a "right" answer. In Chapter III of this study, a reference was made to the tendency of the validation process to eliminate the most discriminating questions and include the most obvious and "easy" questions. With this in mind, we note that with a mean of 2.7221, the trained teachers select the "right" answer only a bit more than half the time. Is it possible that trained teachers are so unaffected by the training that their scores on a comparison such as this are not significantly higher than untrained teachers? If this is the case, then the Iowa human relations training mandate has not accomplished much.

Question 2

Is there any difference in the effectiveness of human relations training if the teacher has received the training as a preservice teacher versus a postservice teacher?
Of the sampled teachers who received human relations training, 105 had been trained preservice and 186 had been trained postservice. The same seven comparison tests were made as were made for the subgroups in Question 1.

The comparisons of these two groups showed no real difference when considering all the questions as a whole. Indications from the review of literature hinted that postservice teachers might profit most from human relations training. However, the average score on all questions together was slightly higher for preservice teachers in this study, even though that difference was not determined to be significant.

In comparing the individual criterion, there were real differences in four of them, with preservice teachers higher on criteria 5 and 6 and postservice teachers higher on criteria 1 and 3. The implication of these results is that preservice trained teachers are better able to respect human diversity and the rights of the individual and also to relate effectively to other individuals and various subgroups other than one's own. Postservice trained teachers seem more aware of and understanding of life styles, history, and contributions of identifiable subgroups in our society, and also better translate their knowledge of human relations into favorable learning experiences for students.

In answering Question 2, there seems to be no indicated advantage of preservice training over postservice training for the Iowa requirement.

In examining the content of criteria 1 and 3, they are found to relate to factual knowledge, skills, and techniques, while criteria 5 and 6 relate to attitudes about the rights of other individuals and other
subgroups. If an assumption can be made that preservice trained teachers would tend to be those who graduated from teacher training programs after the mandate went into effect and that postservice teachers tend to be those active teachers who have gone back for training to meet this requirement, it would be logical to conclude that preservice teachers tend to be younger than postservice teachers. Applying this assumed conclusion to the differences found in the question, two comparisons show the younger teachers, high school products of the seventies and early eighties, to score higher in attitudes about individual rights and relations with other subgroups. Meanwhile, the older teachers score better in the area of knowledge about the life style and history of subgroups and in the skills and techniques for translating this knowledge into positive learning experiences.

**Question 3**

Is human relations training more effective for teachers who train in a regular class than for those who train in a workshop or inservice setting without academic credit?

The study included 229 teachers who had trained for academic credit and 59 who had met the requirement without taking it as a class for credit. The low proportion of teachers who had used the noncredit alternative was a surprise to this author and the difference in the size of the resultant groups made the statistical comparisons for significant differences more difficult to determine.

At the risk of unsettling the American educational system, which is steeped heavily in the daily assignment, term project, and periodic examination format, this study found that teachers who elected the
noncredit alternative, which is "showing up" for the prescribed number of hours, seem to have scored the same on this attitude questionnaire as those who were trained in a class for credit.

The comparisons made in the seven areas did show the averages to be higher for those trained for credit in all areas except criterion 3. However, the tests made showed none of these higher scores to be high enough to be called significant.

This finding would indicate to the state department, which accredits and oversees the human relations program, that both the credit and noncredit modes for implementing the requirement are achieving the same outcomes.

**Question 4**

Is human relations training for Iowa teachers more effective for elementary or secondary teachers?

The same seven comparisons made for the previous questions were made by comparing the averages of 142 elementary and 160 secondary teachers. In those seven comparisons, the averages were very close, with elementary teachers slightly higher in five cases and secondary teachers slightly higher in two cases.

A significant difference was found on criterion 3, with elementary teachers scoring much higher at translating human relations knowledge into favorable learning experiences. This difference is discounted somewhat by the low reliability of criterion 3 questions.
The answer to Question 4 would have to be that there is no difference between elementary and secondary teachers as a result of receiving human relations training.

**Question 5**

Is human relations training more effective for males than for females?

