

Formative Evaluation of Equal Opportunity Advisor Training at the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute



DEFENSE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE
DIRECTORATE OF RESEARCH DEVELOPMENT AND STRATEGIC INITIATIVES

Dr. Richard Oliver Hope Human Relations Research Center
Directed by Dr. Daniel P. McDonald, Executive Director
366 Tuskegee Airmen Drive Patrick AFB, FL 32925
321-494-2747

Prepared by
Robert M. McIntyre, Ph.D.



Tech Report No. 19-07

Preface

In the fall of 2001, USN Captain Robert Watts asked the Acting Director of Research, Mr. Jerry Scarpate, to evaluate the Equal Opportunity Advisor (EOA) training. Thereafter, Mr. Scarpate put out a request for a researcher to serve as lead evaluator on the EOA training. I responded to this request and was on my way to a very important and interesting project.

My vision for the evaluation was to examine the multiple-level learning that EOA students engage in. My examination was to be formative in nature...that is, I strove to collect data that might be useful as feedback to the Institute. My vision was also to view the EOA training as a small part of the EOA program...an organizational development intervention for the Department of Defense, intended to promote the Human Goals Statement of the Department. My preference to view the EOA training as a part of an intervention is based on the purpose for DEOMI's existence. So it is appropriate to think of this report, which focuses on the evaluation of the EOA training, as one step in the direction of comprehensive evaluation.

I have written this report with the intentions of contributing to DEOMI as an education institute, whose goals are unquestionably important to the nation. Any apparently negative criticisms are presented with respect for the institution and the individuals who work so hard to make it work. Any apparently positive criticisms are presented in the same light. Both positive and negative criticisms are designed to be formative in nature, so that DEOMI might continue to develop, grow, and serve its mission.

Background

In order to learn whether today's students in the EOA training meet the training objectives, it is useful to review the history of DEOMI and its curriculum. This historical review is intended to show why DEOMI's curriculum takes its present form. It is intended to show that the labor-intensive and time-consuming nature of the training methods used in present-day EOA training have a strong historical and pedagogical basis, grounded in social science and education.

There are two sources that should be essential reading for any DEOMI scholar and practitioner alike. The first source is the "Education Program in Race Relations," the report of the Inter-Service Task Force on Education in Race Relations" (the so-called "Theus Report") (U.S. Department of Defense, 1970). The other is Richard Hope's book, "Racial Strife in the U.S. Military" (Hope, 1979). Both are excellent reviews of the history of inter-group conflict with the military from the nation's founding until the 1970s.

Two other sources that are important for understanding the philosophy of the "small group" element of the EOA training are Babad, Birnbaum, and Benne's book, "The Social Self: Group Influence on Personal History" (Babad, Birnbaum, & Benne, 1983). The other is a chapter written by Birnbaum entitled, "The Clarification Group" (Benne, Bradford, Gibb, & Lippitt, 1975). My reading of these sources indicates that Birnbaum's ideas were the primary influence on the development of the training at DEOMI.

Having identified these four excellent sources, I will now summarize from them what is essential information for understanding the findings in this report.

Hope's History of Black American Soldiers

Americans in general are unaware that Black Americans served in the military in virtually every conflict since the founding of the United States. Richard Hope (1979) described the long and checkered history of Black Americans in the military. (It should be noted that although Richard Hope specifically wrote about the historical plight of the Black American, much of what he discussed pertains to other groups within the United States as well. In fact, the continuing progress that has been made with regard to the Black American military personnel can be thought to have paved the way for similar progress with other groups, namely women, Hispanics and Latinos, Asian Americans, American Indians and other groups.) "Checkered history" implies that in spite of the fact that Black Americans fought courageously, contributed substantially, and were praised for their courage and valor, once the conflicts ended, the contributions of Black military personnel were forgotten or even denied. Black military personnel were treated in many cases with disrespect, disdain, and disregard. Hope describes the Black military experience as a cyclical series of steps.

(1) Blacks achieved distinction for honorable service; (2) this honorable performance was recognized publicly; (3) this heroism was later questioned, continuing the myth of Black soldier cowardice; (4) there was protest of this anti-Black criticism, not in the streets but in the White House and Pentagon; (5) investigation committees were formed, typifying the opposing positions of the Fahy Committee and the Chamberlin Board; (6) the result of this research led to the

development and implementation of the order to integrate the military; and (7) this had a profound impact on dispersing Blacks and other minorities throughout the Services but resistance remained and most Black soldiers retained their lower-level, unskilled ranks.

Table 1 summarizes the history of the Black American soldier from World War II through the development of the Defense Race Relations Institute (also the Defense Race Relations Education Institute).

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
1939	Reluctance to allow Blacks to enlist in service	As in previous conflicts, Blacks were not welcome to participate in the defense of their country	Pressure from Black press changed the tide on this issue
1940-41	Judge Hastie recommends integration in the military	Suggestions by Hastie met with criticism	For example, General George Marshall wrote: The Army cannot be charged with undertaking a problem that has perplexed US throughout the country's history. Integration would jeopardize discipline and morale. "The level of intelligence and occupational skill of the Negro population is considerably below that of the White."
1941-1942	Discussion groups recommended by Judge Hastie	Hastie recommended that the Bureau of Public Relations and Special Service Branch cooperate to encourage discussion groups and education regarding, among other things, the Black American's historical contributions, e.g.	Suggestions were implemented in 1943 and represented the first effort by the military to improve race relations through education.
1942-43	Hastie persona non grata	Judge Hastie's promotion of desegregation led to his being shunned, in effect.	For example, certain documents dealing with the Black troop utilization distributed in the Pentagon contained the message: "not to be shown to Judge Hastie."

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
1943	Hastie resigns	The common attitude was that integration endeavors within the military were “sociological experiments.” Judge Hastie resigned as a result of this resistance.	Apparently as a result of the resignation, many of the segregation plans were abandoned.
February 1943	War Department embarrassed	A Black soldier was named to the National Honor Roll of Race Relations, awarded the Spingarn Medal of Honor, and was later selected to be discussed in “Current Biography.”	This came at the same time when Judge Hastie resigned his positions, leaving the war department publicly embarrassed.
1943	Gibson replaces Hastie	Truman Gibson was designated civilian aide with the job of improving the lines of communication between the different offices within the War Department.	One of his activities involved inspecting the allegations of problems within the 92 nd Division in Europe. He wrote that hundreds of Black soldiers “melted away” but explained his remark. Popular press picked up his “melting away comment” without his explanations. Black press became very angry at the miscommunication of popular press.
December 1943	Executive Order	Pres Roosevelt issues an order requiring all Services to accept Blacks on an equal basis.	1,154,700 Black men and women served in WWII. Most were assigned to unskilled jobs (road building, stevedoring, laundry, and fumigating).

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
1943	Repercussions of Black entry	Intimidation of Black service personnel increased.	Even White MPs participated in intimidation.
Summer 1943	Riots	“Race riots” occurred in installations in U.S., Australia, the South Pacific, & England.	Anecdotal remark by Walter White: Blacks referred not to the Nazis but to their fellow White Americans as “the enemy.”
1945	101 Black officers denied access to an Officers’ Club.	Black officers refused to sign a statement that in effect stated their agreement with a segregation order.	All were arrested for one month until the NAACP forced the War Department to drop charges.
Toward End of WWII	Not a single Black received the highest award for bravery	Most Blacks served in non-combat positions, thereby diminishing the likelihood of their demonstrating “bravery in combat.”	Nevertheless, a laundry worker, Dore Miller shot down six Japanese fighters aboard the USS Arizona. Charles Jackson French towed 15 men by raft from enemy fire in the Battle of the Coral Sea. Many Blacks received presidential citations.
Toward End of WWII	Desegregation Experiment	Army Research Bureau revealed that White soldiers serving with Blacks had undergone a significant change in attitude.	Yet, Black soldiers who had understood that they were to stay in their mixed commands were not permitted to stay.
1946	Violence against returning Black WWII veterans	Hinton wrote that Ku Klux Klan had committed the murders to terrorize returning Black veterans who “were getting out of their place.”	Truman appointed a nine-member Presidential Advisory Commission. Its report (1947) denounced discrimination and segregation in the Armed Forces.

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
1947	Gillen Report	Lt. General Alvan Gillen with a board of officers wrote in a report that there should be increased opportunities for Blacks within the military, a quota system, and segregation between Whites and Blacks.	Black press and the NAACP condemned the report, indicating that the board basically called for “Jim Crow” units.
1948	Executive Order 9981	President Truman signed this executive order that required equality of treatment for all members of the military, without regard for race, color, or national origin.	The order called for fast action to make the order the way of the military.
1949	Fahy committee formed and presented report	Presidentially appointed committee formed to remove confusion on the meaning of the executive order opposed the quota system (Gillen Report).	Integration began and continued under the watchful eye of the Fahy Committee.
1949-1950	Chamberlin Board	The Army appointed this committee to carry out essentially the same functions as the Fahy Committee. Recommended that the Army retain the policy of segregation with a 10% racial quota.	Same board, because it disagreed with the Fahy report was asked to write a new report in the context of the Korean conflict. In 1951, the Board reported that integrated combat units performed better than segregated units.

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
1950	Awards to Black Soldiers	Pvt. William H. Thompson (24 th Infantry) and Sgt. Cornelius H. Charlton were awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously.	This is the highest award received by Black American warriors since the Spanish-American War. Lt. Col. J.T. Corley said the 24 th Infantry (of which he took command) fought more valiantly than any unit to which he had been assigned in Africa, Sicily, and Europe.
1951	Project Clear	Operations Research Officer studied and reported on the effects of integration and segregation in the Army.	The research, focused on the Korean conflict, indicated that integrated units were more effective than segregated units. 85% of officers reported that Blacks and Whites were on par.
1956	Address to conference of the Council of State Governments in South Carolina	General Mark Clark stated: "My World War II experience persuaded me that Negro units in combat tended to be undependable under fire."	The general also yielded to the desegregation tide and stated that "since we have Negroes in the Army...there is really no choice, if they are to share fairly in the burden of the conflict, except to insert a small percentage of them into White units."

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
Circa 1956	Old guard leadership	General and Flag Officers did not disobey President Truman's executive order. They publicly supported it. However, the mid- and lower-rank leaders treated Blacks inequitably in integrated units.	The "letter of the law," as it were was supported. The "spirit of the law" was not supported.
Circa 1956	James C. Evans	This trusted member of the Pentagon's planning echelon indicated that "refinement" was the primary concern of the Armed Forces. Refinement was the term he used to refer to the achievement of more equitable distribution of Blacks throughout the Services.	Evans was able to guide race-related policy that culminated in the development and implementation of President Truman's monumental executive order that required the integration of the Armed Services.
Post Korean War	Black Military Expectations	Black officers and enlisted had high career expectations.	The assumption was that since segregation was officially ended, that the doors were open for career advancement within the military.
1953-1956	Draw down in the military	Post-war reduction in force occurred. Black military accounted for more than 40% of this reduction in Army personnel.	Blatant racism was replaced by institutional policies that unfairly discriminated.

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
By 1954	Great strides in numerical desegregation	Not since the American Revolution were Blacks as integrated into the Armed Forces of the country.	Yet, numerical desegregation did not eliminate discrimination: Disproportionate numbers of Blacks served on the front lines with miniscule chances of promotion.
July 1963	DoD Directive 5120.36	Secretary Robert McNamara issued this directive on equal opportunity. It stated that the policy of the DoD was to conduct all of its activities free of racial discrimination and to provide equal opportunity for all personnel in the DoD.	The directive charged military commanders with the responsibility to oppose discrimination. It empowered commanders to declare off-limits establishments near posts and bases that engaged in discrimination with regard to race, creed, or national origin.
1963	Office of Deputy Assistant of Defense for Civil Rights	This office was created as a result of the above DoD Directive.	Led to the issuance of regulations within each of the Services for implementing the DoD directive.
1965	Draft calls increase	Blacks inducted into the military in numbers disproportionate to the population to serve in the Vietnam war.	In this year, 27% of Black inductees received low-skill assignments compared to 18% of White inductees.
1965	Judge L. Howard Bennett, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Civil Rights	The Judge suggested race relations training for all officers and commanders. This suggestion resulted from the DoD directive of 1963.	However, after the riots of 1966 and 1967, the educational recommendation was revised to include ALL military.

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
Mid to late 1960s	Black military members assert themselves	Inspired by leaders in the Civil Rights struggle, Black members enter the service with newfound identities with their African-American culture and heritage.	“Afro haircuts,” soul music, books by Eldridge Cleaver and Malcolm X became common.
Mid to late 1960s (Continued)	Riots begin	Hairstyle becomes a major issue in the Pentagon. Preference for different music types among the troops from different ethnic groups led to friction and riots.	Racial conflicts and riots occurred with increasing frequency at bases in Vietnam, Germany, and the US.
1969	House Armed Services Subcommittee hearings	Held in Camp Lejeune, the committee directed the Services “to institute a program of education on race relations at all levels of command, with emphasis on the platoon and company levels.”	This was the preceding driving force for Secretary Melvin Laird to create a task force for the development of a race relation’s curriculum.
1970	President Nixon sends an investigative team to Europe	Frank Rearden III heads up this team to determine the cause of the riots. Cause was determined to be the command leaders’ failure to monitor equal opportunity regulations.	Team also found overwhelming discrimination in military justice, military police, work assignments, promotions, management of clubs, and housing.
January 28, 1970	Secretary Laird creates the Interservice Task Force on Education in Race Relations	This Task Force, headed by Col Lucius Theus, was given great latitude and responsibility in determining the appropriate means of providing race relations education.	The Task Force also investigated communications techniques in round-table discussions, panels, and human relations councils.

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
July 31, 1970	Interservice Task Force Submits recommendations	Five-volume work that called for 1. Mandatory education race relations, 2. Establishment of the Defense Race Relations Institute that would educate and train instructors in race relations, develop doctrine and curricula, conduct research, evaluate program effectiveness, and disseminate educational guidelines and material for use throughout the Armed Forces 3. Recommended the establishment of a board of directors and a DoD race relations education board.	Results of the recommendations: DoD Directive 1322.11 in June 1971 which outlined the most comprehensive race relations education program ever attempted by any major institution in this country. Namely, the directive called for the creation of the Defense Race Relations Institute, and for it to initiate required education in race relations designed to prevent racial strife and conflict.

Approximate Date	Event	Description	Results Effects
December 1970	DoD orders issued	1. Establish equal opportunity officer and council at each major unit; 2. Develop numerical goals and timetables to increase fair utilization of minorities in different occupations; 3. Remove or reassign officers, NCOs, and civilians who fail to act against discrimination; 4. Give base commanders power to declare housing within the US "off limits" if landlords engaged in racial discrimination.	An investigation by NAACP corroborated the Rearden Report. This investigation also cited inequities in career assignments, a disproportionate percentage of Blacks assigned to service and supply positions, great dissatisfaction among Black officers, and serious problems with the military justice system regarding the over-representation of arbitrary and inequitable confinement of Black military members in the stockades. Training in race relations became compulsory for all middle and lower level leaders.

It is highly recommended that the original text be reviewed for a complete narrative on the plight of the Black American soldier.

Inter-service Task Force on Education in Race Relations

Table 1 indicates that a primary influence on the development of race relations training in the military is the report submitted by the Interservice Task Force on Education in Race Relations.” Because Colonel Lucius Theus headed the task force, it is often referred to as the “Theus Report.” This report documents the early development of the training in race relations. A study of today’s curriculum suggests clearly that the early developments continue to have significant effects on the curriculum in the Equal Opportunity Advisor training at what is now the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute. In fact, the importance of the “Theus Report” cannot be over-stated if one is to understand in depth the curriculum of today’s Equal Opportunity Advisor training program. For this reason, the following section provides a detailed summary of the contents of the report.

As Table 1 indicates, the Interservice Task Force on Education in Relations (ITFERR) emerged indirectly as a result of President Truman’s executive order, and directly as a result of the military’s need to reinstate harmony, cohesion within military units, and combat readiness of all military members. Accelerated education in race relations was the consensual solution for several of the committees cited in Table 1 for meeting the urgent needs of the military. The ITFERR carried out the important task of identifying the methods and materials for such an accelerated educational system.

The prefatory comments of the ITFEFF’s report cogently indicate that the “Armed Forces have a race problem because the nation has a race problem” (p.7). This straightforward yet incisive comment, I believe, must remain uppermost in any organization’s mission to combat bigotry and prejudice. The military is a “society” embedded in a larger society, the United States of America. If an embedding system suffers a social “ill” such as prejudice, it is likely that the embedded system also suffers the same social ill. This point will be discussed again, later in this report in the “Recommendations.”

Members and Methods of the Task Force

Nineteen members from all branches of the Armed Services constituted the task force. The names of the members can be found in the task force report. Consultants from the educational, research, and psychology (i.e., mental health and well-being) communities were also asked to participate as adjuncts to the task force. To fulfill the task force’s mission, it employed a multi-method approach including the following:

- A thorough review of relevant literature in the area,
- Extensive observations of current training programs pertaining to race relations and human relations,
- Briefings from military departments on the current status of race relations training programs,
- Close alliance with all Services in order to keep up-to-date on their interventions for race relations,

- Seeking the opinions of important sources within the Department of Defense on ideas pertaining to the race relations training,
- Interviews with important individuals knowledgeable in race relations within the Department of Defense,
- And field trips to various locations to understand the curricular challenges associated with race relations training.

Above all, the task force assumed an objective stance so that the most unbiased approach to recommendations for race relations training would be offered.

Summary of Findings of the Task Force From their Initial Evaluation

1. There was an urgent need for an educational program in race relations.
2. Military command must place high priority on the program in order for it to succeed.
3. **Broad level** of guidance (as compared to specific detail) from the Department of Defense as to how the program should be adapted to the specific Services was recommended. However, because of the urgency of need for the program, the task force recommended that Department of Defense provide **specific** guidance with regard to identifying the educational objectives and methods for attaining them. A special board was recommended at the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense to carry out the dual responsibility of providing guidance in the educational and civil rights areas.
4. The objective of the recommended program was the development of an educational program that focused two outcomes: an understanding by majority and minority group members of socio-cultural issues; and an improvement in behavior, attitudes, and beliefs among majority and minority group members.
5. The task force found that the program required evaluation by military and civilian evaluators to ensure that the objectives were met.
6. The task force indicated that for the race relations education program to have credibility, Department of Defense leaders had to invest a personal commitment in it.
7. The task force found that non-military agencies can provide support for the educational program.
8. The task force found that the educational program had to be directed at individuals of varying levels of education within the Department of Defense.
9. The curriculum was to be prescribed, flexible, presented in phases, adaptive to the educational level of the participants and to accommodate the various ranks and grades within the Armed Services, and suitable for a variety of training locations.
10. Instructors in the program must be qualified in race relations and in the use of training methods requiring emotional involvement by students.
11. Instructional aids and equipment had to be adapted to the military environment.
12. Multiple methods of training could be used. They should be chosen on the basis of the objectives as well as the qualifications of the instructors.
13. There were ample sources of published work to serve as the basis for the curriculum.
14. Race relation's problems were exacerbated by poor communications within the Department of Defense—especially poor communications between social groups.
15. The cost of the program could not be estimated at the time.

16. A Race Relations Education Board was recommended as the way to deal with the future of the race relations training.

Finally, the task force presented a set of recommendations based on the findings. Some of these recommendations strongly resembled the *findings* summarized above. The recommendations were as follows:

1. The Department of Defense should immediately implement an educational program, to be mandatory for all military personnel.
2. The Department of Defense should establish the Defense Race Relations Education Institute (DODRREI) whose purpose was the refinement of instruction techniques, training of instructors, and dissemination of educational materials on the topic of race relations.
3. Panels of military and civilian experts should be convened in order to design (i) race relations training program evaluation procedures, (ii) course of instruction for DODRREI, and (iii) instructional methods for the race relations training program.
4. A Race Relations Education Board (RREB) should be established to direct and monitor the entire educational program.
5. A permanent RREB Secretariat should be established to implement the RREB's decisions.
6. The United States Armed Forces Institute should develop correspondence courses, group studies packages in race relations, and history and culture of ethnic minorities.
7. Department of Defense should develop or procure and provide materials supporting race relations training.
8. Necessary actions should take place at all levels of command to ensure that the race relations training be supported.
9. Services were required to demonstrate publicly equal opportunity practices in procurement, assignment, promotion, and discipline.
10. The Inter-service Task Force on Education in Race Relations should be deactivated.

