To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Bruce Alan Abt entitled "Predicting Casualties in Experiential Groups." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

Kenneth R. Newton, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

Wesley G. Morgan

Robert G. Wahler

F. Stanley Lusky

Accepted for the Council:

Hatton A. Smith
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
T56b
.A242
cop.2

PREDICTING CASUALTIES IN EXPERIENTIAL GROUPS

A Dissertation

Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee

Bruce Alan Abt

December 1975

1266911

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks go to my committee chairman, Ken Newton, for being at the Psychology Clinic and providing me with alternative ways to view psychologists, psychology, and me. I also appreciate my other committee members, Wesley Morgan, for his interest and help when I needed it; Robert Wahler, for his openness to discussion; and Stan Lusby, for always having the attitude of how can I be of help to you.

My wife Evet also deserves my special thanks for reassuring me when I needed it. Thanks also to Ann Lacava, an excellent typist and good person to know.

Finally, I want to thank me for the courage and perseverence to return to graduate school and pursue this once impossible dream.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this investigation was to determine if casualties in experiential groups can be predicted before the group begins. This research was based on information generated in a study on encounter groups by Morton A. Lieberman, Irvin D. Yalom, and Matthew Miles published in 1973.

The Lieberman study suggested that casualties would be positive and uncritical toward the group, they would rate themselves as having low self esteem, being interpersonally inadequate and needing more open peer communication. Also they would want to change but would not be interested in joining the group just for the sake of the experience. This study created groups similar to those in the Lieberman study and, using the questionnaires developed for that study, tried to determine if Lieberman's findings would help to pinpoint casualties.

Two encounter groups and one control group were looked at. The groups met for a period of 10 weeks and each participant was interviewed two months after the group to determine who was hurt by the group. In addition to the personal anticipation questionnaire, the attitude questionnaire, and the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale used in the Lieberman study, the Adjective Check List was also administered before and after the group. The co-facilitators of the groups and two outside observers also made predictions about who would be hurt by the group. These predictions were made after observing the first 20 minutes of the first group meeting.

During the post quarter interview with each of the participants only one person was determined to be more psychologically distressed.

When this casualty's responses were compared with the hypotheses of the Lieberman study, using the top 10 percent of the scales as a cutoff point, none of the eight predictions were correct. At the beginning of the quarter the casualty saw the group as dangerous and phony with little social benefit. He rated himself high in self esteem and interpersonal adequacy with plenty of opportunity for open peer communication. He ranked among the top third of the participants who came to the group wanting new experiences but he was included among the top third who came to the group wanting change. It is only on this last scale, the desire for change, that the casualty tends to agree with the Lieberman study.

Another finding of this study was that one co-facilitator and one outside observer rightly predicted that the casualty would be the one most hurt by the group. The other co-facilitator thought he would be the second most hurt. Therefore, with no training as to what to look for when predicting casualties, those observing the groups' behavior were more successful than the paper and pencil questionnaire devised for the Lieberman study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	1
I. ANOTHER INTRODUCTION AND SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS . . . History of Experiential Groups in the United States and Their Changing Emphasis Casualties in Groups: What Are They?	2
II. METHOD	36
III. HYPOTHESES	46
IV. INTERVIEWS WITH THE PARTICIPANTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF CASUALTIES . . . . . Interview Summaries A Review of What People the Group Participants Thought Could Be Harmed in the Group Situation	55
V. LEADERS' AND OBSERVERS' RANKINGS . . . . . Group I Group II Casualty Rankings Correlations	63
VI. EXAMINING THE RESULTS IN LIGHT OF THE ORIGINAL PREDICTIONS . . . . . Attitudes Toward the Group--Lieberman Questionnaire Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale Leader and Observer Ratings Adjective Check List	71
VII. COMMENCEMENTS	76
BIBLIOGRAPHY	84
APPENDICES . . . . . Appendix A Appendix B	91
VITA	121