The study included 107 males and 204 females who had completed human relations training. The averages of those scores were compared for differences in the same seven areas compared in the previous questions. The female averages were higher in all seven areas, with some very significant differences being noted in three of the comparison areas.

In comparing all questions, as a whole, the higher female score was noted to be significant at the 0.01 level. Higher female scores were also noted to be very significant for criterion 2, which is recognizing and dealing with bias and being aware of the impact of bias, and in criterion 3, translating human relations knowledge into favorable learning experiences.

The findings in the investigation of this question might substantiate the feeling that the role model that females are encouraged to develop in our society is one of greater warmth and emotion than males who are encouraged to display less open emotion. This study shows female Iowa teachers to be more affected by human relations training than male Iowa teachers.
Question 6

Does the length of teaching experience make any difference in the effect human relations training has on Iowa teachers?

To answer this question, teachers who had received human relations training to meet the Iowa requirement were divided into three groups. Group 1 was composed of teachers with the least experience, in this case, 1 to 4 years of teaching experience. Group 2 teachers had a medium amount of experience at 5 to 9 years. Group 3 was composed of highly experienced teachers having 10 or more years of experience. This question was proposed to provide for an extension of Question 2, which compared preservice and postservice training. Had the analysis of Question 2 led to the conclusion that there was greater effectiveness for postservice trained teachers, this comparison was designed to show how many years of service might be optimum. As the results of the preservice/postservice comparisons turned out to be mixed, this question might have served better if the teachers had been grouped by age rather than years of experience.

Of the teachers involved in this study, 69 had 1 to 4 years of experience, 75 had 5 to 9 years experience, and 168 had 10 or more. The three group averages were compared for differences on all six of the criteria and on all grouped as a whole. The comparisons found only two instances where the difference in the means had any significance. Those were the 1 to 4 year group scoring higher than the 5 to 9 year group on criterion 1, and the 10 plus group scoring higher than the 1 to 4 year group on criterion 3.

An observation noted in the study of this question is that the 1 to 4 year group, which would tend to be composed of the youngest teachers, did
have the highest averages, although not significant, on criteria 5 and 6 dealing with attitudes about diversity, individual rights, and relating to different subgroups. This is consistent with the earlier observation that preservice trained teachers, who also tend to be younger, scored significantly higher on these two criteria.

The comparisons made in answer to this question indicate that no conclusions can be made to indicate any marked difference in how human relations training affects Iowa teachers with respect to their years of teaching experience.

Limitations

This study was delimited to Iowa teachers and the comparisons were made relative to the six criteria of the Iowa human relations requirement as outlined in Chapter 670 of the Iowa Administrative Code. This focus on Iowa teachers relative to the Iowa requirement may qualify any generalizations from this study that may be applied to other geographical areas.

An attempt was made to select the participating schools at random for this study. A result of this process is that the greatest share of elementary and secondary buildings participating in the study were from smaller districts because of the high proportion of small rural districts in Iowa. Another factor contributing to this was a difficulty experienced in getting the principals of larger district schools to agree to participate when they were selected by the random process. The responses measured may be affected by a lack of perspective from teachers in larger
systems where there would be a greater representation of minority teachers and also a sampling of more teachers who deal with minority students.

The relative newness of the mandated human relations training means that nearly all participating teachers have been trained in recent years regardless of the number of years of their teaching experience. There has not been sufficient time to determine what the long-range effect might be on teachers who have been trained.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. Some of the findings in this study hinted that teachers of different ages have different attitudes toward the various criteria. A study of Iowa teachers focusing more on attitudes by age is recommended.

2. Some of the criteria areas studied are difficult to measure quantitatively. The low reliability coefficients on two of the criteria studied in this research have been a limitation. Additional research might expand and refine the survey instrument to measure better and more equitably each of the six criteria.

3. The human relations requirement for teacher certification is but one of many programs, events, and trends that have been part of the increased awareness of bias and sexism in recent years. Additional study on the topic of how human relations training affects teachers might be broadened to include consideration of other ways teachers' attitudes are affected in addition to the training itself.