One of the tasks force's primary contributions was a "stop gap" curriculum for race relations training. This curriculum, which appears in the appendices of the task force report, provides specific and detailed guidance on the training of race relations, complete with recommendations for presentation slides, lecture notes, case studies, and bibliographies. Despite its thoroughness, the task force wisely recognized that the curriculum may require change after its initial implementation, and gave authority to direct the changes to the Race Relations Education Board.

The curriculum that appears in the appendices of the task force report focuses on traditional lecture and case study approaches to education. However, the findings and final recommendations in the report clearly told the military Services to do whatever it might take to ensure that members of the military learn about and develop skills in inter-group relationships. In other words, the report set the stage for a system-supported intervention addressing the problem of inter-group friction at the level of members' cognitive understanding as well as attitude and emotion. This recommendation clearly and directly coincides with current recommendations for what the American Psychological Association calls cultural awareness

training. (See Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists, 2003)

Defense Race Relations Education Institute

Citing the Defense Relations Institute's "Program of Instruction" (1972), Hope (1979) presented the following as the educational and training goals of the Defense Race Relations Education Institute:

1. "A knowledge of minority group history and the contributions of minority groups to the development of the United States and the Armed Forces;
2. A knowledge of selected psychological, social, and cultural factors relating to race to increase understanding of the social and behavioral dynamics related to inter-group tensions and conflict;
3. A knowledge of racial and ethnic group experiences in various communities to increase understanding of minority group culture and life-styles;
4. The opportunity to develop teaching techniques and group skills that will prepare them to lead discussions;
5. The opportunity to become aware of current DoD, service, and command equal opportunity of treatment, policies, and directives and their relationship to the need for maintaining good order and discipline; and
6. The capability and judgment to work with commanding officers in determining the specific needs of a race relations group discussion program and how best to employ the Defense Race Relations Education Institute resources within that command." (Hope, 1979, p. 42.)

Hope described the early training program at the Defense Race Relations Education Institute and described its early evolution. At the beginning—September 1971, the program was somewhat informal in nature. The student's day consisted of group discussions, independent reading, field experiences, lectures, use of audiovisual equipment, and development of instructional techniques. The theme of the educational process was inter-group harmony so much so that even students' lunches were characterized by "harmony-related" discussions." In order to better prepare students for their unique roles in their respective Services, a "service-specific" phase of training was introduced not long after the inception of the training program.

Hope pointed to "small-group discussion seminars" as the primary "educational vehicle" in early days of the Defense Race Relations Education Institute (Hope, 1979, p. 43). (It appears as though these small group experiences are similar to the Clarification Group that is used today, but not precisely the same in detail and implementation.) A single faculty member was assigned to the small group seminars, consisting of approximately 20 individuals from diverse backgrounds. The faculty "advisor" acted as a liaison between the groups and the Institute, a problem solver, and evaluator.

The instructional program at the Defense Race Relations Education Institute at the time covered four functional areas: minority studies, behavioral science studies, educational techniques, and community laboratory experiences (in which students actually visited minority communities and "lived with community members" to experience the minority culture).

Change in curriculum and educational approaches took place throughout the history of the Institute. In 1974, because of an expressed need to expand the focus from “Black-White” issues to others including other ethnic cultures, groups, and gender, the Institute developed a revised curriculum.

Hope’s 1979 report is not clear with regard to the introduction of the Clarification Group at the Defense Race Relations Educational Institute. However, from the author’s description of the inter-group interaction that was described on page 45 through 47, it appears as though the Clarification Group concept was introduced near the mid 1970s.

The following information from a memo written by Dr. William Gary McGuire, Deputy Director of Academics at DEOMI and currently on staff at the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute, clarifies how the curriculum evolved from the early 1970s to later in that decade (McGuire, 2003):

“An ad hoc Committee formed in mid-1970s brought members in the social sciences from The National Training Laboratory (NTL), University of North Carolina, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Michigan State University, University of Florida, The Pennsylvania State University, members of the Services, and lead members of the Inter-Service Task Force on Education and Race Relations to what was then Defense Race Relations Education Institute (DRREI) (now DEOMI). The mission of the ad hoc committee was to extend beyond the recommendations of the Inter-Service Task Force on education in race relations and formulate a training program to *change behavior* in military members and government civilians working in the equal opportunity arena. The previously formulated awareness training was judged not to prepare the Equal Opportunity Specialists (the title used at that time) for what was taking place in the field and fleet. The ad hoc committee concluded that a new method or approach should be implemented. They further concluded that the training should not be limited to the 4 weeks—the duration of the then current awareness training.

After several sessions, the Committee concluded the following: The training should target as its goals intra-personal and inter-personal skill development. To accomplish this skill development, it should use the Clarification Group method, a variation of experiential learning. Finally, the committee agreed that the training time needed to be expanded to between eight and 12 weeks. The decision to target intra-personal and interpersonal skill development evolved from the committee members’ realization that in order to effect change in the skills required to ensure and promote equal opportunity, change within the change agents must take place!. Social scientists on the committee realized that change involved “a growth process” that required more than classroom lectures and awareness training. Further, these same social scientists asserted that it is natural for most military members, as members of the larger society, to bring into training some level of personal racism, sexism, and other ‘isms’” (McGuire, 2003).

Social scientists recommended the Clarification Group method (discussed in some detail below) because they realized from the research on bigotry and inter-group conflict that the kind of learning required of change agents in the area of equal opportunity is best acquired through “laboratory training.” As explained below, in laboratory training, students have the opportunity

in a reasonably safe setting to practice developing insight and intrapersonal and interpersonal skills. Thus, a new learning model was introduced in the DRREI training and kept to this day.

More on the Clarification Group Method

The “small group” method at DEOMI is technically referred to as the Clarification Group method. Based on the Kurt Lewin’s group dynamics theory and research, the Clarification Group method was designed specifically to educate individuals regarding their social identities, their natural proclivities to hold stereotypes, and the sources of prejudice and discriminatory behavior.

Birnbaum defines the Clarification Group in the following way:

“The Clarification Group is a small group process [that] typically focuses on the exploration of group identifications: racial, religious, ethnic, etc. The Clarification Group utilizes life history and other experiential data together with appropriate sociological and social psychological knowledge to create a systematic teaching methodology.... The traditional definition of self in individual-idiosyncratic terms, now is giving way in many quarters, because of social pressures and constraints, to the need to define and be defined in group terms—Black, White, WASP, Catholic, Jew, Chicano, Spanish-speaking; woman, youth, etc.” (Birnbaum, 1975, p. 341).

Babad, Birnbaum, and Benne (1978) described the philosophical basis on which the Clarification Group method was developed. First, they espouse cultural pluralism rather than the melting pot concept as a way to deal with the many different groups comprising society. The melting pot metaphor derives from the belief that society ought to “simmer away” each member’s differences and uniqueness, including his or her cultural heritage and social identity. On the other hand, the cultural pluralism concept serves to acknowledge the immutability and essentialness of each individual’s cultural identity. Cultural pluralism views society as the union of essentially unique individuals with unique cultural heritages. Instead of a melting pot where the person is a sort of social “alloy,” pluralism views our heterogeneous society as “vegetable soup” with each individual retaining its special culinary contribution. Bill Russell, the popular African American basketball player in the 1960s and 1970s, in support of the vegetable soup metaphor, remarked, “You do not expect an onion to taste like a tomato” (Babad, Birnbaum, & Benne, 1983, p. 28).

Another philosophical tenet underlying the Clarification Group method, already alluded to above, is that **experiential learning** is required in addition to didactic learning (i.e., lectures, reading) to fully understand and acquire behavioral skills required in inter-group relations. In other words, for an individual to begin to comprehend the cultural identities of others, it is not enough to read or hear about the others’ heritage. One must **experience** others’ cultural identities, and **experience dealing with** others’ cultural identities. Lest there is a misunderstanding of the nature of the Clarification Group training method, it must be pointed out that this form of experiential learning is distinct from the “T group” which was very popular in the 1960s. T-group training is also a type of experiential learning method. However, its goals are for the learner to know him- or herself at a personal and feeling level in order to improve interpersonal relationships. In fact, Birnbaum made a very important point with regard to

contrasting the Clarification Group method with the T-group and other more interpersonally oriented variations of experiential learning:

“It now appears fallacious to assume that a change process involving interpersonal experiences based on contact and emphasis on human similarities will significantly influence the complex feelings and prejudices which are rooted in group identification. The development of a norm focusing primarily on individual and interpersonal dynamics often encourages participants, in their quest for interpersonal and group intimacy, **to avoid discussion of group differences among members** [emphasis my own]. Valuable and genuine as this experience may be on one level, the growth of this feeling of group intimacy is inimical to the realistic recognition of the inter-group factor and its sobering, divisive implications” (Birnbaum, 1975, p. 342).

The Clarification Group, it must be understood, stands on a firm foundation of social-psychological research and theory. It evolved at a time when prejudice was under the social scientist’s “microscope.” From the 1920s through the 1970s, social scientists, confronted with the social unrest associated with bigotry and prejudice, worked hard to define the phenomena of bigotry, prejudice, social identity, stereotype, and inter-group relations. Theories of prejudice evolved from a psychodynamic perspective (relying on the ideas of Sigmund Freud) to personological perspective in which personality characteristics such as authoritarianism were cited as the cause of prejudice to sociological causes related to power struggles between different groups. The designers of the Clarification Group method were eclectic in their assumptions about inter-group frictions and prejudice. For example, they acknowledge that there are forces deep within human beings that may account for our resistance to accept our prejudices (along the thinking of psychodynamic theory). But they also acknowledge the role that personality characteristics and socialization play in prejudice.

A summary of the basic tenets of the Clarification Group goes as follows:

1. Each individual is a social being in the sense that at least part of his or her identity derives from the “societies” from which he or she comes.
2. A person in a real sense comes from a variety of “societies”—e.g., family, religion, ethnicity, race, and language group.
3. Perhaps for good reason—even survival reasons going back to the beginning of early humans—societies are wary of other societies. Therefore, persons whose identities are significantly affected by the societies from which they hail are wary of other persons from different societies.
4. There is a hesitancy to acknowledge this wariness by most individuals.
5. There is therefore a hesitancy to discuss differences, explore differences, and understand differences.
6. Ignorant of the real facts, individuals begin to make certain assumptions and generalizations (stereotypes, prejudices) about others from other groups.
7. A primary way to change these assumptions and generalizations is to **acknowledge** them, **test** them, and **practice** with others from different socializations.

It is hoped that this short summary serves to explain the rationale behind the “small group training” component of DEOMI’s EOA training.

Richard Hope's Evaluation of the Effects of DEOMI Training

Hope (1979) began Chapter 5 of his important book by cogently pointing out that “The directive that established the Defense Race Relations Institute specified as one of its four primary functions that it ‘conduct research [and] perform evaluation of program effectiveness.’” The chapter goes on to describe the effects of training on graduates of the program. A two-level evaluation was proposed and carried out. That is to say, in terms of Kirkpatrick’s learning *criteria*, evaluation was carried out at the **learning criterion level** and the **behavioral transfer level**. The term “*criteria*” in training evaluation technology refers to the outcomes on which training is assessed. Kirkpatrick (1983) presented four levels of these outcomes: Reactions of participants, participants’ knowledge following training, participants’ training-related behaviors after leaving training, and the ultimate impact of the training on the organization that employs the training.

With regard to the learning-level criteria, Hope examined whether the training was “internally valid”—that is, he examined whether there was a change on the learning-level criteria (knowledge, attitude) from the beginning to the end of training. With regard to the behavioral-level criteria, Hope examined whether the graduates of the then Defense Race Relations Educational Institute successfully carried out their tasks in the commands to which they returned after training.

My interpretation of Hope’s description of the evaluation suggests that that Hope did not necessarily carry out all data collection for both levels of criteria, but that he collaborated with the directorate of research at the Defense Relations Educational Institute in sharing certain data apropos of evaluation. Regarding the learning criteria, Hope cites pre-training and post-training assessments for 15 classes at the Defense Race Relations Educational Institute for the academic years 1972 through 1975. These data were footnoted with references to three evaluation reports apparently prepared by the research directorate at the Institute.

Hope described the following learning-level criteria: First, he reported data collected by means of paper-and-pencil tests of knowledge of different cultures and life-styles. This is a **learning-level** criterion in the usual sense. It consisted of questions pertaining to **facts** to which the student responded correctly or incorrectly. Second, Hope reported data collected by means of the “Opinion Survey,” a modification of a paper-and-pencil self-report measure of racial attitudes entitled the “Multifactor Racial Attitude Inventory” (MRAI) (Cook & Selltiz, 1955; Woodmansee and Cook, 1967). The MRAI was psychometrically sound in its development and validation. Although Hope did not describe this questionnaire in detail, examination of technical reports on the measure(s) indicates that it assessed racial attitudes. (The past tense is used here because both the parent instrument and its shortened form are no longer in use to my knowledge. Despite the psychometric soundness of both forms, they would not be usable in today’s climate. Respondents would likely “see through” the purpose of the instrument (assessment of attitudes toward African Americans. Further, the instrument contains the language of the 1960s and 1970s that would require a complete overhaul. Nonetheless, the MRAI and its shortened form were respectable instruments for assessing attitudes toward African Americans.)

A lower score on the Opinion Survey measure indicated more positive attitude. Data collected by means of this assessment device may also be viewed as learning criteria in a somewhat unordinary sense of the term. The measure was self-report in nature, and self-report measures are often considered measures reflective of a person's reactions to training rather than learning outcomes. Reaction-level criteria pertain to, for example, the degree to which students report liking the course, finding the course interesting, feeling that the tests were fair, and so on. In other words, reaction-level data do not speak to how much students learned. On the other hand, Hope described the Opinion Inventory as a bona fide measure of attitudes toward different ethnic groups. This means that data collected by means of the instrument are "learning-level criteria," under the assumption that the Defense Race Relations Educational Institute/DEOMI had as a primary teaching goal that students **acquire** (or **learn**) more positive attitudes toward others from other cultures than their own.

The third measure Hope summarized was the Inventory of Internal-External Control. This inventory was a self-report measure of self-determination. A person on the "internal" side of the continuum believes that for the most part he or she has control over his or her fate. A person on the external side of the continuum believes that his or her future is determined more by chance or luck than by purposive, directive behavior. Hope asserted that a positive change on this measure for the equal opportunity specialist training (now Equal Opportunity Advisor training) is movement from the internal to the external end of the continuum. The rationale was that a person successfully educated in equal opportunity matters becomes more sensitive to the relatively strong influence of forces outside of his or her control within society.

Hope's research design. Hope reported the use of a control group, consisting of randomly selected participants. Hope demonstrated that this control group had the same number of participants and had equivalent demographic characteristics as the training groups. This one sample served as a control for all 15 classes on which evaluation data were reported. In sum, Hope used a pre-training—post-training design with a control group randomly selected from the general population. Technically, the training and control groups were not randomly drawn from the same population. However, the control group was judged to resemble the training groups in all ways except for the fact that it did not receive training.

Results of the Hope's study of learning-level criteria. In all three measures, Hope reported significant changes between the pre-test assessment and the post-test assessment. Further, the control group manifested no noticeable change in the measures. The conclusion was that training effected a change in knowledge and attitude.

Goals of the Present Study

Richard Hope evaluated the training at DEOMI in the late 1970s. As described above, his results showed that the program at the time was effective both in changing attitudes among the students and transferring this skill to the commands from which the students came.

The present study is an examination of the Equal Opportunity Advisor (EOA) training some 25 years later. There are three goals: First, to determine whether the traditional academic portion of the training has an effect on students' comprehension of cognitive material; Second, to observe training procedures and identify areas for improvement and areas of strength; Third, to

determine the degree to which the training positively affects interpersonal and intrapersonal skill development. The latter is the primary goal.

Methods

Participants

Students in the January class of 2003 were asked to participate in the assessment. In all, there were 82 students. However, data on 78 students were used in this study. Four students' data were lost due to equipment problems (the sound track was inaudible or indecipherable). The demographic breakdown of the students appears in Appendix 1.

The Process of Development of the Assessment Method

A fundamental assumption in DEOMI's small group training is that each of its students has room to grow or change with regard to their understanding and interacting with individuals from groups different from theirs. Based on this assumption, the primary goal of the present study was to determine whether the targeted growth or change takes place. Assessing this growth is challenging. In the past, such as in the Hope study, self-report questionnaires have been administered to students and graduates of DEOMI asking them to comment on the training. This is not the strongest method for assessing growth. Self-report data do not present compelling evidence that training designed to change attitudes and behavior (particularly the small group method of training) makes a difference. In the parlance of training evaluation methods, self-report data represent the reactions of participants. The evaluation question here pertains to whether graduates of EOA training can **do** what they were trained to do. As was described earlier, students are expected to develop their intrapersonal and interpersonal skills—both of which are manifest in social settings.

The most compelling data to evaluate the Clarification Group training described above would be naturalistic observations of graduates' social behavior. Imagine camera operators following DEOMI's students day and evenings prior to their participation in the course and following their graduation. Students' social behavior would be recorded on videotape and professional methods of coding this behavior would be used to yield conclusions regarding the effectiveness of DEOMI training.

Clearly, the "roving camera approach" is impractical and unethical. A reasonable alternative is required. Within the context of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, the Assessment Center method of evaluation has been an accepted way of assessing a variety of social skills. Assessment centers are not what their name implies—places where assessment takes place. Essentially, assessment centers are standardized multi-evaluator, multi-setting behaviorally oriented methods for evaluating a broad range of social and communication skills. In assessment centers, the assesses are placed in a variety of simulations including interviews, group discussions, and presentations. Observers, carefully trained in behavioral observation methods, observe the actions and behaviors of the assesses on videotape or in person. The behaviors are carefully consolidated into behaviorally based reports, which summarize the status of the assesses' behavioral skills. This is a tried and true approach to assessing interpersonal behavior. It is a method that is used by organizations around the globe to select managers at

different levels in organizations, and to provide feedback to assesses who seek to improve their interpersonal skills.

Analogue Observational Methods

Clinical psychology researchers and practitioners face a problem similar to that involving the evaluation of the EOA training program when they assess the social skills of their patients. In order to assess a patient's social skills, the clinician must observe or "sample" the patient's social behavior in a variety of settings. Naturalistic observation (that is, observing the patient as he or she negotiates various real social interactions is an alternative) is the preferred alternative—although it is extremely impractical and costly (much like the "roving camera"). This has led behaviorally oriented Clinical Psychologists to use what they call analogue assessment of social skills (Norton & Hope, 2001). The term analogue assessment implies that the patient's behavior is observed in situations analogous to real-life social interactions. In other words, the patient is placed in simulations of real social interactions, observed with regard to social behavior, and eventually diagnosed with regard to level of skill. The analogue observation method and the assessment center share identical roots. They require behavioral observation by trained practitioners. They require a compilation of coded behaviors to make an assessment about the target individual.

Norton and Hope (2001) reviewed this approach to assessment primarily for its use in clinical assessment. Their conclusions contained some important guidelines for the present study. First, training of the coders is emphasized throughout their review. It seems clear that the essential element involves observation and coding training. Second, there were mixed but generally high inter-rater reliability for observer-coders. Third, the method appeared to have the ability to identify the socially skilled from the socially impaired (e.g., schizophrenic). Fourth, the relationship between coded behavior in the simulations and coded behavior in real settings was mixed. This was taken to suggest that observee behaved differently in the simulation than in real life. (Fortunately for this study, this was not an important problem since the current study was attempting to identify the effectiveness of DEOMI training "internally"—that is, we were examining behavioral change as a learning criterion, not as a behavioral criterion in the Kirkpatrick model of criterion levels. Examination of the behavioral effects on the job was not possible in this study, due to constraints of resources.)