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Results of Post Group Interview: Summary of Participants' Replies to Interviewer's Questions	61
2.	Comparison of Group I and Group II Casualty Rankings . . .	69
3.	Summary of Paul's Test Scores Compared with the Lieberman Study of What the Profile of a Casualty Should Look Like .	75
A-1.	Comparison of Control and Encounter Groups on the Two Lieberman Questionnaires, the Rosenberg Scales and the Adjective Check List, Using a t-Test to Measure Significant Difference (Pregroup Comparisons)	92
A-2.	Comparison of Control and Encounter Groups on the Adjective Check List, Using a t-Test to Measure Significant Difference (After Group Comparisons)	94
A-3.	Lieberman's Casualty Indicators	95
A-4.	Pre Group Ranking of All Group Members By Two Observers and By Two Group Leaders Indicating Who Will Be Harmed by the Group Experience (Group I)	97
A-5.	Pre Group Ranking of All Group Members By Two Observers and By Two Group Leaders Indicating Who Will Be Harmed by the Group Experience (Group II)	97
A-6.	Post Group Ranking of All Group Members By Each Group Member and By Each Leader Indicating Who Was Harmed by the Group Experience (Group I)	98
A-7.	Post Group Ranking of Each Group Member By Each Group Member and By Each Leader Indicating Who Was Harmed by the Group Experience (Group II)	99
A-8.	Correlations of Leaders, Observers, and Participants Rankings of Casualties (Group I)	100
A-9.	Correlations of Leaders, Observers, and Participants Rankings of Casualties (Group II)	101

INTRODUCTION

In the October, 1973 issue of the *American Psychologist*, the American Psychological Association presented guidelines for psychologists conducting growth or encounter groups. One of the injunctions to group leaders was to screen out those individuals for whom he or she judges the group experience to be inappropriate. The question of who should be eliminated from participating in these groups and how this deselection should be accomplished is central to this study.

CHAPTER I

ANOTHER INTRODUCTION AND SOME GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

Before I begin to discuss casualties and some of the difficulties in trying to screen for them a bit of personal history is in order to set the background for this research. In one sense I might be considered a casualty of an encounter group or perhaps more aptly of a therapeutic experience. With a Master's degree in Business Administration and with three years of experience working for the Department of State as a Foreign Service Officer, I was in 1968 assigned for two years to the Department of Housing and Urban Development in San Francisco. It was there that I first learned about psychology and encounter groups. With a few friends I joined Synanon as an outside game player. These games were extremely confrontative and I was made more than a little uneasy. At that time word was spread that Fritz Perls would be having his last workshop at Esalen. I had never heard of Perls before but was intrigued with the idea of going to Esalen in Big Sur. As preparation for the weekend, I read *Gestalt Therapy* by Perls, Hefferline and Goodman. This book was no preparation for what was to come.

The weekend was something I had never experienced before. People were crying, screaming, and hugging each other. For me the experience was a shock, and I returned home, broke up with a girl that had gone with me to Esalen, and joined a therapy group. I stayed in this group for about a year and during that time, I went to another Gestalt weekend in San Francisco; some months later I joined an encounter group at the Humanist Institute. The leader of my therapy group was a young

psychiatrist not much older than myself. When he found out that I was in an encounter group he was upset because he thought it would interfere with my therapy. The contrast between these two experiences was dramatic. The therapy group was slow moving and rather uneventful. The encounter group was chaotic and emotion filled. While I talked about my problems in the therapy group, I was feeling them in the encounter group. Most of the time I was frightened.

At this time I was dating a girl who was a psychiatric social worker and who had some group leader experience. She was also in therapy with a psychoanalyst. Despite the fact that thus far my group experiences hadn't been that successful, she and I decided to run our own encounter groups at a local YMCA. We made contact with the Y. They thought the group was a good idea and sent out announcements. No one responded. I told my group therapist about our group plans and this time he was even more upset. He suggested that if I was interested in psychology I should get some formal training. Although I was due to be reassigned to an Embassy abroad within six months, I was not very enthusiastic about continuing my Foreign Service career. So my therapist recommended some schools in the San Francisco area that were somewhat humanistically oriented. Investigating the less structured, more group oriented programs, I found that they usually didn't provide funding for students and weren't usually approved by the American Psychological Association. So in December, 1969, I took the Graduate Record Examination and began the long process of applying to graduate schools in psychology. One of the fears expressed by several authors in discussing the dangers of encounter groups was that participants might want to become group leaders. I fell into that group.