4. This study has illustrated some of the difficulties in developing and validating an instrument to measure attitudes relative to human relations training. Additional study might go from here to develop a
measuring instrument with more sophistication for measuring differences between the groups compared in this study.
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APPENDIX A. ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY BUILDING TEACHER POPULATIONS USED IN THE SAMPLE
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Merged area district</th>
<th>Elementary building</th>
<th>Secondary building</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Elkader Elementary School Elkader, Iowa</td>
<td>Starmont High School Starmont, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Side Elementary Hampton, Iowa</td>
<td>Ventura High School Ventura, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Harris-Lake Park Elementary School Harris, Iowa</td>
<td>Titonka Jr.-Sr. High School Titonka, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sutherland Elementary School Sutherland, Iowa</td>
<td>George High School George, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Jefferson Elementary School Jefferson, Iowa</td>
<td>Newell-Providence High School Newell, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Garwin Elementary School Garwin, Iowa</td>
<td>Montezuma High School Montezuma, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Southeast Elementary School Waverly, Iowa</td>
<td>Allison-Bristow High School Allison, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>East Central Elem. School Sabula, Iowa</td>
<td>Bennett High School Bennett, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Carpenter Elementary School Monticello, Iowa</td>
<td>Marion High School Marion, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NESCO Elementary School McCalisburg, Iowa</td>
<td>Perry High School Perry, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Woodbury Central Elementary School Moville, Iowa</td>
<td>Aurelia High School Aurelia, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Elk Horn-Kimballton Elementary School Elk Horn, Iowa</td>
<td>South Page High School College Springs, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Stanton Elementary School Stanton, Iowa</td>
<td>Corning High School Corning, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Lockridge Elementary School Fairfield, Iowa</td>
<td>North Mahaska High School New Sharon, Iowa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>New London Elementary School New London, Iowa</td>
<td>Central Lee High School Argyle, Iowa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B. ORIGINAL QUESTIONS FROM WHICH VALIDATED SURVEY INSTRUMENT WAS DERIVED
Dear Colleague:

Thank you for your time and help in the process of validating the following questions for the purpose of research on the effects to date of the Iowa Human Relations Requirement.

Please respond to each statement by indicating to which of the six criteria of the Iowa Human Relations Requirement you feel the statement relates. If you feel the statement does not relate to any of the criteria, circle not applicable (NA). The six criteria from Section 13.21 of the Iowa Administrative Code are listed below for your reference as you respond to the statements.

In addition, on the left of each statement please indicate if you feel it is a positive or negative statement by circling (+) or minus (-). In other words, if the response to the question were to be made on a four point Likert scale, a positive statement would call for an agree or strongly agree response. A negative statement would call for a disagree or strongly disagree response.

A postpaid return envelope has been provided for you to return the materials when finished.

The criteria of the Iowa human relations requirement, Section 13.21 of the Iowa Administrative Code are as follows:

1. Be aware of and understand the various values, life styles, history, and contributions of various identifiable subgroups in our society.

2. Recognize and deal with dehumanizing biases such as sexism, racism, prejudice, and discrimination and become aware of the impact that such biases have on interpersonal relations.

3. Translate knowledge of human relations into attitudes, skills, and techniques which will result in favorable learning experiences for students.

4. Recognize the ways in which dehumanizing biases may be reflected in instructional materials.

5. Respect human diversity and the rights of each individual.

6. Relate effectively to other individuals and various subgroups other than one's own.
1. One important reason for racial prejudice is that Blacks offend people by being so sensitive about racial matters.

2. Real estate agents should be required by law to show homes to Black buyers regardless of the desires of owners.

3. I find people who are different from me more interesting than those who are most like me.

4. America really should be the great melting pot of ethnic minorities.

5. On one or more occasions in the past, I have had negative feelings toward a student because he or she was from a racial or ethnic group.

6. Curriculum materials should be examined for implicit biases which might be deleterious to the self-image of students of particular ethnic groups.