Validity of Behavioral Simulation Observation Methods

Two bodies of research speak to the validity of behavioral simulation methods. The first is the assessment center literature. It is generally accepted that the assessment center method, when professionally developed, predicts job performance. The second body is the clinical psychology literature pertaining to analogue behavioral observation methods. This literature reports notable validity of the method when determining the effect of a clinical intervention. Coded behavioral observations in analogue social situations clearly distinguish the treatment group from the control group. Beyond this, individual patients receiving social skills treatment showed significant improvement in their analogue social skills assessment (Norton & Hope, 2001). These related findings are important for the present study; in this study, "treatment" is the EOA training.

Conclusion Pertaining to the Assessment Method

Based on the assessment center and the analogue behavioral assessment literature, a simulation method like the assessment center is ideally suited for identifying the growth or change that takes place within DEOMI's students. The method provides rich data that are not subject to some of the biases of self-report data. The downside of the assessment center method in its purest form is its cost. In the traditional assessment center, assessment can last from eight hours to two days. In order to assess the change attributable to the training, this assessment would have to be done twice—before and after training. Because of the cost, the assessment center method in its pure form was not chosen as the assessment method. However, a method involving analogue behavioral assessment, similar in some ways to assessment center methods, was chosen as the ideal approach to take.

Scope of assessment. In the design of the analogue assessment procedure, the challenge was to develop a less costly and practicable method of assessment that retained the qualities of the assessment center method. In order to develop a practicable alternative, I proposed to DEOMI's management that I narrow the scope of the assessment to the first two phases of DEOMI training—the intrapersonal and the interpersonal blocks. Within these two blocks, students were educated via Clarification Group methods in “who they were” (in terms of their cultural and group identities) and “how they viewed others” (in terms of others' cultural and group identities). Management endorsed my suggestion, agreeing that these two blocks were the essential elements of the course.

Next, I reviewed my personal observations of the training that took place in the first two blocks. On the basis of observing a six-group class for more than sixty days, I noted that there were critical events to which each student is exposed. These events may occur by virtue of the design of the exercises used in the training, or they may occur spontaneously as a function of the natural evolution of the groups. These “events” correspond to the learning modules of the course. They involved interactions between individuals from different cultural heritages. These interactions provided the opportunity for the students to explore their own attitudes and behavioral proclivities. These interactions provided the opportunity to “experiment” with the ideas presented in the small group exercises, or in the course lectures, or the students' assigned readings. I decided that if a representative sample of these “events” could be drawn, they could serve as the basis of a skills assessment.

The Assessment Stimuli

After gaining the support of the video production staff at DEOMI, my associate and I approached a sample of eight of the most experienced small group trainers and requested that they describe “critical incidents” pertaining to inter-group issues involved with race, gender, religion, ethnicity and culture as well as general communication. Specifically, we asked them to describe incidents involving two or more individuals who were involved in discussions about issues that might arise in Clarification Group meetings (i.e., race, gender, religion, ethnicity, culture, and interpersonal interactions). The group wrote out 69 short descriptions of incidents, each consisting of approximately 25 words. We proceeded to look for themes among the incidents, and to drop out duplicate incidents.

The result of our culling was a set of 50 unique incidents. At this point, I proceeded to create a script for each of the incidents. This was necessary in order to present a realistic scenario from the short critical incidents that the experts provided earlier. The development of the scripts was partially based on my 12 weeks of observations of the training during the summer of 2002. My goal was to create scenarios, true to the critical incidents, involving individuals from varying social identities. The development of the scripts required trial and error, and much editing. My associate and I collaborated regularly to ensure that the scripts were realistic and true to the originally reported incident.

We completed a set of 50 “screen plays.” It was apparent that the “screen play” versions of the critical incidents required a review for their realism and fidelity to the small group training. However, we reasoned that the proper time to review the scenarios was after they were produced and recorded on tape. The next task was to produce them on video. Volunteers from within DEOMI were recruited to participate as actors. The challenge in this recruitment effort was the mix of ethnicities, races, religions, and gender for the characters in each scenario. It was necessary to broadly recruit actors in order to match the social identities of the characters. On occasion, a character’s social identity had to be changed (for example, changed from Asian American to Latino-Hispanic America) to accommodate the available pool of “actors.”

The production of the videotaped scenarios went as follows: Actors were presented with the scripts prior to the taping. The actors showed up at the appointed time in the studio. With the help of camera operators and studio management, we explained the goal of the study, the role that the actors would play in the study, basis for the scenario, and the feelings that the actors might assume in their assigned roles. After discussion about the scenario, the actors practiced approximately four times on the average. At that point the staff members recorded several “takes” of the scenario, thereby providing options for the final editing. The volunteer actors were encouraged to ad-lib to make them more comfortable with the roles. We gave specific feedback to the actors as they attempted to play their roles in order to make sure that the proper attitude and demeanor were present. Fifty scenarios were taped and reviewed in raw, unedited form.

We reviewed the fifty scenarios in order to pick those with highest quality. We judged that 25 scenarios was the maximum that could be used in the assessment instrument, anticipating that the individual assessment could not exceed two hours. Descriptions of the 25 that appeared to be of highest quality and that amply covered the range of likely experiences within the Clarification Group process are presented in Table 2 below.

Table 2. Synopsis of Scripts for Final 25 Scenarios

Scenario One: Women in combat

White Male: States that women should not be allowed in combat – women have their place—
“but we’re the ones who have to rescue *their little butts*.”

Other Hispanic Male: States that in his family environment, women did the work at home; the real work was the men’s work. (*Body language suggests he agrees with the other Male.*)

Woman – States that a woman if a woman is qualified to do the job, she should be allowed to do the job. (*Very clear body language from her indicating her negative response.*)

Scenario Two: The use of English language in the workplace

Filipino Male: States that people think he’s un-American when he speaks his native language.

White Male: States that everyone should speak English; when he hears others speaking other languages, suspects they are talking about him.

(*Body language: Filipino Male looks uncomfortable.*)

Scenario Three: how lighter and darker skinned Blacks collide

Black Male – States that as a light skinned Black, he experienced this problem.

White Male – States that he likens the experience of Whites in Germany during World War II as similar to what Blacks experience in this controversy.

Other White Male – “States that his ancestry is German Jew.” States that the comparison is weak.

White Male – States that for him both issues are a simple matter of prejudice.

Other White Male – States that Jews experienced genocide in WWII while Blacks experience a minor controversy.

Black Male – Asks with some emotion whether the former statement was effectively saying that *Germans in WW2 were worse off than Black Americans are today*.

Scenario Four: Examining how the group is developing as a group – sharing observations about each other

White Female: Asks whether she can share some observations with the White Male.

White Male: States sarcastically that he didn’t realize she was **observing**. Then agreed to feedback.

White Female: She tells him that he seems withdrawn and seemed not to want to participate.

(Body Language: White Male looks very uncomfortable.)

Other Male: Asks in puzzlement whether the former White Male had anything to say.

White Male: States that he does not care what others think of him; *“When I leave this room, I get down on my knees and I share my thoughts and my feelings with my God – that’s all that matters to me.”*

Scenario Five: Group viewed film on racism, showing treatment of African Americans

First Black Male: Asks others what they think.

Other Black Male: States that the whole racist thing comes to mind.

White Female: States that she does not know what the big deal is; that these things happened 25 years ago. Went on to say that women’s role in the military is a much more important and current problem.

(Nonverbal: Two Black Males look at her in disbelief.)

Scenario Six: Discussion of racism effects on their careers

First Black enlisted Male: States that he has seen his share of racism in the military; that he has had to wait behind Whites for specialized training pull guard duty when Whites were on leave.

Second Black enlisted Male: States in agreement that there are the same old racist jokes and that racism is not “behind us.”

Third Black Officer Male: States that he did not agree. All one needs is to exert some hard work to get ahead. States that if wanted to, he could be a four-star general. States that there has been no racism effects in his career; jokes should be ignored.

Scenario Seven: Reveal a personal racism each has participated in earlier in life

White Male: I guess I will – when I was growing up I used the word Nigger all the time – everyone in Ohio did, I don’t use it anymore – I have to admit when I go home I still hear that word used (Black Male and White Female look very uncomfortable) – my brother and father were using the word a couple of weeks ago.

Black Male: Man that really gets to me – what did you do when you heard them using that word?

White Male: *What would you have me do – they’re adults, they not going to change now?*

Black Male: *Listen to yourself, you're supposed to be an EEO adviser and you still don't get it – your attitude is the very reason why I dread when my two-year-old son becomes an adolescent and has to face reality!*

Scenario Eight: After visiting a synagogue, one individual remarks – “An awful lot of doctors and lawyers money went into the building of this place – This cost some bucks - Oy Vey” The members of the group did not respond to the comment – They are now meeting.

Black Male: Asked with disgusted whether the others heard “the idiot” who made the stupid joke.

White Male: Stated that the joke was really embarrassing and hoped that no one in the synagogue heard it. – and we're supposed to be learning about cultural diversity.

White Female: Stated that what made it worse is that none of them stood up and said anything. Asked what they should do now.

Black Male: Stated that he would like to kick him but could not do that, of course.

Scenario Nine: Lecture on Affirmative Action

First Black Male: Stated that he thought there was no need for affirmative action. He received his promotions based on merit.

Black Female: Stated (sarcastically) that that was an *interesting* statement; that he received some very good assignments and special duties because of affirmative action.

Scenario Ten: Discussion of marrying outside one's race – speaker is not aware that other two members have spouses from other races

Black Female: Stated that she believes that any Black man who marries a White **girl** is too weak to marry a Black woman.

Black Male: States that his wife is White and that she is a **Women**—not a girl. Then asked for confirmation that the other White Woman was married to a Black man.

White Female: Stated that her husband is Black and he's never been weak.

Black Female: States that maybe what she said doesn't apply to the persons in the group but held that it was true in general.

Scenario Eleven: Jokes that poke fun at different religion

Black Male: States that this issue of jokes about religions is upsetting. States that he has heard people saying derogatory things about Southern Baptists, Catholics, and Muslims.

Hispanic Female: States that she was thinking the very same thing.

White Navy Male: Asks what's wrong with telling a few harmless jokes about *ragheads* or *Holy rollers*. States that nobody is offended and when out to sea, the jokes break up the monotony.

(Nonverbal: Black Female looks at him in disbelief.)

Scenario Twelve: discussing personal experiences of discrimination

Hispanic Female: States that she is Hispanic descent but that she has not experienced racism in the military. She says that she doubts that it exists.

Black Female: Asks with passion: "You're telling me when people hear or see your name, you haven't felt their stares or seen their reaction"?

Hispanic Female: Stated that in her 12 years in the military, she honestly has not experienced racism. She then asks, "But it sounds like you don't believe me?"

Black Female: States that it is not that she does not believe her. But from her experience, she suspects that the Hispanic Female has been victim of some subtle form of discrimination.

Hispanic Female: Asks whether the other woman thinks that she was missing something. Stated that friends at the NCO club ignore her and her Hispanic husband when they are there together.

Black Female: States that only the Hispanic Female can know for sure, but if it looks like prejudice, it probably is.

Scenario Thirteen: Individual describing personal experiences

Non-Black Male: States that because of his background, he knows what it is like to be Black.

(Nonverbals: Other two Black members look at him with smirks on their faces.)

Scenario Fourteen: Discussion about cross-cultural communication

Black Female: Addressed the White Male, that she has noticed he has been awfully quiet. States that HE MUST have something to add to the discussion.

(Nonverbal: Black Man looks at his watch, annoyed.)

White Male: States that he did not feel as though he was particularly quiet. *(Nonverbal: sounds upset).*

Black Female again: Attends to the White Female and indicates that she keeps looking at her watch, that she has been quiet, and asked if she had something to add to the discussion.

White Female: Confronted the Black Female and states that the Black Female was overstepping her role in the group. (*Nonverbal: Upset.*)

Scenario Fifteen: Two women discussing experiences within their military units

White Female: States that she has experienced sexism in her previous work settings. She was ignored and felt unwanted.

Black Female: States that she knows all about that. She goes on by saying “*Try being Black on top of woman*”!

Scenario Sixteen: Discussion of the experience of racism

Black Female: States that she has just shared a couple of experiences of racism and I wondered if the White Male had experienced being minority.

White Male: States that he could not really think of a time when he was a minority. But then says: *I can understand what it must be like to be minority!*

Black Female: States, “So you’ve never been in any situation where you’ve been a minority but then you say that you understand what it’s like to be a minority.” (*Nonverbals: Sarcastic.*)

Scenario Seventeen: Details of different cultures

White Male: Asks why if there is a Black History month, why is there not a White History month?

(*Nonverbals: Black members look at him in disbelief.*)

Scenario Eighteen: Privileges of White Males

White Male: States that he is not comfortable with this idea of White Male privilege. States that as a child he grew up poor, in a slum, and that his sister to this day is even married to a Black drug dealer.

(*Nonverbals: Hispanic shakes his head in disgust.*)

Scenario Nineteen: Discussion of backgrounds – the first three openly revealed

Black Female: Addresses a White Male and asks why he did not discuss his race while discussing WHO WE WERE AS INDIVIDUALS. Asks if he forget.

White Male: States that he didn't forget, but indicated that he is devout seventh day Adventist, and that religion is a very important part of his life. He then stated that as far as he was concerned, race does not matter; that for him, everyone is TAN.

(Nonverbals: Other members look at him as though he was foolish.)

Scenario Twenty: Perceptions we have about others – identify those most likely to marry someone outside of their race

Black Male: Takes the role of exercise monitor. States that the marry-outside-race prediction questionnaires have been tallied for the group. States that there is a tie for the group predictions—then states the two women who were predicted to marry outside their race.

Light-skinned Black Female: States with great emotion the following: *“I don't know how in the world you people would think I would marry outside my race—I know people perceive me as being White or other than African American, but I'm African American and I told you how important that is to me.”*

Darker skinned Black Female: States something similar. Says *“I want to know from my group, what behaviors have I displayed that would make you think I would marry anyone other than an African American.”*

Scenario Twenty-One: Sexism in the workplace

White Female: Stated that she felt compelled to discuss a sexist episode when she was a junior level enlisted person. She went on to describe a sexual harassment experience with a former commander in which the commander would keep her from a field exercise in exchange for a sexual favor.

Black Male: *(With smirk on face.)* States that he doubts that a commander would do this out of the blue.

White Male: *(With sarcasm on face.)* Asks what **SHE DID** next?

Scenario Twenty-Two: Discussion

Black Male: States that the presentation on the culture of Turkey was very interesting, indicating that he did not know that between Turkey, Iraq, and Iran, they all spoke different languages. Addresses this point to White Female and ignores the Hispanic Male.

White Female (cutting off the Hispanic): States that she did not know that information either.

Hispanic Male with noticeable accent: States the following: *“What a minute – I have opinions about Turkey too but before I say anything about Turkey let me say something first – First of all, I believe you two continue to ignore me and you are always talking about yourselves only – I*

believe its because of my accent – maybe it bothers you or something – I may not know much English but I speak it very well – I’m part of this group so I am ready for your feedback so give it to me now.

Scenario Twenty-three: Racism

Black Female: States that she has been sitting quietly for far too long. States that there may not be riots any more but that racism in the military is alive and well.

White Female: States apologetically that she did not mean to be insensitive. Asks the Black Woman to share her feelings. (*Nonverbals: Very sincere and “real.”*)

Scenario Twenty-four: Sexual harassment

White Male: States that a former Female Commander has sexually harassed him.

White Female: (*Somewhat sarcastically.*) States that she appreciates that predicament that the White Male was in. She then says that real sexual harassment is from man to woman, not from woman to man.

Scenario Twenty-Five: Casual conversation among individuals from a variety of services

White Male: States boisterously that the U.S. Marine Corps is the only real service that counts. He goes on to make fun of the other services.

(*Nonverbals: Other two service members look uncomfortable.*)

White Female: States the following: “*Here we go again –blah, blah, blah.*”

Other White Female: (With some emotion and concern.) Asks White Marine if she could provide him feedback.

White Male: Sarcastically states that she is welcome to give feedback but knows what she is going to say.

Other White Female: States that it is ridiculous to believe that the other services do not count.

Male: States that what she was really saying that she did not like *Jarheads*.

The studio professionals edited the raw-footage of the final set of 25 scenarios to emphasize key nonverbal and verbal communications presented in the scenario. (At least two cameras had been used in the “shooting” of the raw footage so that the editing process might take

advantage of different camera angles, close-ups, and so on.) For each scenario, we wrote a narrative to set the stage for the respondent. This narrative was included on the tape of the 25 final scenarios in a voice over just prior to the presentation of the taped scenario. One of the studio staff with professional experience in broadcasting served to create the voice-overs.

Pilot study. We carried out a pilot study of the assessment process with 10 volunteers (five highly skilled trainers and five staff members who had not attended any DEOMI course) at the Institute. The goal was to refine the procedure and discover any major limitations. Following the pilot, the following procedures were used in the actual assessment. The pilot study tapes of students were used to train the behavioral coders.

The Final Assessment Method

The assessment process was designed to evaluate each individual student on a set of intra-personal and inter-personal skills (the targeted skills in the small group training in blocks 1 and 2). The skills assessment “test” was designed to last approximately 1 ½ hours—a period of time judged to adequately sample skill status while not inordinately affecting the tight schedule of the course.

Prior to the beginning of the assessment process, the Commandant of the Institute publicly endorsed the project by explaining that the Institute was involved in examining its training methods. He thanked the students for their cooperation and assured them that the data would only be used for program evaluation purposes. Thereafter, at one of the auditoria that were used for classroom training, we presented a short description of the evaluation project to all students in the class. We also explained that the evaluation would have no bearing on their course grade. In addition, we made a plea that their participation was extremely important for the future development and improvement of DEOMI. We then proceeded to give the students preliminary directions for the skills assessment. Because the skills assessment was carried out prior to training and after training, the directions were somewhat simpler in the post training presentation. (It was assumed that the students would recall the basic instructions provided them in the pre-training instructional section.) Students were told that they would be participating in a 1 ½ hour session. Their job was to answer the questions presented by the monitor. A sample of the scenario and the questions that they might hear were presented. Students viewed one of the unused scenarios. They then heard us ask the question “What would you do or say if you were a member of the group?” We emphasized that the respondent should participate as though he or she was a member of the group; not as though he or she was an observer and analyzer of the group. (In spite of this emphasis on our part, we later saw a number of students resist responding as participants.) We asked the students if there were any questions. There were none. We proceeded to begin the individual assessment.

Monitors selection and training. Staff members who had played roles in the taped scenarios or who had direct supervisory or evaluative relationships with the students were excluded as possible monitors. Each monitor was briefed in person and writing as to their function. They were instructed to greet the student, respond to questions with a standard set of written answers, and operate the video playback equipment. A copy of the guidelines and directions for the monitor appear as Appendix 2.

Assessment session. Prior to the beginning of the assessment, we appeared before the entire class of students and explained the purpose of the project. We assured students that their performance in the assessment would not affect their grades for the course. At the appointed time, the student entered a room individually, greeted by “the monitor.” The monitor asked the student to take a seat in front of the TV screen at a prescribed position accessible to the video lens. During the first phase of the assessment, 12 students were assessed in 12 different rooms simultaneously. A videotape of the directions run from a central control room. The script of this videotape, delivered by me, is found in Appendix 3. On the videotape, I emphasized once again that students should listen carefully to the question that the monitor asked (which requested the students to play the role as an additional member in the videotaped group). The monitors then asked the participant if he or she was ready. Upon an affirmative response, the monitors played the videotaped scenario one at a time, pausing between each one. At the pause, the monitor asked a question such as the following: “Consider yourself a fourth member of the group. What would you say?” Each student’s responses were recorded by videotape recorder that was centrally managed and controlled from a central monitoring station. After the students responded to the 25th scenario, the monitors thanked them for their help. They were then released.

Development of the Coding System

It must be understood that this research effort was an evaluation of DEOMI students’ *learning* resulting from the course. The EOA training program was designed to impart two types of learning. The first was intellectual in nature: they were to understand and recall the material that they read and heard in lectures. The second was behavioral-attitudinal in nature as described above. This second learning target was the more challenging to assess as described above. In order to fairly test the level of acquisition of the behavioral-attitudinal material, we selected the Interpersonal Skills Development Evaluation (ISDE) form, which, in conjunction with course directives, the instructors used to assess the students’ acquisition of intrapersonal and interpersonal skills throughout the course. The complete ISDE appears in Appendix 4. The component dimensions of the ISDE were in short “communication process,” “feedback skills,” “self-centered functions,” “self-awareness,” and “standards of conduct.” Unfortunately, we were unable to find the theoretical basis and supporting documentation for the component dimensions and for the ISDE. However, it was very clear from reviewing the literature on the Clarification Group method that the component dimensions of the ISDE and especially their constituent dimensions (i.e., subscales) came directly from the work of Birnbaum and his colleagues (1975). Therefore, the ISDE seemed to be the appropriate basis to assess the second learning target.

We investigated each of the parts of the ISDE with great care. Our first task was to determine whether each skill in the component dimension could be elicited by the assessment method of assessment. Many of the most important skills, we judged, could be elicited. The components that we judged were appropriate appear in Table 3.

Table 3. Sample of Skills Judged to be Assessable in Current Study

Component 1: <u>Communication Process:</u>

a. Sender - communicates in an understandable and sincere manner; clearly expresses thoughts and feelings.
b. Responses - responds to what has been said; is non-evaluative and non-patronizing; seeks clarification of verbal and non-verbal expressions.
c. Receiver - remains alert and involved in discussions; allows speaker to finish comment before responding; demonstrates the ability to paraphrase.
d. Psychological Barriers - expresses anger/frustration in a constructive manner; accepts and uses new information.
Component 2: <u>Feedback Skills:</u>
a. Specificity – gives specific feedback; directs feedback towards changeable behavior.
b. Need – takes into account the needs of the receiver.
c. Timing – gives feedback at the appropriate time.
d. Information - shares information rather than gives advice.
e. Clarification – checks to ensure clear communication.
f. Receptive - responds to feedback and developmental counseling.
Component 4: <u>Self-Awareness:</u>
a. Explore Life History – shares life experiences in terms of group membership (race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and social class); balances sharing between impact on self, group memberships, and all human beings.
b. Recognize Multiplicity of Socio-Identities – communicates an awareness of the conflict caused by the internalization of multiple identities within group memberships; displays the ability to deal with differences and conflicts between various socio-identities.
Stereotype Awareness – identifies and discusses stereotypes learned in the socialization process.
d. Inter-group Conflict & Resolution – communicates personal experiences with inter-group conflict; identifies destructive and unrealistic elements and potential strategies of conflict resolution; displays the ability to implement conflict resolution strategies.
e. Empathy – displays the ability to view situations from the others' perspective(s).
g. Collaborative Inquiry – asks questions that compare and contrast personal development of values, relationships, and behavior patterns with the experiences of group members whose development has been different.
Component 5: <u>Standards of Conduct:</u>
c. Equal Opportunity & Treatment – treats others with fairness and respect; uses inclusive language; challenges discriminatory behaviors (i.e. sexually exclusionary language, racial/sexual/etc... slurs, jokes, or innuendoes); contributes to the organization's cohesiveness and morale.

By comparing the list above with actual ISDE (see Appendix 4), You will notice that one of the components—self-centered functions—was dropped altogether. We judged that this could not be reasonably assessed by the method that we had designed and under the conditions that we had to carry out the evaluation. The self-centered functions components on face value appear to be important to successful inter-group function skills. However, we also argue that assessment of this dimension requires the collection of data over time. That is, it requires the observation of **patterns** of interactional behavior. Consequently, it was not evaluated in this study. However,

the majority of the training targets are represented on the coding form that my associate and I devised.

The form appears in Table 4. It is important to note the modifications of the form Vis a Vis the original ISDE form. We edited the form to clarify the terms, provide behavioral examples of each of the behaviors, and provide for negative and positive occurrence of the behaviors (that is the valence of the skill was allowed to be manifest). After revising the form through multiple iterations, we presented the form to experienced trainers and staff at DEOMI to ensure that it coincided with the originally designed skills. These experienced trainers provided a positive response to the assessment form that we created. Anecdotally, some recommended that the modifications that we applied to the ISDE might improve the evaluation of students during training either as changes to the ISDE or as training aids for small group facilitators.

Table 4. Complete (Training Version) of Coding Forms Used in Coding Students Taped Behavior

<u>COMMUNICATION AND GIVING FEEDBACK</u>	
1	<i>Speaks for him- or herself.</i> Positive: Makes it clear that he or she is speaking for him- or herself; that others may have different viewpoints seems to be implied. Also, avoids saying the generic “you” when really the speaker means “I.” • “For me, this is the case • “I believe • “I feel • “I think Negative: Making general statements or using the generic “you” or “ya” when really he or she means “I.” Seems to not recognize that what he or she is saying is based on HIS or HER beliefs and feelings that are not necessarily universal. • “You (generic) need to pay attention when...” • “English ought to be the universal language; women should not be on submarines...” No response: Does not make a statement involving this behavior.
2	<i>Communicates in a sincere manner.</i> Positive: He or she seems to mean what he or she says through words, gestures, and nonverbal behaviors. • Appears to be serious when discussing the feelings of others (Verbals and nonverbals in agreement) Negative: He or she seems to be saying something without meaning it. Words, gestures, and nonverbal behaviors do not agree. Remaining distant while making a statement. • (Smirking) “Women really have it bad in the military...”

	No response: Not possible. Must always be positive or negative.
3	<i>Clearly expresses thoughts and feelings.</i> Positive: Ultimately, at the end of his or her statement, his or her final meaning is clear. • Examples are too many to enumerate. The idea(s) is/are clear. Negative: At the end of the person's statement, it is still not clear what he or she means. • Makes statements that are not clear even after some reconsideration by observer. • If he or she combines contradictory statements, and ultimately the observer does not know what he or she means, then this would be negative. • Finally, if he or she does not respond at all with any statement, then this would be a negative. • "Women deserve respect but my wife must stay home with the kids." No response: Not possible. Must always be a positive or negative.
4	<i>Uses inclusive language.</i> Positive: When the opportunity arises that one might slip and be exclusive, but nonetheless is inclusive in language, then this would be a positive. Uses gender neutral pronouns. • "When a soldier joins the Army, he or she makes a commitment to his or her country." • "Every sailor, soldier, or person in the Air Force or Coast Guard deserves equal respect." Negative: When the opportunity arises, uses non-gender-neutral pronouns. • "A soldier must take pride in his opportunity to serve the country." • "A doctor in the Air Force is responsible for his professional identity as well as for his country." No response: No opportunity to observe inclusive language because of the circumstance.
5	<i>Challenges discriminatory behavior such as racist/sexist jokes, comments, statements, and innuendos.</i> Positive: Directly addresses the discriminatory behavior. Note—it is not necessary that the challenge is an effective one or not here.... only that it is made. • "Lt Commander, using the term "rag heads" may be very offensive to people from different countries. I find it offensive as well." Negative: Failure to challenge but through his or her statements appears to recognize that there is discriminatory behavior. Not challenging when the discriminatory behavior is blatant. Downplays the effects of discriminatory behavior.

	• In the presence of a sexist statement ignores the statement. No response: Not challenging when there is nothing there. • Not possible for Scenarios 1, 10, 11 and 19
6	<i>Responds specifically to at least one aspect of what has been said.</i> Positive: Makes a clear statement directed to something that was discussed. • “Commander, you indicated that enough has been done for women in the military. But doesn’t this imply that you are ignoring the other roles that women can play?” Negative: Going off on tangents, no comments, no response at all. • After a discussion of the role of women in the military, discussed the role of American Indians in the military and ignores the primary point of the discussion. No response: Not possible. Must always be positive or negative.
7	<i>Responds to at least one aspect of nonverbal behavior.</i> Positive: Makes a clear statement directed to some nonverbal behavior. Perhaps asks for clarification on what it means. • “Captain, I noticed that you looked upset after the Sergeant’s statement. Will you share what you are feeling?” Negative: Ignoring a strong nonverbal, over-interpreting a nonverbal, wrongly interpreting a nonverbal behavior • “Master Chief, your arm-crossing behavior clearly states that you are pissed at the group.” No response: No statement directed at nonverbal behavior if there is no notable nonverbal behavior. • Not possible for Scenarios 4, 7, 13, 14, 17, and 21
7a	Provides feedback Positive: Information we give to others about themselves Negative: Only for Scenario 11 and 13 – the absence of feedback No response: No feedback statement if there is no need to provide feedback • Not possible for Scenarios 11 and 13
8	<i>In the process of providing feedback, directs comments towards changeable behavior of group or individual</i>

	Positive: Provides information to someone offering helpful solutions vis a vis the situation described. Ensures that this information addresses behavior that can be controlled by the person spoken to. • “Master chief, perhaps statements like that make others in the group feel as though you don’t care about the other group members.” Negative: Makes statements that do not address behavior under the control of the addressee. A statement referring, and to the addressee’s personality would be a negative—“you are hopeless and stubborn.” • “Master Chief, maybe you should cut back on that religious fanaticism. It is disruptive to the group.” No response: If no feedback given, then no response.
9	In the process of providing feedback, ensures that the amount of information delivered to recipient is manageable. Positive: Provides one or two useful pieces of information to the addressee. • “Here are one or two things that you might want to consider” Negative: Provides a laundry list of information to the addressee. • “There are a dozen points where you can improve....” No response: No behaviorally specific feedback is given. No feedback given when there is no opportunity to give feedback.
10	<i>In providing feedback, states how the behavior that was exhibited by others impacts him or her.</i> Positive: Tells someone that what that someone has said affects him or her either emotionally or cognitively. • “Lt Commander, I am confused by what you said. Could you explain...?” • “Captain, I feel sad when I hear you say that about people of color.” Negative: Uses ad hominem statements rather than directing comments toward behaviors. • “Sergeant, you are a hot head. Cool down.” No response: No feedback given when there is no opportunity for feedback.
11	In giving feedback, shares information rather than gives advice. Positive: Gives direction to the addressee rather than sharing ideas and observations that allow the addressee to choose to behave. • Avoids “You should....” • Avoids “You ought to...”

	• Avoids leading questions that suggest that the addressee is in error Negative: Plays the role of advisor and tells addressee what he or she should do. • “You ought to find out how people feel about your behavior” • “You should realize that people get pissed off when you behave that way.” No response: No feedback given nor is feedback relevant here.
12	Remains non-evaluative toward other group members during communication. Positive: Uses non-evaluative language. • “I observed that some of the other group members showed some signs of being upset—from their nonverbals. Is that true (addressing those members)?” Negative: Uses evaluative language. • “The group members seemed pretty upset, Master Chief, when you made that statement. You really rub people the wrong way.” No response: Not possible.
13	<i>Remains non-patronizing during communication.</i> Positive: Treats other as on same social or moral status as self. Avoids treating addressee as below him/her. • “Master Chief, I respect your position when it comes to working with the other group members. But have you considered that we need you to succeed?” Negative: Treats others as on a lower moral or social plane. • “Sergeant, you are a poor representative of Special Forces.” No response: Not possible.
14	Seeks clarification for verbal and non-verbal expressions of group members. Positive: Asks what someone meant to say or asks to understand some nonverbal behavior. Negative: Makes erroneous conclusions or conclusions that go to beyond the data. Miss the opportunity to request information. No response: If clarification is not necessary, then no such statement may be made. • Not possible for Scenarios 4, 7, 13, 14, 17, 18, and 21
15	<i>When necessary or useful, demonstrates the ability to paraphrase.</i> Positive: When necessary or useful, clarifies a statement made by re-stating it in different

	words. • “So it seems as though you are saying, Sergeant, that you believe Black women in the military have it worse than others.” Negative: When necessary or useful, wrongly paraphrases or goes beyond the data. • “Your point that just because Jews suffered during World War II, that Blacks have not had problems...this point is stupid.” No response: Possible if paraphrasing is not necessary
16	Expresses displays of emotion (e.g., anger/frustration, laughter) in a constructive manner. Positive: Acknowledge that there is some emotion—laughter or anger. • “I have to admit...when I hear that comment about the Jews in World War II...I get very angry.” • “I notice that when we speak about women flying jet airplanes...people in this group have laughed. I wonder what this means. For me, the topic is serious.” Negative: Inappropriate laughter. Unexplained emotion that might disrupt the group’s functioning. • (Angrily states): Master Chief, you are a disgrace to the United States Navy. No response: No emotion expressed.
17	Treats others with respect and dignity. Positive: In referring or addressing others in the group, uses language and nonverbal behaviors that demonstrate that he or she treats others with respect. • “I would like to respectfully differ with the Lt. Commander. It is not unreasonable for women to work in the submarine community.” Negative: Uses verbal expression or nonverbal expression that clearly indicates a disrespect of another in the group. • “Lt Commander, your position on women in the military is stupid. This caveman attitude will just perpetuate the plight of women.” No response: Not possible. Must always be positive or negative.

	SELF AWARENESS
1	<i>Shares or references his or her life experiences pertaining to the group(s) to which he or she belongs (E.G., racial group, ethnicity, religion, gender, and social class)."</i>

	Positive: Sharing one's experience and comparing and contrasting it with others • "From my experiences as a Black Male, I believe that ..." Negative: Over-generalizing one's experience; mis-generalizing; over-confidence in one's assessment of the relevance of one's experience to others' • "I know what it's like to be Black" (from a White person) No response: Simply not sharing any experience.
2	<i>Communicates an awareness of any conflict caused by his or her internalization of his or her own multiple social identities</i> • E.G., identities related to membership in at least two of the following groups: race, gender, religion, or social class including status, role in society, or role in the organization Positive: Internal conflict due to dual or more than dual roles or identities • "As a woman and an officer..." • "As an officer and a mother..." Negative: Denial of conflict or denial of the importance of recognizing conflict • "I am a woman and an officer and a mother of two...and I don't believe it is my job to consider the conflict between these roles...I just do what I am told." No response: Simply not talking about it.
3	<i>Displays the ability to deal with any conflict caused by his or her internalization of his or her own multiple social identities.</i> • E.G., identities related to membership in at least two of the following groups: race, gender, religion, or social class including status, role in society, or role in the organization Positive: Describing a strategy used to deal with the conflict • When I deal with this conflict, I try to set my priorities for the moment and communicate to all involved..." Negative: Displaying the inability or describing the inability to deal with the conflict • "I've had that conflict and can't figure out how to deal with it."

	No response: Not bringing it up
4	<i>Communicates an awareness of the possible conflict caused by another individual's internalization of that individual's multiple social identities.</i> - E.G., identities related to membership in at least two of the following groups: race, gender, religion, or social class including status, role in society, or role in the organization Positive: Fortright statement of an understanding that different social identities can create conflict. “It sounds as though you are pulled in two directs...as a woman and as an officer...” Negative: Denying that there is such conflicts; denying the importance of such conflicts; or assuming without data that there are such conflicts “The master chief is a Male in the Navy...he doesn't have a clue...” “The master sergeant is a Black woman in the Air Force...so she knows about the conflicts that such individuals have...” No Response: Not bringing it up - Not possible for Scenario # 4, 6, 15, 18
5	<i>Displays the ability to deal with the possible conflict caused by another individual's internalization of that individual's multiple social identities.</i> - E.G., identities related to membership in at least two of the following groups: race, gender, religion, or social class including status, role in society, or role in the organization Positive: Providing a cogent statement or suggestion that attempts to deal with the conflict of the other... “There are a variety of things that I can think of that might be done in your situation. Would you like to hear my suggestions or thoughts on this?” Negative: Unrealistic response to the conflict; discarding the problem “Look...you joined the military...just do it and quit complaining.” No Response: Not bringing it up - Not possible for Scenario # 4, 6, 15, 18
6	<i>Communicates an awareness of inter-group conflict.</i> Positive: Based on the data, respondent states something to indicate that he or she sees the

	conflict between different groups. • “I am concerned. You (Sgt x) said that Blacks had it tough. And you Sgt xx said ...It seems as though that you are competing each other almost for “whose hurt is worse?” Is this going to help us as a group or is it going to lead to anything positive?” Negative: Ignoring or denying the existence of inter-group conflict • In the presence of conflict, does not respond. • In the presence of conflict, makes a statement that diminishes the importance of it. No Response: Says nothing because there is no opportunity to address it. • Not possible for Scenario # 1, 3, 5, 7, 24
7	<i>Identifies or displays ways to deal with inter-group conflict.</i> Positive: Says something that moves the two in conflict toward resolution. • “Sergeant, have you considered the impact of your statement on the Captain and others?” Negative: Says something that does not move the two toward resolution. Or says something that denies the importance of the conflict between the two. In the presence of conflict, no statement is made. • “I think you two just need to get along. You are not listening to each other.” No response: In the presence of no conflict, says nothing. • Not possible for Scenario # 1, 3, 5, 7, 24
8	<i>Asks questions or make statements that compare and contrast his or her personal development of values, relationships, and behavioral patterns with the development of values, relationships, and behavioral patterns of other group members.</i> Positive: Clearly makes a statement that shows that he or she is juxtaposing his development with that of others. • “It’s interesting...in my family, my mother and father both took responsibility for home making and watching the children. So my background is different from yours, Sergeant.” Negative: Denying the importance of comparing personal development with others. • “I don’t see where it is important to share values or behavioral patterns with others.” No response: Does not speak to the issue.

9	<i>Identifies his or her own stereotypes that come from his or her socialization process or experiences.</i> Positive: Describes what he or she thought certain “groups” were like from childhood rearing. • “I grew up in a household that basically said that women should not be involved in combat. I am very aware of this part of my early experience and can see how it may have affect my interaction with women in the past.” Negative: Denial that he or she has stereotypes; or suggesting that they are real...not stereotypes. • “I don’t know how people can think that women are the “gentler sex.” I don’t think at all like that about other people.” • “I view everyone as equal.” • “This discussion about stereotypes gets us no where.” No response: Does not speak about it.

Ultimately, students’ behavior was observed and coded with the help of the coding form just described. For each behavioral skill, in the communication-and-feedback and self-awareness categories, a student’s responses to the 25 scenarios were given positive, negative, and negative scores according the guidelines provide the coders in training.

Training of Observer-Coders

Three doctoral students from different stages in the Industrial-Organizational Psychology program at Old Dominion University volunteered to observe and code the tapes. I directed the training process with the help of my associate from the directorate of research. Overall the training followed the logic of two approaches, frame of reference training and “think-aloud” type of modeling (McIntyre, Smith, & Hassett, 1984; McIntyre, & Bentson, 1984). First, coders reviewed and discussed the details of the coding tool. When doubts occurred with regard to the meaning of terms appearing on the tool, coders arrived at a consensual understanding by discussion and feedback from me. Review and discussions of the coding tool lasted approximately six hours of group training time. Thereafter, the coders observed the tapes of students that were produced during the pilot study. These served as training stimuli. Over a period of 20 hours, coders observed the tapes scenario-by-scenario, independently coded the behavior on the tapes, and then discussed their individual codings as a team. Consensus was fully achieved at the end of these practice-and-feedback sessions.

Coders began the coding process by observing 10 different students’ tapes independently and then convening to ensure that there was agreement. They were determined to have 97% agreement on their codings. They proceeded to independently code the tapes rather than have multiple raters per tape because of the time requirements for coding. They reconvened two times after this first convening to reestablish their inter-coder agreement. On the next meeting, their

agreement dropped to 91%. However, through discussion, their agreement returned to 95% thereafter. These rather high agreement indices (percent of codes to which all agreed) were considered an indication that the behavioral codes were reliable assessment.

Overall Psychometric Quality of the Coding—A Summary

It was infeasible to carry out an independent psychometric evaluation of the coding system given the deadlines of the project. However, the assessment tool was a sample of the events and the measurements that appeared as part of the Clarification Group training. The former was confirmed by a sample of five experts in Clarification Group training (expert by virtue of their have extensive experience in facilitating small groups). In this confirmation process, the experts were asked to indicate whether the 25 scenarios were able to elicit the behavioral skills appearing on the assessment tool. All experts indicated that all scenarios were of sufficiently high quality to elicit all skills that were trained and evaluated in Clarification Group training. This along with the higher inter-coder agreement indicates that the assessment method has content validity and high inter-rater reliability.

Criteria for Statistical Evaluation

In order to analyze the positively, negatively, and zero-coded data, a set of criterion indices was developed. First, for the pre-training and post-training assessment, individual skill scores were computed. These scores for each of the 30 skills were the sum total of positive, negative, and (technically) zero codes across the 25 scenarios for each student.