7. I think it is more enjoyable to teach in schools which have students from many ethnic and economic backgrounds.

8. I do not like to teach classes in which there is a wide range of ability levels.

9. Girls should be actively encouraged to prepare themselves professionally for jobs such as physicians, lawyers, and engineers.

10. Blacks came to America as slaves as early as 1619.

11. On one or more occasions in the past, I found myself discriminating against a student on the basis of religion.

12. Reading materials of high adventure such as Treasure Island are useful to maintain the interest of boys in the class.

13. American Indian people are mentally and emotionally equal to members of the society in general.
14. Schools should be most concerned with academic pursuits and leave socialization of the child to the home and family.

15. Conversion to Christianity, fostering meekness and nonresistance, resulted in greater oppression of Blacks as slaves.

16. Racial discrimination is not a major problem in schools in this country.

17. The school should reflect a cross section of our society and reinforce cultural diversity instead of trying to eliminate it.

18. In a junior high gym class the teacher has the boys play against the girls. On the infrequent times the boys lose they have to run laps around the gym.

19. Hispanics were not recognized as an autonomous ethnic group until 1975.

20. I am more interested in whether students learn something than how they feel about themselves.

21. It is more enjoyable to work with teachers who are the same race.

22. The best teaching situation is when students of different ability levels are grouped together in one class.

23. It is a major concern of mine that modern education has lost its academic rigor.

24. While history books are lacking in the amount of American Indian history included, at least the perspective of the role of the American Indian in the development of the West is usually correct.

25. Contemporary curriculum materials are free of biases against racial and ethnic groups.

26. Although I believe in hiring the handicapped, I do not think this should include hiring the blind as teachers.

27. Hispanics of Puerto Rican origin, legal citizens since 1917, did not come to the mainland in large numbers until the early 1950's.

28. I can't trust a person until I know him or her well.
29. My racial attitudes never influence my teaching.

30. I would just as soon live in an integrated neighborhood as one which is not.

31. People with extremely different life styles should be prohibited from teaching in public schools.

32. Caption under a textbook picture: "Israeli leaders Mrs. Meir and Moshe Dayan."

33. Because of the inequities in educational opportunity and hiring practices in the past, American Indians should receive preferential treatment in present hiring practices.

34. People should be allowed to work until they are deemed incompetent on an objective test instead of being arbitrarily retired at a given age.

35. If I were single, I could possibly fall in love and marry a person of another race.

36. Exclusion from the benefits of public schooling or restriction to segregated and inferior schools has created the impression of intellectual inferiority among Hispanics.

37. One important reason Black people are discriminated against in housing is that they don't keep up the property.

38. A person should not have the right to run a business in this country if not willing to serve members of minority groups.

39. The best way to evaluate student progress is to give letter grades.

40. On one or more occasions in the past, I have found myself having negative feelings toward a student because he or she was from a lower social class.

41. American Indians have a continuing struggle to survive throughout American history.

42. One cause of hostility and discrimination against Asian Americans of Chinese origin in the 19th Century was because Americans could not compete with their productivity.
At a time when jobs are scarce and families hungry, it is inappropriate for women, who are secondary earners, to enter competition for jobs with men, who are primary earners.

Maintenance of cultural identity among members of minority groups weakens our society.

Sexism, as it occurs in our society, is profitable for some.

I am pleased that many schools have liberalized their dress codes.

The mysticism and inscrutable nature of the Oriental culture lends itself well to the study of Orientals in social studies.

I have never been guilty of discriminating against students on a racial basis.

Those who live in slums would make a slum out of better housing if it were given to them.

Once I have my mind made up I seldom change.

Asian Americans of Japanese origin have always placed a priority on education, even though they have been unable to find jobs equal to their educational skills.

Example from instructional materials: "These examples of contemporary clothing are of manmade materials."

Girls with masculine tendencies should be counseled as soon as their problem is identified.

An employer should not be required to hire Blacks or members of other minority groups if he doesn't want to.

Until equal proportions of qualified are in all academic jobs they desire, women should be given clear preference in hiring over comparably qualified male applicants.

Homosexuals should be prohibited from teaching.
In the long run, it is best to pick friends whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own.