For example, suppose that the skill is “Speaks for Self.” A student’s individual skill score would be the total of codes (positive, negative, and zero) across the 25 scenarios. A student will have 30 such individual skill scores.

Second, for the pre-training and post-training assessment, a **total score** was created for skill each category. The total score was the sum of each person’s positively coded, negatively coded, and zero-coded behaviors across the 25 scenarios across the 12 individual self-awareness and across the 18 communication-and-feedback skills. (Of course, the zero-coded behaviors indicating that the behavior was not exhibited did not affect the total score.) In effect, the construct assessed by this procedure is “total skill exhibited” across 25 “occasions” in each “category” of skill. For example, suppose a student had the following individual skill scores for the self-awareness skill category prior to beginning training: 5, 4, -11, -15, 2, 0, 15, 18, -2, -8, 0, -1. His or her total score for self-awareness would be 7.

Third, for each category, a count of the **number of skills** in each category that had **negatively coded, positively coded, and zero-coded scores** was computed. In effect, three indices were computed for negative, positive, and zero coding. Each of these three scores provides a rough insight as to the effect of training on skill development from pre-training to post-training. If training is effective, one would expect fewer negatives after training, a greater number of positives, and fewer zero codes. To see an example of the positive, negative, and zero scoring, see Table 5.

Table 5. Example of Number of Positive, Negative, and Zero Scores

Individual Skills	Scores for 25 Scenarios
Skill 1	5
Skill 2	-4
Skill 3	11
Skill 4	15
Skill 5	2
Skill 6	0
Skill 7	15
Skill 8	18
Skill 9	-2
Skill 10	-8
Skill 11	0
Skill 12	-1
Skill 13	7
Skill 14	0
Skill 15	0
Skill 16	-12
Skill 17	23
Skill 18	-1
# of Negatives	5
# of Positives	8
# of Zeros	4

Fourth, for each category, two indices were created pertaining to positive and negative codes. Each of these indices can be interpreted as the degree of positivity and negativity for each of the categories of skills. For example, consider Table 6. The following would be the positivity and negativity for Communication and Feedback for a fictitious student.

Table 6. Example of Positivity and Negativity for Data Presented in Table 5

N egativity	-28
P ositivity	89

Results

Observations of Training Process Issues

As described above, during the summer of 2002, I observed lectures and small group training for the entire pre-service-specific course. The following are the **primary observations and judgments** that I made during this process, based on my experience as an educator and professional in organizational science. Some of these are “positive” and some “negative.” It is important to note that many of the observations that I summarize in this section were made during the summer of 2002 (second class of 2002). It is likely that group facilitator training that has been implemented after my observations as well as other kinds of management and instructor actions have addressed some of the issues that I observed. Nonetheless, it appears valuable to present what I observed in the spirit of improving the educational process at DEOMI.

Lectures on the Cognitive Material. The quality of the lectures in general was high. The ideas pertaining to each of the topics for the most part were well organized, and clearly expressed. Students seemed to receive the material openly and enthusiastically. Instructors were on the average excellent at getting students involved in the topic.

If there was one area that needed improvement, I believe it was in the currency of the information presented. On occasion, the material was not in always in agreement with the current professional literature. A case in point was the Work Motivation material. It did not reflect the current material that is covered in Work Motivation chapters found in college texts in Industrial-Organizational Psychology. It over-emphasized some dated material and misinterpreted other information. I spoke with the instructor assigned to the task of making the presentation at his request. He told me that his lecture on motivation represented his first exposure to the material. He explained that he was a bit uncomfortable making the presentation. The lecture that this person gave did not represent what is taught in most introductory undergraduate courses that deal with the material. Yet, it did provide some basis of understanding for work motivation.

Lectures on other topics evidenced similar problems. This report is not the appropriate document for enumerating the weak areas. However, as I explain in the Discussion and Recommendation sections, it seems appropriate to review the lecture material to ensure currency.

Clarification group. The primary emphasis of this report pertains to the effects of the “small group” (the Clarification Group) on the students’ skill development. However, before discussing these findings, it appears useful to present a summary of my observations pertaining to DEOMI’s current implementation of the Clarification Group process.

First and foremost, I will repeat what most individuals who understand the Clarification Group process know: Small group facilitators have a unique and challenging job. They are to instruct students by (a) serving as role models as to how a person embraces his or her own social identity, and (b) to shape the students to assume what the American Psychological Association (2003) calls the “cultural lens” in dealing with all people. Lastly, the job of the small group facilitator is to provide feedback to students in the Equal Opportunity Advisor training regarding their developing interpersonal skills. To say that these roles require experience and competence

is an understatement. To say that the DEOMI's facilitators dedicate themselves to meet the demands of the task is also an understatement.

Yet there were some indications of "slippage." (I use the word "slippage" to communicate not **failure** but some degree of **weakness** in the small group training.) I observed facilitators who worked long hours to ensure that their students were learning optimally. Yet, some of these same facilitators lacked experience in the small-group training. They appeared at times uncomfortable and even unsure. This resulted in their reticence to intervene at important points during group exercises. At times, the under-experienced facilitator tended to stick strictly by the **recommended** set of questions, rather than to respond to some important event taking place in the group. Inexperienced facilitators sometimes missed important behaviors exhibited by their group members apparently because these facilitators were mentally preparing for the next exercise. The result of these kinds of actions on the part of the less experienced facilitators was the Clarification Group became a group discussion, with diminished opportunities for skill development.

I observed a lack of standardization in the use of certain powerful tools such as the "Form 3,"—an instrument designed to provide immediate feedback to a student regarding certain important behaviors he or she exhibited. I observed that the experienced facilitators promptly used this tool to provide feedback to students exhibiting effective as well as ineffective behaviors. But I also noted that there was variance in group facilitators' use and understanding of the importance of providing feedback to students (with the Form 3 tool or otherwise). Providing feedback is one of the most powerful learning tools in Clarification Group. Feedback can be delivered through the facilitator as just described or through the fellow students (at a result of the facilitators' shaping). When there is variance across instructors on providing feedback, on the Form 3 or otherwise, there is variance in the quality of the Clarification Group experience.

Another example of "slippage" pertained to the facilitators' preparedness for dealing with students who exhibited relatively high emotional reactions within the small group exercises. For example, I noted on several occasions that students became distraught, angry, or tearful. On many more occasions, I noted the nonverbal communication of students who appeared to have felt left out, overlooked, or misinterpreted. Yet, it was not uncommon for instructors to effectively ignore these events. The result was at best missed opportunities for students to learn in their groups to deal with emotionally charged issues. At worst, students may have been emotionally hurt by the episode. It is not possible to know the effects of these events. Lack of skill to deal with emotional events has the potential to diminish the effects of the Clarification Group process. It places doubts in the students' minds, possibly discrediting the Clarification Group process for them. Although working through doubts is a common occurrence in Clarification Groups and other experiential learning methods, it is important to recognize that doubts related to facilitator's skill level may lead to a public discrediting of the learning process by individuals who feel disenfranchised by the process.

I also noted "slippage" among Clarification Group facilitators with regard to their trust of one another. This observation, **it must be understood**, was clearly anecdotal and may not apply

to all cadres of instructors, or even consistently to the cadre with whom I had the privilege of working. That said, I noted times when communication among the facilitators and their counterparts in the curriculum development group was characterized by apparent skepticism or mild disdain. Individuals asked to carry out certain tasks failed to show. Individuals who knew the expectations and procedures did things “their way.” Although instances such as these occurred infrequently, they were **striking** in an Institute whose motto was “Infinity Dignity and Worth.”

The last point of possible weakness in the Clarification Process is the grading. I noted through discussions with a variety of instructors that the Interpersonal Skills Development Evaluation (ISDE) was a difficult form to use without sufficient standards. I learned in my discussions with small group facilitators that the job of completing the ISDE was often laborious and unrewarding. Some believed that they owed their students “as much time as it took” to complete the evaluations. Others stated that many instructors used a sort of “boiler plate” approach to completing them because of the futility of expending effort in the evaluation process. In concert with what was stated above regarding feedback and its importance, evaluation likewise is critical in the Clarification Group. The lapses that may occur in the completion of the ISDEs have the potential to degrade the quality of training in the Equal Opportunity Advisor training. They also have the potential to discredit the program from an external program evaluator’s perspective.

Among the varying problems that I discovered regarding the ISDE was an informal expectation among some instructors that the point values for each must increase over time, irrespective of the quality of the students’ performance. Whether this is true is not possible for me to assess. But if it is true, it is a built-in weakening of the developmental feedback process. Another problem associated with the ISDE expressed by some instructors with whom I spoke is the abstract language of the ISDE. For example, “psychological barriers,” and “recognize multiplicity of socio-identities” are terms not immediately understandable or immediately useful for “coding” observed behaviors. I will discuss possible ways of addressing these issues in the Discussion and Recommendation Sections. Suffice it to say that the language used on the ISDE is language of the developers of the Clarification Group. As explained in the introduction, Birnbaum and his colleagues provided a deep rationale for the use of the Clarification Group for developing within individuals the skills to deal with their own and other’s inter-group prejudices.

Integration of the Small Group and the Lecture Aspects

The most important of my personal and anecdotal observations of the Equal Opportunity Advisor training was that there were some instructors and staff who seemed to lack a “meta-understanding” of the training program. I noted on several occasions that platform instructors made comments that indicated that they did not know what was happening in the current Clarification Group training. I noted also that the Facilitators of the Clarification Group were unaware of the material presented by the platform instructor and did not take advantage of that material in the small group exercises. Finally, I noted that there were contradictions between what was presented on the “platform” and what was presented in small group. An example was the idea that “there was no such thing as negative feedback.” This statement was made by the platform instructor, explained, and endorsed in the lecture hall. Thereafter, small group

facilitators and students used the term “negative feedback” without regard for the apparent contradiction. I noted several similar small “glitches” like this. Lectures that discussed the topic of confidentiality in the lectures were confusing and contradictory. The lecturers left the impression that even data from climate surveys are not protected with regard to the identity of the respondent.

The lack of understanding of the “big picture” on the part of some faculty at DEOMI **did not invalidate** the larger learning process. But it may have reduced the credibility of the training...particularly for those students who were still resisting the basic assumptions of the course.

Findings on Learning Outcomes

Essentially, there were two primary sets of outcomes for evaluating the EOA training. The first are the “cognitive” outcomes—assessed by means of a pre-training—post-training achievement test. This test was developed by DEOMI’s testing staff to assess the entire gamut of information that students read and heard about during their training.

The second and most important set of outcomes was behavioral in nature. As described above in the Methods sections, students’ videotaped behaviors were observed and coded in order assess whether the Clarification Group process had effects on the behaviors, attitudes, and skills of the students.

Cognitive Findings

The fifty-item achievement test was administered before and after training. Results indicated that there was a statistically significant change in test scores. A paired-sample t-test comparing the pre-training mean score of 58.4 and the post-training mean score of 78.9 indicated the difference between the means was statistically significant, $t = 20.8$, $p < .00001$. This result on the surface suggests that training was effective in improving students’ cognitive understanding of the material. However, training evaluation experts discuss the topic of “threats to the conclusion” that training effected or did not effect change. In other words, the experts pose the question regarding what OTHER phenomena might actually explain the statistical results? This is not the place to present a comprehensive discussion of the variety of “threats to the validity of the conclusions.” Suffice it to say that there were several alternate explanations to the positive results explained above. The primary one was the fact that the students may have remembered the questions and answers for the test from the beginning to the end of training. This is referred to as an “instrumentation threat.” A way of ruling out this threat is to employ in the study’s design a control group, randomly selected from the same population as the training group. The control group would not engage in the training. They would only take the test before and after training just as the training group did. The control group would be given the same “experience” as the training group; that is, if the training group received feedback on the pre-training test, so would the control group. The difference between the two groups is that the control group would not receive the training.

A control group was not possible in this study. It was practically impossible to select a sample equivalent to the training group. The fact that there was no control group in this part of

the study might lead a training evaluation expert to pose the question as to the validity of the conclusion that training caused the positive change in understanding of the cognitive material in the course. Nevertheless, as will be discussed in the Discussion of the report, it appears that it is reasonable to conclude that the training had some positive effect on the students' achievement in the cognitive arena.

Behavioral Skill Findings

There were 30 skills assessed in the video-based assessment procedures. Eighteen of the skills fell in the Communications and Feedback category. Twelve of the skills fell in the Self Awareness category. Paired-sample t-tests were used to test the effect of training on all behavioral skill indices.

Results are organized first around the two major skill categories and within these around the different indices that were computed: individual skill scores, total scores, total number of positively, negatively, and zero-coded indices within each category, and amount of positivity and negativity for each of the categories.

Communication and Feedback

Table 7 presents the means and descriptive statistics for the individual skills comprising the Communication-and-Feedback category. Table 8 presents the results of the one-tailed paired-sample t-tests for the individual skill scores and the total score.

Table 7. Pre-Training Post Training Descriptive Statistics for Communication and Feedback--All Skills

Skill	Pre-Post	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Skill 1	PRE	3.68	78	7.908	0.895
	POST	3.14	78	10.438	1.182
Skill 2	PRE	23.77	78	3.453	0.391
	POST	24.55	78	2.966	0.336
Skill 3	PRE	22.54	78	3.934	0.445
	POST	24.09	78	3.101	0.351
Skill 4	PRE	0.24	78	0.648	0.073
	POST	0.08	78	0.419	0.047
Skill 5	PRE	0.04	78	2.756	0.312
	POST	1	78	2.824	0.32
Skill 6	PRE	22.24	78	4.28	0.485
	POST	23.35	78	3.625	0.41
Skill 7	PRE	4.51	78	3.786	0.429
	POST	4.58	78	2.771	0.314
Skill 8	PRE	4.27	78	1.912	0.216
	POST	3.63	78	2.439	0.276
Skill 9	PRE	0.69	78	3.089	0.35
	POST	2.26	78	2.894	0.328

(Table 7. Continued)

Skill	Pre-Post	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Skill 10	PRE	5.18	78	3.422	0.387
	POST	5.13	78	2.545	0.288
Skill 11	PRE	2.12	78	3.146	0.356
	POST	0.18	78	3.837	0.434
Skill 12	PRE	4.59	78	3.712	0.42
	POST	2.68	78	3.627	0.411
Skill 13	PRE	7.67	78	8.125	0.92
	POST	11.14	78	9.221	1.044
Skill 14	PRE	23.29	78	3.572	0.404
	POST	23.88	78	3.479	0.394
Skill 15	PRE	3.01	78	3.946	0.447
	POST	0.27	78	5.872	0.665
Skill 16	PRE	0.35	78	0.699	0.079
	POST	0.24	78	0.585	0.066
Skill 17	PRE	1.06	78	1.812	0.205
	POST	0.35	78	0.88	0.1
Skill 18	PRE	21.24	78	5.135	0.581
	POST	23.64	78	3.854	0.436
Total	PRE	120.32	78	27.149	3.074
	POST	140.33	78	31.608	3.579

Table 8.
Results of
Matched-
Pair t-tests
for the
Communication and
Feedback
Category

Results of Training	Skill	Skill Label	Mean Difference	SD	SE _{mean}	t	df	Sig. (1-Tailed)
No Effect	1	Speaks for him- or herself	0.54	11.49	1.30	0.41	77	NS
Effect	2	Communicates in a sincere manner	-0.78	1.98	0.22	-3.48	77	0.00041
Effect	3	Clearly expresses thoughts and feelings	-1.55	2.81	0.32	-4.88	77	0.00000
No Effect	4	Uses inclusive language	0.17	0.75	0.08	1.97	77	NS
Effect	5	Challenges discriminatory behavior	-1.04	2.54	0.29	-3.61	77	0.00027
Effect	6	Responds specifically to what has been said by others	-1.10	3.08	0.35	-3.16	77	0.00113
No Effect	7A	Responds to at least one aspect of nonverbal behavior	-0.06	3.30	0.37	-0.17	77	NS
Effect	7	Provides feedback	-0.64	2.99	0.34	-1.89	77	0.03099
Effect	8	In providing feedback, directs comments to changeable behavior	-1.56	3.62	0.41	-3.82	77	0.00013
No Effect	9	In providing feedback, ensures that amount of information is manageable	0.05	3.08	0.35	0.15	77	NS
Effect	10	In providing feedback, states how others' behavior impacts self	-2.29	4.39	0.50	-4.62	77	0.00001
Effect	11	In providing feedback, shares information rather than giving advice	-1.91	3.89	0.44	-4.33	77	0.00002
Effect	12	Remains non-evaluative during communication with others	-3.47	9.47	1.07	-3.24	77	0.00089
Effect	13	Remains non-patronizing during communication with others	-0.59	2.21	0.25	-2.35	77	0.01055
Effect	14	Seeks clarification for verbal and nonverbal expressions of others	-2.74	5.79	0.66	-4.19	77	0.00004
No Effect	15	When necessary, demonstrates paraphrasing skills with others	0.10	0.96	0.11	0.94	77	NS

Table 8. (Continued)

Results of Training	Skill	Skill Label	Mean Difference	SD	SE _{mean}	t	df	Sig. (1-Tailed)
Effect	16	Expresses displays of emotion (anger, laughter, sadness) in a constructive manner	-0.72	1.83	0.21	-3.47	77	0.00043
Effect	17	Treats others with dignity and respect	-2.40	3.88	0.44	-5.45	77	0.00000
Effect	TOT	Total Communication & Feedback Skills	-20.01	28.73	3.25	-6.15	77	0.00000

Because of the way the computer program (SPSS, Version 10) carries out the matched-pair analyses, the signs of the mean differences are opposite to those expected. A negative value in this table indicates positive change. A positive value indicates, technically, no positive change.

Overall, the results suggest that 12 of the 18 skills in the Communication-and-Feedback category were positively affected by training. In addition, the table indicates that as the category labeled communication-and-feedback skills increased after training.

Among the largest individual mean differences were the following:

1. When providing feedback, states how the others' behavior impacts self (Skill 10)
2. Remains non-evaluative during communication with others (Skill 12);
3. Seeks clarification for verbal and nonverbal expressions of others (Skill 14).

I recognize that carrying out multiple statistical tests on data within the same study leads to a possible inflation of Type I error—that is, an erroneous conclusion that there was a training effect when there was none. Application of Bonferroni analyses suggested that the results are not attributable to an inflated Type I error rate.¹

The fact that a one-tailed approach was used in this study based on the expectation that skills would improve between pre-training and post-training assessments requires that effects that may be non-supportive of training or “opposite of those hypothesized” must be treated as simply non-effects. However, this theoretically correct approach runs the risk of ignoring several possible problems apropos of the training evaluation. Because of the “formative philosophy of this evaluation,” it seems to be a greater risk to DEOMI to effectively ignore non-positive and “opposite effects.” Therefore, the following paragraph reports the two surprising non-positive “effects.”

Given my observations of the training, review of the material, and discussions with so many of the critical personnel at DEOMI, I was surprised to find that Skill 1 (Speaks for self) and Skill 4 (Uses inclusive language) were apparently not positively affected by training. There is a definite emphasis on these two skills throughout the early part of training. I provide possible explanations for these “surprise findings” in the Discussion section of this report.

Number of skills with positive, negative, and zero codings. Table 9 presents the mean number of positively, negatively, and zero-coded skills within the Communications-and-Feedback category. Table 10 presents the results of the paired samples t-test effects of training on the count of positively, negatively, and zero-coded skills. Results indicate that for the communication-and-feedback

¹ Kirk (1982) explained that the sum of per comparison Type I error rate in multiple comparisons t-tests should be less than the nominal error rate (e.g., .05). In this study, the sum is below the nominal rate.

skill, there were significantly more positively coded and significantly less negatively coded skills. However, there was no effect on the number of zero-coded skills.

Table 9. Means for Count of Positively, Negatively, and Zero-coded Skills Pre-training versus Post-Training for Both Skill Categories Communication and Feedback Skills

	PRE-pos	PST-pos	PRE-neg	PST-neg	PRE-zero	PST-zero
Mean	9.78	10.92	4.92	3.85	3.29	3.23
N	78	78	78	78	78	78
SD	2.178	2.161	1.704	1.652	2.157	1.98
SE _{mean}	0.247	0.245	0.193	0.187	0.244	0.224

Self Awareness Skills

	PRE-pos	PST-pos	PRE-neg	PST-neg	PRE-zero	PST-zero
Mean	3.69	3.95	3.31	2	5	6.05
N	78	78	78	78	78	78
SD	2.128	1.92	1.943	1.659	1.563	1.347
SE _{mean}	0.241	0.217	0.22	0.188	0.177	0.153

Table 10. Results of Paired Sample t-tests for Counts of Positively (POS), Negatively (NEG), and Zero-Coded (ZERO) Skills within Communication-and-Feedback (CF) and Self-Awareness (SA) Skills

Results of Training		Mean Difference	SD	SE _{mean}	t	df	Sig. 1-tailed
Effect	CF: POS PRE-POST	-1.14	2.024	0.229	-4.979	77	0
Effect	CF: NEG PRE-POST	1.08	1.742	0.197	5.461	77	0
No Effect	CF: ZERO PRE-POST	0.06	1.426	0.162	0.397	77	NS
No Effect	SA: POS PRE-POST	-0.26	2.041	0.231	-1.109	77	NS
Effect	SA: NEG PRE-POST	1.31	1.782	0.202	6.48	77	0
No Effect	SA: ZERO PRE-POST	-1.05	1.586	0.18	-5.852	77	NS

Amount of skill positivity and negativity. Means and descriptive statistics for the amount of positivity and negativity in the Communication-and-Feedback skill category are presented in Table 11. The results of the paired-sample tests on the amount of skill positivity and negativity are reported in Table 12. Skill Positivity means for pre- and post-training were 141.09 and 155.62. As Table 13 indicates, this is indeed a statistically significant difference. Skill Negativity means for pre-training and post-training were –20.77 and –15.28. Again Table 13 suggests that this is a significant improvement.

Table 11. Descriptive Statistics for Amount of Positivity and Negativity on Both Categories

	Condition	Mean	N	Standard Deviation	SE _{mean}
Communication- and-Feedback Skills	Negativity— Pre	-20.77	78	8.91	1.00
	Negativity— Post	-15.28	78	8.60	.97
	Positivity— Pre	141.09	78	25.29	2.86
	Positivity— Post	155.62	78	28.47	3.22
	Negativity— Pre	-11.21	78	8.39	.95
	Negativity— Post	-5.67	78	6.00	.68
Self-Awareness Skills	Positivity— Pre	13.12	78	10.91	1.24
	Positivity— Post	14.81	78	11.68	1.32

Table 12. Results of Paired Sample t-tests for Amount of Positivity and Negativity within Communication-and-Feedback (CF) and Self-Awareness (SA) Skills

Results of Training		Mean Difference	SD	SE _{mean}	t	df	Sig. 1-tailed
Effect	CF: POS PRE-POST	-14.53	24.64	2.79	-5.21	77	0
Effect	CF: NEG PRE-POST	-5.49	10.72	1.21	-4.52	77	0
Effect	SA: POS PRE-POST	-1.69	11.148	1.26	-1.34	77	NS
Effect	SA: NEG PRE-POST	-5.54	7.486	0.848	-6.534	77	0

Table 13. Pre-Training—Post-Training Descriptive Statistics for Self-Awareness--All Skills

	Pre-Post	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error	Skill	Pre-Post	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
					Mean						Mean
Skill 1	PRE	3.32	78	3.106	0.352	Skill 7	PRE	2.06	78	3.188	0.361
	POST	1.03	78	1.503	0.17		POST	0.97	78	3.928	0.445
Skill 2	PRE	0.4	78	0.727	0.082	Skill 8	PRE	0.14	78	0.448	0.051
	POST	0.32	78	0.781	0.088		POST	0.01	78	0.197	0.022
Skill 3	PRE	0.19	78	0.582	0.066	Skill 9	PRE	0.09	78	0.488	0.055
	POST	0.18	78	0.619	0.07		POST	0.01	78	0.197	0.022
Skill 4	PRE	0.76	78	3.626	0.411	Skill 10	PRE	0.01	78	0.47	0.053
	POST	0.13	78	4.253	0.482		POST	0	78	0	0
Skill 5	PRE	2.37	78	2.429	0.275	Skill 11	PRE	1.17	78	2.675	0.303
	POST	1.18	78	2.432	0.275		POST	0.64	78	2.156	0.244
Skill 6	PRE	0.14	78	3.82	0.432	Skill 12	PRE	1.82	78	6.111	0.692
	POST	3.6	78	4.277	0.484		POST	3.47	78	4.377	0.496
Total							PRE	1.97	78	17.473	1.978
							POST	9.17	78	15.928	1.803

Table 14. Results of Paired Sample t-tests for Self-Awareness Skills

Result of Training	Skill	Skill Label	Mean Difference	SD	SE _{mean}	t	df	Sig. (1-tailed)
No Effect	1	Shares/references life experiences pertaining to his/her social groups	2.29	3.03	0.34	6.69	77	NS
No Effect	2	Communicates awareness of conflict caused by his/her internalization of his/her multiple social identities	0.08	0.99	0.11	0.69	77	NS
No Effect	3	Displays ability to deal with conflict caused by multiple social identities	0.01	0.88	0.10	0.13	77	NS
Effect	4	Communicates awareness of conflict caused in another by multiple social identities	-0.88	4.10	0.46	-1.90	77	0.03030
Effect	5	Displays ability to deal with others' conflict from their multiple social identities	-1.19	2.62	0.30	-4.02	77	0.00007
Effect	6	Communicates awareness of inter-group conflict	-3.46	4.06	0.46	-7.53	77	0.00000
Effect	7	Identifies or displays ways to deal with inter-group conflict	-3.04	3.91	0.44	-6.86	77	0.00000
No Effect	8	Asks about or makes statements that compare and contrast his/her own values, relationships, and behaviors with the development of others'	0.15	0.49	0.05	2.80	77	NS
No Effect	9	Identifies his/her own stereotypes based on his/her socialization	-0.08	0.50	0.06	-1.35	77	NS
No Effect	10	Discusses impact or displays awareness of impact of his/her own stereotypes	0.01	0.47	0.05	0.24	77	NS
No Effect	11	Displays recognition that individuals hold different perspectives based on their socialization	0.53	2.80	0.32	1.66	77	NS
Effect	12	Displays ability to view situations from others' perspectives	-1.65	5.93	0.67	-2.46	77	0.00796
Effect	TOT	Total Self-Awareness Skills	-7.19	15.54	1.76	-4.09	77	0.00005

Self-Awareness Skills

Table 13 presents the means and other descriptive statistics for the individual skills comprising the Self-Awareness Skills category. Table 14 presents the results of the paired-samples t-tests for the second category of skills. Overall, five of the 12 skills showed significant improvement following training. Although this indicates that the effect of training on Self-Awareness Skills is lower than on Communication and Feedback, there was an overall positive change as evidenced by the final line of Table 14.

Training appeared to have positive effects on three important self-awareness skills:

1. Communicates an awareness of others inter-group conflict (Skill 6);
2. Identifies or displays ways to deal with inter-group conflict (Skill 7);
3. Displays ability to view situations from others' perspectives (Skill 12).

These skills were clearly emphasized throughout training.

In accord with the formative philosophy of this evaluation, there were some “surprises” as well in this skill category. For example, “Displays recognition that individuals hold different perspectives based on their socialization” appeared to be negatively affected. Although I acknowledge the statistical risk in this possible finding, it appears counterintuitive that this key skill (perhaps the most important skill) was not positively and possibly even negatively affected. Another self-awareness skill—Shares/references life experiences pertaining to his/her social groups (Skill 1)—also appeared to be possibly negatively affected by the training. Possible reasons for these anomalous findings are discussed later in this report.

Number of skills with positive, negative, and zero codings. Table 9 presents the means and other descriptive statistics for the mean counts of positively, negatively, and zero-coded skills within the Self-Awareness category. Table 10 presents the paired-samples t-test results of the effects of training on these same data. Results indicate that for this self-awareness skills category, there was **not** an increase in positively coded skills from pre-training to post-training. There were, however, significantly fewer negatively coded skills from pre-training to post-training. As with the communication-and-feedback skill category, there was no effect attributable to training on number of zero-coded skills.

Amount of skill positivity and negativity. The means and other descriptive statistics pertaining to the amount of positivity and negativity in the Self-Awareness category are presented in Table 11. The results of the paired-sample t-tests on the amount of skill positivity and negativity are reported in Table 12. The means of Skill Positivity for pre- and post-training were 13.12 and 14.81 respectively. Table 12 indicates that this was not large enough to be identified as a statistically significant difference. Table 11 indicates that means on Skill Negativity for pre-training and post-training were –11.21 and –5.67. Information in Table 12 indicates that this represents a significant improvement.

Demographic Characteristics and Training Effects

Independent-sample t-tests were carried out to investigate the possible effects of race and gender on the outcomes examined in the study. Results indicated that neither race nor gender accounted for variance in any of the outcome variables under examination.

Discussion

My Observations of Training Process

Traditionally, the Discussion section of a report addresses the major findings presented in the Results. However, the results of under the heading above were qualitative in nature. In a sense, they speak for themselves. Therefore, I will address them in the final section of the report—Recommendations.

Comments on the Measurement Methods Used

The single-prompt analogue assessment procedure was extremely important to the findings in this study. It seems useful to point out its advantages and its disadvantages for the present study prior to interpreting the results.

I will provide my personal observations of the method. First, the student participants took the exercise quite seriously. No one indicated that the situation seemed artificial. No one volunteered to criticize how the scenarios were presented. Second, on average, students became involved in the exercise. That is, they attended with interest, they responded to the questions, and they seemed to be genuine in their responses. Third, students did have some difficulty responding to the question as asked with some notable exceptions. For example, instead of responding as though they were members of the group that they had observed (which was their requested task), they often discussed their opinion of the scenario or spoke **about** what was going on. This seemed to happen more in the pre-training than in the post-training assessment, which is to suggest that the behavior may not be a method-related problem but rather a skill deficiency. Yet, there may have been problems for some participants with the artificial nature of the request—to respond as though the participant was the nth member of the group. The last observation I had regarding this behavioral assessment procedure concerned the degree to which each skill is elicited by the method. Although it is true that subject matter experts reviewed the scenario scripts and indicated that the skills in general that students might manifest the range skills to the different scenarios, nevertheless, the fact that the assessment method did not afford the participant the opportunity to engage in a two-way conversation with another may have reduced the likelihood that certain skills were exhibited. That being said, observers indicated that every skill was exhibited by at least a subset of the participants. It may be that there is an interaction between a participant's personality style and his or her likelihood to demonstrate certain skills in this type of assessment. It may also be that the method is very effective for eliciting skill behaviors from the highly skilled, but not for those in the ordinary range of the skill. In general, given the constraints, the method used in this study seemed to be an effective approach for eliciting the target behavioral skills.

Positive Results

The results of this investigation indicate that DEOMI's Equal Opportunity Training did in this study have positive effects.

First, the results of the cognitive test (pre-training versus post-training) suggest that there is a positive change in understanding and comprehension of the cognitive portion of the training. One might respond that not having a control group prevents such a definite conclusion. However, the usual threats to conclusion validity (e.g., history, maturation, memory of the pretest) seem not to have the usual impact in this study. First, there is a large amount of cognitive information provided students during the training. To remember a small sample of the test items from the many possible items seems unlikely. Second, the length of time from pre-test to post-test reduces the potency of the memory-of-the-test explanation. Third, students at the end of the 12-week training are interested in leaving training, according to most staff members at DEOMI. They regularly show signs of wanting to finish the course, cease taking written tests, and moving into the "service-specific" phase of the training. In other words, given that students' motivation is diminished, they might have "blown off" the test as unimportant. Yet the post-training test scores were higher. I believe therefore that the positive change in test scores indicates that cognitive learning took place.

There is also evidence that the training has positive impact with regard to skill development. Twelve of the 18 Communication-and-Feedback skills on the average showed improvement. Five of the 12 Self-Awareness skills showed improvement. The argument that external effects might have accounted for these positive effects can be addressed in a way similar to that presented above. Most importantly, the behavioral nature of the assessment provides reasonably strong evidence that the effects that were observed were valid and not attributable to extraneous influences. That is, the assessment "scores" that students received were based on discrete behavioral observations by trained observers. Observers made their behavioral observations and assigned the behavioral codes on the basis of a set of specific guidelines. Inter-observer agreement was high and recalibrating among the observers throughout the coding process ensured that this agreement remained high.

One possible problem with the coding process is that the observer-coders were aware of the fact that the taped performance they observed was from the pre-training or post-training conditions. This fact was unavoidable. The ideal process would have been to "mix up" pre-training and post-training tapes so that observer-coders were "blind" to the training condition. However, this option would have required delaying the coding until the post-training taping was completed. With three individuals coding the tapes, there would not have been enough time to finish the project if coding began after the post-training assessment process. My discussion with the coder-assessors indicates that they were not influenced by the training condition, although they were aware of it. They were instructed to follow the specific guidelines laid out at the beginning of the study. They continued to follow this process strictly. It seems unlikely, therefore, that coder-assessors' knowledge of condition had a noticeable influence on the coding process.

Under the assumption that the latter argument is true, what does the observed positive skill development mean? It means that the students have acquired a set of basic skills that they may bring to the field to carry out their work as Equal Opportunity Advisors. On the average, students communicate more sincerely and clearly, are able to challenge discriminatory behavior, provide feedback reasonably effectively. They are on the average able to communicate the impact that others' behavior on themselves, and they are able to remain non-evaluative in their feedback and communiqués. Graduates also have greater Self-Awareness skills with regard to awareness of conflict of others' social identities, dealing with such conflicts, understanding inter-group conflict, and viewing situations from others' perspectives. This means that, on the average, DEOMI EOA training graduates have a firm foundation for beginning their EOA assignments, for continuing their learning to deal with inter-group conflict, and for continuing their skill development outside the classroom in their various commands.

These are important findings and should be recognized as such. On the other hand, a major goal of this study is to provide formative evaluation information for the improvement of DEOMI's education and training. This leads to discussing the "negative" or perhaps more appropriately called "non-positive" findings of this study. Table 14 summarizes Communication-and-Feedback skills for which there were no positive effects.

Non-positive Findings

The most important of these were the first two skills in Table 15 below. My observation of training for an entire cycle in addition to my review of the curriculum materials and background led me at first to be surprised by these non-positive findings. There were no other skill areas discussed as much as these. Why might positive change not take place for these skills? Upon reflection of my personal observations of the course, I recalled several things that may help explain these results.

Table 15. List of Communication-and-Feedback Skills Not Positively Affected by Training

-
1. Speaks for him- or herself
 2. Uses inclusive language
 3. Responds to at least one aspect of nonverbal behavior
 4. In providing feedback, ensures that amount of information is manageable
 5. When necessary, demonstrates paraphrasing skills with others
-

First, regarding "speaking for self," it appeared as though there was not sufficient emphasis on the deeper meaning of the skill. The real meaning of skill is to acknowledge in communication with others that "I have my own perspective and what I say comes from that perspective." Yet the explanations of the skill that I heard group facilitators provide and the associated "corrective feedback" they gave could well be interpreted by students as a directive simply to use the first-person personal pronoun, "I." At times, group facilitators and, later in the training cycle, students behaved as though they "caught" other students in the act of not beginning their statements with "I." In other words, group facilitators missed the opportunity to

convey the essence of the skill. Consequently, students may not have consistently grasped its deeper meaning.

In discussing this insight with management and faculty at DEOMI, I discovered that they agreed. They observed that, at times, a sort of “gotcha” game begins in small group exercises, where speakers are “caught in the act” of not displaying “key behaviors.” On the other hand, the observers of the taped behavioral responses were trained to code for the deeper meaning of “speaking for self.” Therefore, the coded behavior reflected the fact that the skill on the average was under-developed among students.

Why might group facilitators and students treat “speaking for self” in a superficial way? I believe that the reason is that it is one of those skill areas that appears to be simple and straightforward. In other words, it appears easy to develop a rule of thumb for engaging in the skill: Simply say “I.” Yet, there is more to the speaking-for-self skill. Furthermore, as one of the more experienced trainers indicated to me, this skill is a very powerful one when interacting with others. It conveys a sense of inclusiveness of others’ ideas and others’ opinions. The personal pronoun rule of thumb reduces the skill to a simplistic grammatical issue.

Second, regarding the use of inclusive language, once again there is a consistent discussion in this behavior during small-group training. In order to better understand the non-positive training effect on this skill, I discussed the finding with several individuals highly familiar with the training. I also examined a frequency analysis of pre-training and post-training responses. The DEOMI representatives indicated that they were not particularly surprised at the non-positive finding. They explained that they believed that students don’t take the “inclusive language” skill seriously perhaps because it deals with women in the military. In examining the frequency analysis of responses, I found that seventy-six percent of participants showed no response on this skill in the pre-training condition; eighty-six percent showed no response in the post-training position. It appears, therefore, that in both conditions, participants avoided making responses that involved the use of inclusive or non-inclusive language. Based on this, one might speculate either that the scenarios did not elicit responses with potential non-inclusive language or that students remained uncomfortable using inclusive language in both conditions. There is no firm basis for making a conclusion. However, there may be sufficient information to monitor this skill.

Third, consider the results pertaining to addressing non-verbal skill. This is one of those skills central to EOA training. To a greater or lesser extent depending on who the small group facilitators are, students are trained in the importance of attending to others’ non-verbal behavior early in training with feedback on this skill throughout the training. It is important to point out that on six scenarios, the role players’ non-verbal behavior was so overt that a student could not receive a “no response” or zero code. In other words, the coding protocol called for a student to receive a negative “score” when not responding to obvious and overt non-verbal behaviors.

An examination of the frequencies of responses for this skill revealed that in the pre-training condition, the majority of students (N=73) had negative scores on the skill. In the post-training condition, the majority of students also had negative scores on the skill (N=70). These

facts suggest that the recognition and acknowledgement of non-verbal behavior is a difficult one for a person to acquire and display. Even in situations where the non-verbal behaviors of the videotaped role players were blatant, the great majority of students failed to deal with them—even after training. My own observations of the training suggest that small group facilitators neglect to provide feedback to students when the students ignore blatant non-verbal behavior. What’s more, my observations lead me to think that practice and feedback on this skill may lead to improved results. This will be addressed in the final Recommendations section.

With regard to providing manageable feedback (Skill 4 in the Table 15), frequency analysis suggests that in both the pre-training condition and post-training condition, manageable feedback was given equivalently. There were relatively few zero codes on this skill. There were no negative codes. Therefore, this non-positive finding is not very important.

The final skill listed in Table 15 for which there were no positive effects of training pertained to “paraphrasing skill.” Post hoc frequency analyses revealed that the majority of students (77 percent in the pre-training condition and 80 percent in the post-training condition) did not display evidence of this behavioral skill. In the pre-training condition, a total of 18 students demonstrated positive evidence of the skill (approximately 23 percent). In the post-training 15 individuals (approximately 19 percent) demonstrated positive evidence of the skill. It appears as though the primary issue conveyed by this result involves the likelihood that the scenarios and the assessment method did not sufficiently provide opportunities to display this skill.

Table 16 presents the set of skills within the Self-Awareness skill category for which there was no positive effect. The first comment that must be made prior to attempting to understand these results is that the Self-Awareness skills, in general, are difficult to change.

Table 16. List of Self-Awareness Skills Not Positively Affected by Training

-
1. Shares/references life experiences pertaining to his/her social groups.
 2. Communicates awareness of conflict by his/her internalization of his/her multiple social identities.
 3. Displays ability to deal with conflict caused by multiple social identities.
 4. Asks about or makes statements that compare and contrast his/her own values, relationships, and behaviors with the development of others’.
 5. Identifies his/her own stereotypes based on his/her socialization.
 6. Discusses impact or displays awareness of impact of his/her own stereotypes.
 7. Displays recognition that individuals hold different perspectives based on their socialization.
-

Behaviors associated with these skills are not easily acquired. However, several DEOMI management and staff members pointed out very cogently that this set of skills is what sets DEOMI's EOA training apart from other types of training. In other words, it is important to examine the non-positive findings carefully to identify interventions for improving the training.