There should be an end to sex differentiated tracking in the educational system, e.g., so that girls no longer are counseled into feminine careers.

Modern Indian militancy has worsened relations between Indians and Whites.

Modern American Indian militancy has worsened relations between Indians and Whites.

It makes no difference to me whether I'm a black person or a white person.

Blacks who were brought from Africa by force represented many tribes and cultures and frequently had little in common other than their race.

Instructional stories and examples can include ethnic characters, but behavior and success should be measured by prevailing middle class white standards.

Our society over emphasizes youth and has created a "youth mentality" through the media.

People with homosexual tendencies should not be allowed to teach.

I am in favor of strict enforcement of all school rules.

Despite the image of general poverty, about 50 per cent of Blacks are in the middle class.

It is the school's job to eliminate cultural and ethnic differences among students.

Environment has been shown to be a contributing factor to a student's IQ. As a result, minority students with low socioeconomic status can be expected to achieve less in school.
+ 70. Hispanics have a strong regard for the family and maintain close kinship ties across generations.

- 71. I have observed that fewer students are interested in really learning anything in school these days.

+ 72. If a couple have children, then the mother should stay home and raise them while the husband works.

- 73. A better solution to minority problems would be to train minorities for a useful career they are suited for, rather than lowering our college and university academic standards and hiring them in jobs for which they are not qualified.

+ 74. Cuban enterprise has transformed Miami and Dade county into a dynamic commercial center.

- 75. I am concerned that schools today tend to lack good discipline and control.

- 76. American Indians are not psychologically well suited for working in a time oriented job market.

+ 77. Women were not accepted into any state universities until 1858.

- 78. I don't think teachers should ever share their personal problems with their students.

+ 79. Older teachers should consider early retirement to make way for younger teachers with new ideas.

- 80. The children of working mothers are more often juvenile delinquents.

+ 81. We are too easy on kids in schools these days.

- 82. Tracking is a viable means of offering the best educational experience to all students.
83. I feel uncomfortable where people talk about their personal problems.

84. For their own good, Hispanic students should be forced to use English exclusively while in school.

85. Most American Indians spend a lot of time and money drinking.
APPENDIX C. LETTER AND REPLY CARD SENT TO BUILDING PRINCIPALS ASKING THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE STUDY
Dear administrator:

I am currently involved in completing a doctoral dissertation in Educational Administration at Iowa State University under the supervision of Dr. Ross A. Engel. The topic of the study I am doing is the effects of the Iowa human relations requirement for teacher certification. This requirement was mandated for all teachers certified after August of 1980.

As part of my research I have developed a questionnaire that is designed to survey the human relations attitudes of Iowa teachers who have had this training as well as those who have not been trained. To gather the data necessary for the comparisons in this study I am surveying the teacher populations of one elementary and one secondary building selected at random from each of the fifteen merged area districts in the state.

Your building is one of the thirty selected at random to participate in this study, therefore, I am writing to seek your help in administering a fifty-six item survey to the certificated teachers in your building. The instrument is composed of Likert-type questions and can be completed by individual teachers in about twenty minutes. If you will agree to participate, I will forward the survey materials to you. The packet will also include a postpaid envelope for you to return the answer sheets once your teachers have completed the survey. Being a building administrator myself who understands the value of your time, I have tried to design this part of my research to take as little time and effort on your part as possible.

Please respond on the enclosed card if you are willing to participate and indicate how many certificated teachers there are in your building. If for some reason you are unable to participate please indicate so in the appropriate place and return the enclosed card to me.

Thank you for your time and help.

Sincerely,

Gary D. Currie
Yes, I will participate and administer the questionnaire to the teachers in my building.

No, I will not be able to participate in this study.

Principal
School
Address
APPENDIX D. INSTRUCTION LETTER SENT TO PARTICIPATING BUILDING PRINCIPALS
1921 Joan Avenue  
Carroll, Iowa 51401  
April 22, 1985
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Dear administrator:

Thank you for agreeing to administer the enclosed human relations attitude survey to the teachers in your building. Please find enclosed in this mailing the following:

1. Copies of the survey for all certificated staff in your building.
2. The same number of answer sheets for use in answering the questions.
3. A postpaid envelope for the return of the answer sheets to me. (The questionnaires may be discarded.)