With regard to the first skill cited in Table 16, the frequency analysis of the response categories revealed an important finding. In the pre-training condition, 83 percent of the respondents displayed at least some behavior within this skill. In contrast, in the post-training condition, 44 percent displayed positive behaviors. In other words, there was a drop in the number of positive behaviors and an increase in zero responses after training. It is difficult to understand why this may be the case. A number of the DEOMI management personnel and staff indicated that this result may be due to a sort of "stifling" effect of the training—that students begin to hold back in their sharing of life experiences. If this is the case, then the training is missing an opportunity to develop this important skill.

In order to understand the results with regard to the second skill in Table 16, a frequency analysis of responses was examined. The majority of respondents presented no evidence of this skill, suggesting that perhaps the skill assessment procedures did not sufficiently elicit the skill. On the other hand, the counter-argument to this is that there were some who did display behaviors associated with the skill one or more times in the pre-training condition (N=24) and in the post-training condition (N=15). In addition, as with the Skill 1, the frequency analysis suggested that a reduction in skill expression followed training. That is, 68 percent of respondents showed no response in the pre-training condition while 81 percent showed no response in the post-training condition. It is not possible to definitively explain the results. But the formative evaluation perspective points to the importance of examine how the skill is trained and whether improvements in training can be implemented.

For the third skill referenced in Table 16, a frequency analysis was carried out. Seventeen percent of respondents showed positive examples of behavior in the pre-training condition while 3 percent showed negative examples. In the post-training condition, 13 percent of respondents showed positive examples of behavior with 3 percent again displaying negative behaviors in this skill area. This of course means that a large majority of students--81 percent in the pre-training condition and 83 percent in the post-training condition displayed no examples of the skill. Therefore, it appears as though this skill is "under-elicited" by the assessment method.

The fourth skill referenced in Table 16 involves asking about or making statements that compare one's socialized values with another's. On its face, it appears that this skill might be difficult to elicit through the assessment method used in this study. This was born out. 90 percent of those in the pre-training condition displayed no example of the behavioral skill. 96 percent in the post-training condition displayed no example of the behavioral skill. Once again, it appears as though the assessment method explains the results.

The fifth behavioral skill pertains to a person's identifying his or her own stereotypes. Once again it may be that the result is related to the current assessment method. A frequency analysis revealed that in the pre-training condition, three percent of students displayed positive

behavioral skills; in the post-training condition, 1 percent of the students evidenced this skill. It should be noted that in the pre-training condition, approximately eight percent of the students displayed negative behavioral indicators of this skill. No students in the post-training condition displayed negative indicators of the skill.

In the sixth skill identified in Table 16, a frequency analysis revealed that in the pre-training condition, 92 percent displayed no evidence of the skill, two percent showed negative evidence, and six percent showed positive evidence. In other words, the overwhelming majority of students did not demonstrate behavioral evidence of the skill. In the post-training condition, one hundred percent of the students displayed zero behavioral indicators of the skill. Once again, it appears as though the assessment method may not have provided sufficient opportunity for students to display the skill.

The final behavioral skill cited in Table 16 pertains to an important target skill for EOA training: the recognition that individuals hold different perspectives based on their socialization. Because of the centrality of this skill in EOA training, the actual results of the frequency analysis are presented in Tables 17 and 18.

First, it appears as though the scenarios do indeed elicit behaviors indicative of this important skill. In other words, in this instance, the type of assessment method does not explain the non-positive findings. Second, a comparison between the pre-training and the post-training condition indicates that there were fewer individuals with negatively coded behavior after training (N=6) than before training (15). Third, there were fewer students who displayed positive evidence of the skill in the post-training condition (N=33) than in the pre-training condition (46). Finally, there were more individuals in the post-condition who displayed no behavior indicative of this skill (N=39) than in the pre-training condition (N=17). This set of findings leads to several questions: (1) Are students more “cautious” in their behavior as a result of training in order to avoid the obvious “faux pas” types of behaviors? (2) If this is what is happening, is it due to the training or the assessment? Again, these are difficult questions to answer. However, my conversations with professionals at DEOMI (management and staff) suggested that some students felt as though they should develop a policy of keeping quiet rather than to risk demonstrating fallibility in certain areas, and being “called down” for their “incorrect” behavior. On the other hand, and this is important, it may be the case that students are still working on improving the skill.

Table 17. Frequency Analysis of Pre-Training Responses to Self-Awareness Skill: Displays recognition that individuals hold different perspectives based on their socialization or experiences

Score	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
-8	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
-7	1	1.3	1.3	2.6
-3	3	3.8	3.8	6.4
-2	3	3.8	3.8	10.3
-1	7	9.0	9.0	19.2
0	17	21.8	21.8	41.0
1	13	16.7	16.7	57.7
2	12	15.4	15.4	73.1
3	8	10.3	10.3	83.3
4	5	6.4	6.4	89.7
5	4	5.1	5.1	94.9
6	2	2.6	2.6	97.4
7	1	1.3	1.3	98.7
8	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
Total	78	100.0	100.0	

Table 18. Frequency Analysis of Post-Training Responses to Self-Awareness Skill: Displays recognition that individuals hold different perspectives based on their socialization or experiences

Score	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
-8	1	1.3	1.3	1.3
-6	1	1.3	1.3	2.6
-3	1	1.3	1.3	3.8
-2	1	1.3	1.3	5.1
-1	2	2.6	2.6	7.7
0	39	50.0	50.0	57.7
1	16	20.5	20.5	78.2
2	10	12.8	12.8	91.0
3	1	1.3	1.3	92.3
4	4	5.1	5.1	97.4
5	1	1.3	1.3	98.7
11	1	1.3	1.3	100.0
Total	78	100.0	100.0	

A final comment needs to be made with regard to the Self-Awareness skill set. As mentioned before, these skills are difficult to develop. One might posit that it takes years to fully develop the self-awareness skills that are expected to change at DEOMI. Theories of organizational development may offer another way of considering the non-positive findings. (See Golembiewski, Billingsley, & Yeager (1976).) In the research on evaluating organizational development, one learns that there are three types of change. “Alpha change” refers to standard “linear change.” That is, if the metric is a yardstick, alpha change may be demonstrated as the difference between “14 inches” (pre-training score) and “21 inches” (post-training score). But consider that the yardstick is made of a highly stretchable substance like soft rubber. This allows

us to consider “Beta change.” Beta change occurs when the yardstick stretches from the time of the pre-intervention to the time of the post-intervention. If self-report evaluation is used, a person learning interpersonal skills may rate him- or herself a 12 before training and a 13 or even an 11 after the training. In other words the usual alpha change is not present. However, the person’s understanding of the interpersonal skills increased, making the yardstick to stretch, and making the evaluation to appear not to represent change.

Although self-report evaluation was not used in this study, the beta change effect may be operating to an extent. For example, if students learned that their self-awareness skills are somewhat weaker than they originally thought, they may recognize this as a result of training and be somewhat circumspect about behaving too spontaneously. One of the professionals at DEOMI in discussing the possibility of beta change indicated “being reticent to act is good if a person is unsure of his or her skills—the training achieved its purpose.”

A third level of change is gamma change. Suppose that a person coming into DEOMI’s EOA training enters the training, due to his or her upbringing, as ego- and ethno-centric. Over a period of 12 weeks, this student begins to understand that people are different, with different values, views, and opinions. In effect, the student is become more cognitively complex with regard to dealing with others from different social identities. This student may have moved from a relatively simplistic understanding to a much more complex understanding of the world. Yet, he or she may not manifest alpha change in the measures, perhaps because the learning is still percolating within.

The point of discussing the different types of change is not to deny that there were non-positive findings. Rather, it is to point out that some change may be in progress, as it were, but not fully crystallized at the time of the post-training assessment. It may be of interest for future evaluators of DEOMI’s training to build into their strategies some mechanism for tapping beta and gamma change. As for the current study, a follow up of this investigation, where the actual transcripts of the students’ responses will be examined in part to determine whether there is evidence of beta and gamma change.

Recommendations

This section was written to provide DEOMI with a set of recommendations that I believe are most important for its attaining its true potential as a world-class training Institute in the area of equal opportunity and diversity appreciation. In order to simplify this section, and to avoid repeating the phrase “I believe that DEOMI should...” I present the recommendations as simple imperative sentences. Clearly, they should only be considered recommendations.

My Observations of the Training Process

1. Integrate the training components.
 - a. Examine whether all the parts of the training are logically linked and sequentially arranged.
 - b. Answer the question: “Why is this a lecture or exercise a part of EOA training?”

- c. In each case, document the answers to this question.
 - d. Disseminate this documentation so that all trainers and group facilitators understand why the EOA training is the way it is.
- 2. Reduce the complexity of terms and ideas.
 - a. Take an “inventory” of all terms, ideas, and models including but not limited to the experiential learning cycle, the facilitation skills model, the group development model, and terms and phrases used on the ISDE form.
 - b. Answer the questions:
 - i. Is each necessary?
 - ii. Is there room for trimming or clarifying terminology?
 - iii. Will training be successful if the topic/model is dropped or changed?
 - iv. Document the answers to these questions.
 - v. Disseminate the documentation for faculty and staff.
- 3. Ensure that lecture material is current.
 - a. Commission a professional educator thoroughly familiar with the goals of EOA training and the role of the EOA to examine the material in the readings and lectures.
 - b. With the assistance of the professional, critique each instructional document for currency, completeness, and clarity.
 - c. Based on the comment made in the IFFEFF report, ensure that there must be continuing acknowledgement of the “isms” that are currently operative within society. The military is embedded in larger society! In particular, ensure that subtle racism, modern racism, and anti-religious tendencies so commonly discussed in 2003 literature are covered.
- 4. Increase the competence and experience of facilitators.
 - a. Review the current training materials for group facilitators.
 - b. Critique the material, simplifying if possible the materials so that they directly relate to DEOMI’s EOA training.
 - c. Document and disseminate any revisions.
 - d. Within the documentation, make sure that a clear explanation of the history and purpose of the Clarification Group is presented.
 - e. Develop a training program for group facilitators that is more experiential than lecture based.
 - f. Use the “Behavioral Modeling Training Approach” in this training. This requires four components: lecture, modeling, practice, and feedback by new instructors. (Comment: small group facilitation is a skill. As such, competence in it cannot be acquired without practice and feedback. Practice and feedback in “live groups” is not the optimal approach.
 - g. Set standards of competence for this facilitator training. These are the absolute essential behavioral skills required to succeed.
 - h. Ensure that this training brings all group facilitators to the standards of competence.
 - i. If a facilitator does meet the standard, he or she should not lead small groups.

- j. Recognize that when facilitators have less on-the-job training (or, better, in-the-group training), they must acquire **experiential training** to substitute for the lack of experience.
- 5. Ensure consistency in evaluation of students across all faculty and group facilitators.
 - a. Examine the ISDE with regard to its inter-rater consistency, validity, and practicality.
 - b. Modify the ISDE according to best practices.
 - c. Develop training module to ensure appropriate and consistent use of the ISDE.
 - d. Document all modifications and training.
 - e. Provide training on evaluation within facilitator training.
 - f. Carry out the same steps for other evaluation and feedback tools such as the "Form 3."
- 6. Prepare DEOMI staff, faculty, and management to dealing with the distressed student.
 - a. Identify the range of emotional reactions to the training that students may present. Do this by interviewing or surveying current and past small group facilitators.
 - b. Commission a professional to discern which of the emotional reactions are manageable by DEOMI's small group facilitators and which are best left to counselors or psychotherapists.
 - c. Develop and document a compendium of emotional reactions encountered in DEOMI's small group.
 - d. Disseminate this document at facilitator training.
 - e. Use this as the basis of part of "Behavioral Modeling Facilitator Training." (That is, this becomes one of the areas in which lecture, modeling, practice, and feedback are used.)
 - f. Leave the very difficult emotional cases for mental health professionals.
 - g. Ensure that current selection criteria for the entering student include reasonable guidelines regarding the student's mental health status.
 - h. Ensure that a mental health professional, knowledgeable of the Clarification Group process at DEOMI, assesses the "reasonableness of standards".
- 7. Monitor and build trust and morale among faculty.
 - a. Take "inventory" of the stresses that affect faculty and staff at DEOMI.
 - b. Identify the link between these stresses and performance effectiveness of faculty and staff.
 - c. Determine which of these stresses are controllable and which are not.
 - d. Develop a plan for reducing the controllable stressors.
 - e. Develop a plan for managing the uncontrollable stressors.
 - f. Document this as a management development tool as the basis for developing the organization.
 - g. Use the skills DEOMI teaches.
 - h. Openly discuss problems that lead to subtle disintegration among the team of faculty and staff.
 - i. Identify occasions when these skills were not used or used ineffectively. (Discussion groups or surveys of past facilitators might help in this regard.)
 - j. Identify current interpersonal frictions and develop a plan to deal with these.
 - k. Attend to the apparent dissatisfaction or stresses of staff members.

- l. Use the communication-and-feedback skills to continue build a high-performing climate.
- m. Build on the satisfaction and daily successes experienced by DEOMI staff.
- n. Continue to ascertain the successes small and large of DEOMI staff.
- o. Continue to recognize these consistently.
- p. Find ways of further promoting and reinforcing the successes of the DEOMI staff.

The Positive Skill-Development Findings

- 1. Discuss the results of this study so that faculty and staff understand how they have succeeded and how they might build on the successes.
- 2. Identify ways of further developing the positively affected skills.
- 3. Consider using the skills assessment form used in this study as a model for improving the ISDE form and procedures.

The Non-positive Skill-Development Findings

- 1. Examine and look for corroborating evidence (student comments, faculty observations, management observations) for the non-positive findings presented in the Results and Discussion section of this report.
 - a. Ensure that all findings presented in this report are discussed in the context of corroborating evidence.
 - b. Investigate whether the non-positive “alpha change” findings are indeed examples of beta or gamma change.
 - i. Commission an expert to pursue this line of inquiry.
 - c. Prioritize the importance of the skills that may not be optimally trained.
 - d. Commission professional-experts to identify reasons for sub-optimal skill acquisition and obstacles to student skill development in the current training.
 - e. Develop candidate strategies for better developing these skills.
 - f. Make carefully chosen changes to training tactics based on the identification of improved training tactics
- 2. Continuing the Evaluation Process
 - a. Develop plans to evaluate DEOMI and its training program on a regular basis.
 - b. Carry out a thorough job analysis of the EOAs range of duties in all Services to identify currently relevant knowledge, skills, abilities, and other characteristics.
 - c. Ensure that this job analysis focuses not only on tasks performed but also on the skills and other characteristics required of today’s EOA.
 - d. Ensure that this job analysis develops an understanding of not only what EOAs do but also what they **should be doing** according to their mission.
 - e. Carry out a content validity analysis of the EOA training based on the detailed job analysis results.
 - f. Regularly examine the effect of the EOA training on behavioral skills.
 - g. Optionally, use approaches similar to the one used in this study to assess a sample of students on a yearly basis.
 - h. Consider building skill assessment into the curriculum so that the students’ final grades represent their skill and knowledge level.
 - i. Avoid sole dependence on student evaluations as training evaluation data.

- j. Evaluate the impact of DEOMI as an organizational intervention designed to positively affect the Department of Defense and Department of Homeland Security.
 - k. Commission a team to study DEOMI as an “intervention.”
3. Study the modern forms of inter-group conflict that exist in society and, therefore, in the military.
- a. Learn the effects of this conflict on mission readiness and combat effectiveness.
 - b. Document and disseminate the evaluation.

Study Summary

The goal of this study was to examine formatively the effect of EOA training. Several methods were used. First, I employed qualitative approach. By observing the course for 12 weeks, by reviewing the materials, by attending the lectures, and by interviewing faculty and staff, I gathered a good deal of information about EOA training process. In addition, students from one class were assessed with regard to their understanding of the cognitive material in the course. More importantly students were assessed with regard to their communication-and-feedback and self-awareness skill development. A single-prompt analogue assessment tool was designed to assess a large subset of the skills targeted in EOA training. The study used a pre-training—post-training design, which allowed for an assessment in change that occurs after training.

I believe that this study was successful. The results of the study indicated that EOA training has powerful effects in both skill areas. They also indicated that there might be room for improvement in the EOA training program. The results of the study point directly to a number of recommendations which I presented very succinctly above.

I believe that the formative goal of this study can be met if DEOMI considers the results carefully and begins systematically to make some changes. It is important not to over-emphasize what might be seen as the “negative” results of the study. It is far more productive to build upon the positive results and develop a strategic plan for continued improvement. I ask that optimism guide present and future management of DEOMI so that its impact is enlarged and appreciated.

Finally, I must say that it has been a privilege for me to carry out this study. At last count, 72 members of DEOMI’s staff have participated in some way or another in carrying out this effort. Three of my graduate students at Old Dominion University Lara Tedrow, James Camic, and Hope Hanner, have also spent hours of their personal time, unpaid, coding the taped responses of the EOA students. The names of all who participated in this endeavor are listed in the Appendix 5 for my personal recognition.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2003). Guidelines on Multicultural Education, Training, Research, Practice, and Organizational Change for Psychologists. *American Psychologist*, 58, 377-402.
- American Evaluation Associate (1995). Guiding principles for evaluators. In W.R. Shadish, D.L. Newman, M.A. Scheirer, & C. Wye (Eds.). *Guiding principles for evaluators*.
- Babad, E.Y, Birnbaum, M., & Benne, K.D. (1978). The Clarification Group approach to laboratory learning. *Group & Organizational Studies*, 3(2), 168-184.
- Babad, E.Y, Birnbaum, M., & Benne, K.D. (1983). *The social self: Group influences on social identity*. Sage Library of Social Research: Beverly Hills, CA.
- Benne, L.P., Bradford, L.P., Gibb, J., & Lippitt, R. (Eds). (1975). *The laboratory method of change and learning*. Palo Alto, CA: Science & Behavior Books.
- Cook, S.W. & Selltiz, C.A. (1955). Some factors which influence the attitudinal outcomes of personal contact. *International Social Science Bulletin*, 7, 51-58.
- Cronbach, L. J. (1982). *Designing evaluations of educational and social programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Defense Race Relations Institute. (1972). *Program of instruction*. Patrick Air Force Base, FL., p. iii.
- Golembiewski, R.T., Billingsley, K.R., & Yeager, S. (1976). Measuring change and persistence in human affairs: Types of change generated by OD designs. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 12, 97-103.
- Hope, R. (1979). *Racial strife in the U.S. Military: Toward the elimination of discrimination*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Kirk, R. (1982). *Experimental design: Procedures for the behavioral sciences*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Kirkpatrick, D. L. (1983). Four steps to measuring training effectiveness. *Personnel Administrator*, 28 (11), 19-25.
- McIntyre, R. M., Smith, D. E., & Hassett, C. (1984). Accuracy of performance ratings as affected by rater training and perceived purpose of rating. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 147-156.

McIntyre, R. M. & Bentson, C. A. (1984). A comparison of methods for training behavioral observation: Modeling works! Presented at the 92nd meeting of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

McGuire, W.G. (2003). Unpublished memo to the Commandant of the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute.

Norton, PJ & Hope, DA (2001). Analogue observational methods in the assessment of social functioning in adults. *Psychological Assessment*, 13, p. 59-72.

Scriven, M. (1967). The methodology of evaluation. In R.E. Stake (Ed.), *Curriculum evaluation*. (American Educational Research Associate Monograph Series on Evaluation, No. 1, pp. 39-83. Chicago: Rand McNally.

U.S. Department of Defense. (1970). Theus Committee. Education Program in Race Relations. Report of the Inter-Service Task Force on Education in Race Relations.

Woodmansee, J.J. & Cook, S.W. (1967). Dimensions of verbal racial attitude: Their identification and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 7, 240-50.

Worthen, B.R., Sanders, J.R., & Fitzpatrick, J.L. (1997). *Program evaluation: Alternative approaches and practical guidelines (2nd Ed.)*. New York: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.