You may have your teachers complete the survey as you see best, whether that be during a regular staff meeting or distribution to them individually to be completed on their own and returned to you. If you should choose the latter method, do set some sort of time limit to assure that they are returned within a reasonable amount of time. If one or two refuse to cooperate they have the right to refuse, although the responses are entirely anonymous. Let those go and return the completed answer sheets to me.

The return envelope has been affixed with the necessary postage to return the completed answer sheets for your building. Do not return the surveys.

In the event you get some questions from your staff members and to give you a brief idea of what we are trying to do with this study, I am including a brief outline as follows. Human relations training was mandated for all teachers certified or recertified in Iowa after August of 1979. This study is comparing the resultant attitude changes in three pairs of teacher subgroups:

1. Teachers who have been trained and those who have not been trained.
2. Teachers trained preservice and those trained while inservice.
3. Teachers trained in formal classes and those trained in workshops or inservice modules that meet the requirement but do not offer post-secondary credit.

The survey being used was developed to measure teacher attitudes about each of the six criteria of the human relations requirement as outlined in Chapter 670 of the Iowa Administrative Code. Teachers should give their honest agreement or disagreement to the statements without trying to determine what they think they should answer. Some statements are positive, some are negative, and there are not necessarily right or wrong answers.

It is hoped that the results of the study will provide some useful feedback to the Department of Public Instruction and to the AEA, college, and university agencies that provide human relations training for teachers. To date we are not aware of any such evaluation having been done since this training was mandated.

There is a place on the front of the return envelope to indicate whether you would like a summary of the results of the study.

Thank you again for your help. I encourage you to get the surveys completed and returned as soon as convenient for you.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Gary D. Currie
APPENDIX E. SURVEY INSTRUMENT AND ANSWER SHEET
USED BY PARTICIPATING TEACHERS
Dear Educator:

Thank you for being a part of this study to assess the effects of the mandated Iowa Human Relations Requirement. This questionnaire has 56 items asking your reaction to the statements given and can be completed in about 20 min. Please use a No. 2 lead pencil to grid your responses on side one of the accompanying lavender colored machine scored answer sheet. Mark your responses on the right side of the sheet under the portion that says GENERAL PURPOSE-NCS-ANSWER SHEET. You need fill in nothing else on the answer sheet as your responses will be totally anonymous.

1. Have you met the Iowa Human Relations Requirement that went into affect 1) yes August of 1979 and received approval for it from the Dept. of Public Inst? 2) no

If your answer to question no. 1 was “no” go to question no. 6.

2. Did you meet the Iowa Human Relations Requirement as part of your preparation for teaching or before you began to teach for the first time? 1) yes 2) no

3. Did you meet the Iowa Human Relations Requirement after you had begun to teach for the first time? 1) yes 2) no

4. Did you meet the Iowa Human Relations Requirement by taking a regular class (or classes) for academic credit from a college or university? 1) yes 2) no

5. Did you meet the Iowa Human Relations Requirement as part of a workshop or inservice program that met DPI approval requirements, but did not include academic credit? 1) yes 2) no

6. What is your primary teaching area? 1) elementary K-6 2) secondary 7-12

7. How many years have you taught? (count 84-85 as one) 1) 1-4 2) 5-9 3) 10 or more

8. Please indicate your sex. 1) male 2) female

Please give your reaction to the following statements. For each statement indicate the extent of your agreement or disagreement by answering:
1) for SA if you strongly agree
2) for A if you agree
3) for D if you disagree
4) for SD if you strongly disagree

9. One important reason for racial prejudice is that Blacks offend people by being so sensitive about racial matters.

10. America should be the great melting pot of ethnic minorities.

11. On one or more occasions in the past, I have had negative feelings toward a student because he or she was from a racial or ethnic group.

12. Curriculum materials should be examined for implicit biases which might be deleterious to the self-image of students of particular ethnic groups.