Appendix 1. Demographic Breakdown of Students in Study

Racial Breakdown of Sample

		Fr equency	ercent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Asian – Filipino	1	.3	1.3	1.3
	Asian – Other	2	.6	2.6	3.8
	Black not Hispanic	41	2.6	52.6	56.4
	Hispanic - Latin American	1	.3	1.3	57.7
	Hispanic – Mexican	3	.8	3.8	61.5
	Hispanic – Other	2	.6	2.6	64.1
	Hispanic – Puerto Rican	6	.7	7.7	71.8
	White not Hispanic	22	8.2	28.2	100.0
	Total	78	100.0	100.0	

Breakdown of Sample by Gender

		Fr equency	ercent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid		30	8.5	38.5	38.5
		48	1.5	61.5	100.0
	Total	78	100.0	100.0	

Breakdown of Sample by Service Branch

		Fr equency	ercent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	FR	1	.3	1.3	1.3
	RNG	2	.6	2.6	3.8
	GC	1	.3	1.3	5.1
	SA	51	5.4	65.4	70.5
	SAF	3	.8	3.8	74.4
	SAR	1	.3	1.3	75.6
	SMC	6	.7	7.7	83.3
	SN	13	6.7	16.7	100.0
	total	78	100.0	100.0	

Appendix 2

Instructions for Monitors

INSTRUCTIONS FOR MONITORS

This packet includes:
VHS tape of 25 scenarios
Instructions for Monitors
Labels for the students' tapes
Packet with 25 questions (one question per scenario)

Greetings, Monitor:

You have agreed to serve as a "monitor" during the skills assessment planned to take place during the first week of DEOMI training. We thank you for this. Without your help, this work could not be done. The following is a set of directions to clarify what you will do as "monitor."

Brief Background

The summer of 2001 began a comprehensive study to evaluate DEOMI intervention. The leader of the study is a visiting professor, Dr. Robert M. McIntyre. One part of the study investigates behavioral skill changes within DEOMI students; we refer to this as "skills assessment." There are three important areas of skills assessment. First, students will individually view a videotape of 25 scenarios depicting incidents that have occurred in group settings. Second, students respond to what they have observed in each videotaped scenario. Third, students' statements and reactions to scenarios are recorded on videotape. The monitor's job is to help with this three-part process.

Directions and Guidelines

Step 1. Monitor greets the student as he or she enters the assigned room. For example, say the following:

"Hi, my name is xxxxxx. And you are xxxxx, correct?"

[Write the name and date on the label of the videotape. The label should be in your packet of materials. If it is not, please make sure that you write the student's name on a piece of note paper (or something).]

You have been asked to participate in a study of the effectiveness of DEOMI's educational methods. All students have been asked to participate in this study. Please have a seat and I will play a videotape of Dr. McIntyre who will provide the directions. Here is a copy of the directions. Please read along with Dr. McIntyre.

Step 2. Monitor ensures student is seated comfortably in the proper place.

NOTE: PLEASE ENSURE THE STUDENT REMAINS SEATED IN THE PRE-POSITIONED DESK TYPE CHAIR (ONE-ARMED BANDIT) WITH THE TWO FRONT WHEELS PLACED AT THE END (S) OF THE MASKING TAPE ON THE CARPET. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU (THE MONITOR) DO NOT POSITION YOURSELF BETWEEN THE STUDENT AND THE CAMERA; THE INTENT IS TO FILM ONLY THE STUDENT! POSITION YOUR DESK-TYPE CHAIR SO THAT YOU ARE ABLE TO SPEAK NATURALLY WITH THE STUDENT AND ALSO VIEW THE TV SCREEN. IT IS IMPORTANT THAT THE STUDENT CAN VIEW THE TV SCREEN COMFORTABLY, WITHOUT DISTRACTION. IT IS ALSO IMPORTANT THAT STUDENT IS **SEEN** BY THE EYE OF THE BUBBLE CAMERA.

[Now start the taped directions tape. Then say,]

“Ok, are you ready to begin?”

[If the student has questions, then use the suggested responses to help you with them.]

Step 3. Start the scenario tape. Play the first scenario, stop the tape and ask the question for scenario 1. When the student completes his or her response, restart the tape, and continue through the process until completion.

After the student finishes responding to the last tape, say the following:

*“That completes your task today/this evening. We ask you **not to discuss the scenarios** with your classmates. We ask this favor in order to make sure that everyone gets a **fresh chance** at viewing and responding to the scenarios.”*

“You are free to go. And once again, on behalf of DEOMI and for me, thanks for your help in this study.”

Step 4. After the student has responded to all 25 scenarios, make sure to bring the label to the lab and attach it to the appropriate tape.

Possible Questions and Suggested Answers for the Monitor

In general, monitors are asked to not say anything other than what was written above. However, if questions arise, several answers are provided below:

Question: What if I don't have anything to say?

Answer: *"That is perfectly OK. Just say 'I don't have anything to say about this.'"*

Question: Was that the right answer?

Answer: *"As I read to you before, there are no wrong answers?"*

Question: Is that what you are looking for?

Answer: *"As I read above, we are not looking for a certain response."*

Question: How can I respond to that if I have not had the course yet?

Answer: *"As I read above, make the response that is most natural for you now."*

Question: Do I have a time limit?

Answer: *"Altogether, for all the scenarios, you will have approximately 1 ¼ hours. There is technically no time limit for any scenario."*

Question: How am I doing so far?

Answer: *"Because there are NO WRONG ANSWERS, it is not possible for me to answer your question. Just be yourself."*

Question: That was dumb, wasn't it?

Answer: *"There are no WRONG answers."*

Question: Can I ask you a question about what was just said in the scenario?

Answer: *"I cannot answer questions about the scenario."*

Question: Can you replay that scenario again?

Answer: *"I am sorry, I am not allowed to replay a scenario. Just do the best you can with what you have heard and seen."*

Question: Why are you writing my name on the tape label?

Answer: *"We have to be able to track the patterns and trends of students before and after training. Your name is used as a way of keeping track. No one associated with student evaluations will see your name. Further, your personal records will be kept in confidence by the professional observers."*

Any question that asks you for more information, just say:

Answer: *"I have been asked to say only what is written here. Just make the response that is most natural for you."*

To any comment on the scenarios intended to get a reaction from the monitor:

Answer: *“I have been asked not to comment on the content of the scenario.”*

If a student does not make a response in 10-15 seconds, and seems to not have a response, you may ask him or her *“Should we move on to the next scenario?”*

If a student talks for an extremely long time, and does not seem to be adding any new information, you should use your judgment and ask or say something like—**with great sensitivity to the student**—

“OK, why don’t we move on to the next scenario?” **[NOTE: We expect that you will rarely if ever do this]**

Any student who needs to go to the bathroom, please point out the location of the facility. Then ask him or her to return as quickly as possible. Please tell technician in the laboratory to stop the tape until the student returns. Please note on the tape label that the student had to take a break in the exercise.

Any student who asks to see the results of the study should be told that the study will not be done until August 2003 (earliest). At that time, students are more than welcome to request a summary of results from the Directorate of Research.

Additional Points for the Monitors

1. The scenario tape is a controlled item; please treat it accordingly.
2. Be aware that the room is being recorded when students are present. If you encounter faulty equipment or tape malfunction, go to the lab for assistance.
3. **Important:** Please write down the student's names and date conducted on the labels provided. (One name per label.)
4. Upon completion of each assessment, please go to the lab and have the person in the lab pull the student's tape and place the label with the student's name and date on the tape.
5. Dr. McIntyre gave the students the following brief about the skills assessment. Here is what Dr. McIntyre said.

My name is (Dr.) Bob McIntyre. I am a full-time faculty member at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. This academic year, I am helping to evaluate the course at DEOMI to make sure that it is the best that it can be. On the student schedule, you will notice the phrase "skills assessment." This skills assessment will provide me with the information for evaluating DEOMI's course. There are two parts to the skills assessment. The first involves your viewing and responding to videotaped scenarios. For approximately one hour during the next three days, each of you will individually do this at your assigned time. You will also do this toward the end of the course. You will learn more about this later at your assigned session. I don't want to say much more than that so as not to give you information overload. When you show up for your session, you will find out more details.

The second assessment involves a paper-and-pencil knowledge test. Again, you will take this test early in the course and toward the end.

So I would say that my job is to determine the degree to which DEOMI is providing you with important knowledge and skills. I will use my findings to provide feedback in general form to DEOMI staff members so that they can continue to do their important work.

One last thing. I am looking at the results overall, in summary form; not at the individual level. Any information that I collect in this process will become a part of a larger data set and will have absolutely no impact on you as individuals.

(Dr. McIntyre will now pass out the schedule and explain to students that on Monday, all students will be attending library orientation and some will participate in the assessment. They will be asked to check their assignments for these activities.)

I thank you in advance for your help.

Appendix 3

Scripted Instructions and Greetings

McIntyre's Script for Directions

"Hello, I am Bob McIntyre. I introduced myself earlier to your class when I discussed the skills assessment. I am a faculty member from Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia, and this year I am doing some research for DEOMI.

"You may remember from what I said, and from what Captain Watts spoke about, that DEOMI is carrying out a study to identify the strengths and weaknesses of the current curriculum. As DEOMI's Commandant, Captain Watts thanked you in advance for your help. I am also thanking you as well.

"I will refer to the person in the room with you as your monitor. Your monitor's job is to help with the session. After I finish reading the directions, the monitor will start the VCR. Your job is to listen carefully to the direction and the narrator on the tape, view a series of 25-videotaped scenarios, and respond to the question that the monitor reads to you. Each scenario consists of two or more individuals having a conversation with one another. At the end of each scenario, your monitor will stop the tape and read a question to you.

To give you a better idea of the kinds of scenarios you will see, look at the following:

For example, the monitor may read the following question after you see the scenario:

What would you say if you were a member of the group that you just observed?"

*"This question is asking you to **BE A MEMBER** of the group that you just observed and respond as though you were a member of the group. It does not ask you to **DESCRIBE** what is going on in the group. This is important. Please listen carefully to each question that the monitor reads to you. Please make sure you address the question.*

"The monitor's main jobs are to start and stop the VCR and read the questions to you. In other words, he or she has been asked not to react to your responses or interact with you about your response. He or she will not say anything about the scenario or about your response. So again, I ask you to pay close attention to the taped narrator's statement, the conversation in each scenario, and the question that the monitor reads. And again, please respond to the question that is read to you.

*In answering the question, your response should be what is natural for you. We are not looking for **ANY** particular kind of answer on your part—there are **no WRONG ANSWERS**. After you have finished making your response to the question, the monitor will start the VCR for the next scenario.*

“Each response you give will be recorded on videotape. Your videotaped responses along with those of all students will be observed and coded by a group of trained professional observers, not associated with DEOMI. No one involved in student evaluations at DEOMI will see the tapes. The goal of the professional observers is to identify patterns and trends that can be used to evaluate and improve DEOMI training methods.

*“I should let you know that toward the end of the course, all students will be asked to participate in another similar task. Once again, professional, outside observers, will observe your and your classmates’ taped responses. Your responses now and then will not, in any way, affect your grades or be entered into your student records. In total, all information will be summarized and used **only for evaluating and improving DEOMI’s training methods.***

“As you go through this exercise, you may have some questions. In piloting the exercise we have discovered several common questions: For example,

- **What do you do if you do not have much or anything to say?**
- **Was that the right answer?**
- **Is that what you are looking for?**
- ***How can I answer this question without having had the course?***

We have no expectations. Just make the response that is natural for you.

- ***You may wonder if there is a time limit to your response.***

Answer: “Altogether, you will have approximately 1 ½ hours. If you just happen to speak a little on the long side, the monitor may ask you if you are ready to move to the next scenario.

- ***You may want to ask question about what took place in a scenario or to see a scenario again.***

Answer: “Make sure you pay attention. The monitor has been asked not to give any additional information.”

- ***You may wonder why the monitor is writing your name on the label for the tape.***

Answer: “The trained observers have to track the patterns and trends of students before and after training. Your name is used as a way of keeping track. No one associated with student evaluations will see your name. Further, your personal records will be kept in confidence by the professional observers.

- ***You may wonder about which member in the scenario to address.***

Answer: *“Please make sure that you answer the question. The question is your key as to whom you should address.”*

“Remember, your monitor has been asked to limit what he or she says.

“I know you have heard this before, but let me say it again. Your participation is extremely important for the continuing improvement of DEOMI.

Thanks for your help and attention.

Appendix 4
ISDE

Student: _____ Group: _____ ISDE#: _____ Dates: _____

ISDE Rating Scale: **U** - Unsatisfactory (did not practice appropriate behaviors)
K - Knowledge (practicing appropriate behaviors **with** trainer prompting)
KH - Know-How (practicing appropriate behaviors **without** trainer prompting)
W - Wisdom (the student has become the teacher)

Individual Category 1: Communication Process:

- Sender** - communicates in an understandable and sincere manner; clearly expresses thoughts and feelings.
- Responses** - responds to what has been said; is non-evaluative and non-patronizing; seeks clarification of verbal and non-verbal expressions.
- Receiver** - remains alert and involved in discussions; allows speaker to finish comment before responding; demonstrates the ability to paraphrase.
- Psychological Barriers** - expresses anger/frustration in a constructive manner; accepts and uses new information.

Total Each Column of Category 1:

U	K	KH	W

Individual Category 2: Feedback Skills:

- Specificity** – gives specific feedback; directs feedback towards changeable behavior.
- Need** – takes into account the needs of the receiver.
- Timing** – gives feedback at the appropriate time.
- Information** - shares information rather than gives advice.
- Clarification** – checks to ensure clear communication.
- Receptive** - responds to feedback and developmental counseling.

Total Each Column of Category 2:

U	K	KH	W

Individual Category 3: Self-Centered Functions:

- Withdrawing** - addresses important differences; effectively copes with conflicts; takes a stand on key issues; expresses feelings; responds to the comments of others.
- Blocking** - encourages progress toward group goals by **not** constantly raising objections; does not repeatedly bring up the same topic or issue after the group has considered and rejected it.
- Status & Recognition Seeking** – does not boost or call attention to one's own expertise or experience when unnecessary to establish credibility or when not relevant to the group's task; does not play games to elicit sympathy.
- Special Interest** - does not manipulate or use other group members for selfish goals that compete with group's needs.

U	K	KH	W

Total Each Column of Category 3:

	96		
--	----	--	--

Student: _____

Individual Category 4: Self-Awareness:

- a. **Explore Life History** – shares life experiences in terms of group membership (race, ethnicity, religion, gender, and social class); balances sharing between impact on self, group memberships, and all human beings.
- b. **Recognize Multiplicity of Socio-Identities** – communicates an awareness of the conflict caused by the internalization of multiple identities within group memberships; displays the ability to deal with differences and conflicts between various socio-identities.
- c. **Stereotype Awareness** – identifies and discusses stereotypes learned in the socialization process.
- d. **Inter-group Conflict & Resolution** – communicates personal experiences with inter-group conflict; identifies destructive and unrealistic elements and potential strategies of conflict resolution; displays the ability to implement conflict resolution strategies.
- e. **Empathy** – displays the ability to view situations from the others' perspective(s).
- f. **Back-Home Application** – demonstrates the ability to practice and experiment with strategies of applying learned skills outside the small group.
- g. **Collaborative Inquiry** – asks questions that compare and contrast personal development of values, relationships, and behavior patterns with the experiences of group members whose development has been different.

Total Each Column of Category 4:

U	K	KH	W

Individual Category 5: Standards of Conduct:

- a. **Personal & Professional Behavior** – inspires cooperation and progress; accepts and offers group direction; conducts self congruently with organizational goals and objectives.
- b. **Personal & Professional Appearance** – displays excellent personal & professional appearance, demeanor, and conduct; meets minimum service physical fitness standards.
- c. **Equal Opportunity & Treatment** – treats others with fairness and respect; uses inclusive language; challenges discriminatory behaviors (i.e. sexually exclusionary language, racial/sexual/etc... slurs, jokes, or innuendoes); contributes to the organization's cohesiveness and morale.

Total Each Column of Category 5:

U	K	KH	W

Student: _____

Trainer Comments: *(Comments should include student's contribution to the small group's development, specific behaviors related to evaluated areas, encouragement, and strategies to overcome deficiencies.)*

Trainer Signature/Date
Signature/Date

Trainer

Student Comments: _____

STUDENT	
GRADE	

Student Signature/Date

USER INFORMATION:

1. Abbreviations:

- **U** – Unsatisfactory (did not practice appropriate behaviors)
- **K** – Knowledge (practicing appropriate behaviors **with** trainer prompting)
- **KH** – Know-How (practicing appropriate behaviors **without** trainer prompting)
- **W** - Wisdom (the student has become the teacher)

Appendix 5

List DEOMI Staff Who Participated in Study

Role Players

NAME
Sgt Linda Mendez
SFC Frederico Jacobs
MSgt Jeff Jennings
SFC Nathaniel Knight Jr.
Ms. Debra Eddy
*LTC Mike Lawrence
*SSG Mary Lawrence
Mr. Sam Cruz
LCDR David McKay
*MCPO Dennis Burns
SFC Calvin Brown
CPO John Bacay
*Capt Christine Willett
*MSG David Clay
MSgt Clifton Thibodeau
MSG Lori Briscoe
CPO Arthur Dunklin
Maj Darold Boswell
MSgt Lauren Long
*LCDR Mary Ann Geise
MAJ Javier Garcia
*MAJ Jay Steinke
MSG Trevor Deveaux
CPT Gary Spearow
SFC Connie Papion
MSgt Dennis Jones
USMC (student)

IMM Personnel who assisted in putting scenario tapes together and setting up rooms for taping:

Dr. Bill McAndrew
 MSgt Robert Miller
 Mr. Pete Hemmer

Mr. Rob Massingale
 SSG Leo Torres

Cognitive Test:
 Mr. Randy Conrad

Pilot test:

	Monitors	Staff participant
<u>1</u>	<u>*Ms. Dorothy Miles</u>	*SFC Leslie Jones
<u>2</u>	<u>*LT Juan Mercado</u>	*Ms. Kelly Thayer
<u>3</u>	<u>*Maj Paul Charron</u>	Dr. Gary McGuire
<u>4</u>	<u>*Mr. Jerry Scarpate</u>	Ms. Iris Speed
<u>5</u>	*MAJ Dean Bonura	SFC Yma Stallworth
<u>6</u>	*Dr. Rick Tallarigo	*Ms. Mary Ann Chevalier
<u>7</u>	*Ms. Mary Cooler	PO Vincent Williams
<u>8</u>	<u>*Mr. Jim Lambright</u>	*Ms. Karen Olender
<u>9</u>	<u>*CPT Susan Sotherland</u>	*SFC Ian Dames
<u>10</u>	<u>MSG Paul Donnelly</u>	SGM Vincent Mathias
<u>11</u>	<u>*MAJ Bruce Dempsey</u>	Ms. Dottie Maney-Kellum
<u>12</u>	SFC Shelton Tolbert	<u>*MAJ Jay Steinke</u>

Monitors in lab rooms:

*MCPO Dennis Burns
 *Capt Chis Willett
 *SSG Mary Lawrence
 *LCDR Mary Ann Geise
 *MSG David Clay

Student Monitors for assessments:

*Maj Dean Bonura	*Maj Paul Charron	*Ms. Mary Cooler
*MAJ Bruce Dempsey	*Ms. Dorothy Miles	*Lt Juan Mercado
*Mr. Jerry Scarpate	*Dr. Rick Tallarigo	*SFC Leslie Jones
*Mr. Jim Lambright	*CPT Susan Sotherland	*Ms. Kelly Thayer
MAJ James Mullins	Mr. Howard Wiggins	Ms. Carrie Tillman
*LTC Mike Lawrence	LTC Tom Blake	Capt Daniel Stoner
*Ms. Mary Ann Chevalier	Ms. Eileen Gonzales	Ms. Barbara Springer
Ms. Pat Hall	LT Vanessa Givens	Maj Todd Kustra
Ms. Annette Clay	Mr. Jerry Dilley	*Ms. Karen Olender
Capt Karen Gregory	LT Buddy Coard	*SFC Ian Dames
MSgt James Woodland	SCPO Kurt Nance	Capt Bryant Gilchrist
Mr. Don Samuels (intern)	Dr. Judy Johnson (SFRP)	Dr. Gene Murray SFRP)
Dr. Steve Knouse (SFRP)	Dr. Jim Stewart (SFRP)	

Research Assistant: Ms. BJ Marcum

*These individuals were repeat supporters, i.e., respondent for pilot and staff and student monitors

Total numbers of staff members who supported project: 67

Total numbers of outside individuals who supported project: 5

Total on project: 72