13. I think it is more enjoyable to teach in schools which have students from many ethnic and economic backgrounds.

14. Blacks came to America as slaves as early as 1619.
15. On one or more occasions in the past, I found myself discriminating against a student on the basis of religion.

16. Conversion to Christianity, fostering meekness and nonresistance, resulted in greater oppression of Blacks as slaves.

17. Racial discrimination in schools is not a major problem in this country.

18. The school should reflect a cross section of our society and reinforce cultural diversity rather than trying to eliminate it.

19. Hispanics were not recognized as an autonomous ethnic group until 1975.

20. The best teaching situation is when students of different ability levels are grouped together in one class.

21. While history books are lacking in the amount of American Indian history included, at least the role of the American Indian in the development of the West is usually correct.

22. Contemporary curriculum materials are free of biases against racial and ethnic groups.

23. Although I believe in hiring the handicapped, I do not think this should include hiring the blind as teachers.

24. Hispanics of Puerto Rican origin, legal citizens since 1917, did not come to the mainland in large numbers until the early 1950's.

25. I can't trust a person until I know him or her well.

26. I would just as soon live in an integrated neighborhood as one which is not.

27. People with extremely different life styles should be prohibited from teaching in public schools.

28. People should be allowed to work until they are deemed incompetent on an objective test instead of being arbitrarily retired at a given age.

29. If I were single, I could possible fall in love and marry a person of another race.

30. Exclusion from the benefits of public schooling or restriction to segregated and inferior schools has created the impression of intellectual inferiority among Hispanics.

31. One reason Black people are discriminated against in housing is that they don't keep up the property.

32. American Indians have has a continuing struggle to survive throughout American history.

33. One cause of hostility and discrimination against Asian Americans of Chinese origin in the 19th Century was because Americans could not compete with their productivity.

34. At a time when jobs are scarce and families hungry, it is inappropriate for women, who are secondary earners, to enter competition for jobs with men, who are primary earners.

35. Maintenance of cultural identity among members of minority groups weakens our society.

36. Sexism, as it occurs in our society, is profitable for some.
37. I have never been guilty of discriminating against students on a basis of race. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

38. Those who live in slums would make a slum out of better housing if it were given to them. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

39. Asian Americans of Japanese origin have always placed a priority on education, even though they have been unable to find jobs equal to their educational skills. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

40. Girls with masculine tendencies should be counseled as soon as their problem is identified. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

41. An employer would not be required to hire Blacks or members of other minority groups if he doesn't want to. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

42. Homosexuals should be prohibited from teaching. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

43. In the long run, it is best to pick friends whose tastes and beliefs are the same as one's own. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

44. Legislation, awareness, and action group pressures have eliminated salary inequities between men and women. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

45. Blacks who were brought from Africa by force represented many tribes and cultures and frequently had little in common other than their race. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

46. Instructional stories and examples can include ethnic characters, but behavior and success should be measured by prevailing middle-class white standards. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

47. It is the school's job to eliminate cultural and ethnic differences among students. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

48. Environment has been shown to be a contributing factor to a student's IQ. As a result, minority students with low socio-economic status can be expected to achieve less in school. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

49. Hispanics have a strong regard for the family and maintain close kinship ties across generations. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

50. If a couple have children, then the mother should stay home and raise them while the husband works. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

51. A better solution to minority problems would be to train minorities for a useful career for which they are suited, rather than lowering our college and university academic standards and hiring them for jobs for which they are not qualified. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

52. Cuban enterprise has transformed Miami and Dade county into a dynamic commercial center. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

53. I am concerned that schools today tend to lack good discipline and control. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

54. Women were not accepted into any state universities until 1858. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

55. The children of working mothers are more often juvenile delinquents. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)

56. People with homosexual tendencies should not be allowed to teach. (SA) (A) (D) (SD)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME (Last, First, M.I.)</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>GRADE OR EDUC.</th>
<th>BIRTH DATE</th>
<th>IDENTIFICATION NUMBER</th>
<th>SPECIAL CODES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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