A month later the group I had been in for a year decided to have an all night marathon. For me all my other experiences in groups paled in comparison to the intense reactions I had in regard to that night. Now with hindsight I realize that soon after that night I left the group because I felt the therapist and the group were not able to give me enough support after the marathon. With a recommendation from my girl friend's therapist, I began to see a psychoanalyst. At that time I already had been accepted by the University of Tennessee for the following fall. I soon wrote them that I wanted a year's extension because I wanted to continue my therapy. In the fall of 1971 I came to the University of Tennessee to begin my graduate training without the blessing of my therapist who was giving me subtle hints about staying in treatment. This short description of my involvement with encounter and therapy groups sets the stage for this dissertation about screening clients for encounter groups and what happens when you don't. Now it should be obvious that I wrote this dissertation not only with an academic interest in whether casualties could be spotted in groups before they occur, but also because I was interested in evaluating my own experiences in groups with an eye to viewing myself as a group dropout who gained greatly from having the group experience.

History of Experiential Groups in the United States and their Changing Emphasis

Just the Facts

Around the time of World War II group therapy began to be widely used as a means of psychotherapy. While a few psychologists had used the idea of group therapy several years earlier, the lack of therapists

during the war caused an increased use of groups for therapeutic purposes. At this same time authors began to study the relationships of therapy to functioning in group situations. Many years later Yalom (1970) wrote that the principal means of change in groups were the members themselves and how they interacted. The group leader's main function was to orchestrate the interacting of the group members. He shapes his group to do the necessary job. This role of the leader in therapy, one of enabling the group to do its job, is distinct from how the leader in experiential groups emerged as one who by personal wisdom, charisma and energy is able to help the group members to change.

To take a detailed look at experiential groups the place to start is 1946. In August of that year members of a government agency met to discuss ways to reduce racial discrimination. This meeting was held away from the closed and sterile office conditions and participants were housed close by the meeting rooms. Divided into several small groups one such group meeting broke up early and these members wandered into another meeting that had not yet concluded. These members soon became participants and contributed views as to what had been occurring at the meeting. It soon was apparent that unrevealed thoughts and feelings had been playing a major role in the course of that meeting. The participants were so pleased with their insights as to how the meeting had been progressing that they formalized the beginning of the practice of learning through being a participant observer. This kind of learning depends on the situation being unstructured and being more or less spontaneous. Efforts to be more spontaneous, honest and open when

participating in groups are consistent with the general aim of participative democracy. As a result of similar goals experiential groups and a desire for increased participative democracy have always been closely aligned.

These experiential or learning groups then place great emphasis on interpersonal relations among group members and on styles of emotions and communications because such factors have an important bearing on a group's actions. The purposeful abandonment of conventional rules and agendas elicit characteristic interpersonal patterns, and these styles begin to become the primary focus of attention in every group experience, usually in terms of how the individual himself responds to others.

Out of the original meeting in Connecticut came the first training laboratories in Bethel, Maine, with an emphasis on intraorganizational patterns and group processes. During the 1950's the National Training Laboratories expanded to the West Coast, where the Western Training Laboratories in group development were set up. According to Kurt W. Back (1973), in his analysis of the experiential group movement, there are three distinct stages of development: 1946-54 when there was experimentation and new methods were being tried; the middle 1950's to the early 1960's when methods became more fixed; and the period of the 1960's when the movement underwent some drastic changes. The difference between the last two stages which will be discussed later in more detail is characterized in the names popularly attached to these two periods: t-groups or learning lab and encounter or sensitivity groups. A substage of this last period is a real questioning of the value of these encounter groups by psychiatrists and psychological researchers.

While the major emphasis in the 1950's remained on group process insight and organizational conflict amelioration a new personal orientation on improving the self, reducing anxiety and developing greater authenticity in relationships began to emerge. Then, in the early 1960's there was even greater attention placed on certain aspects of the learning group. In 1962 Michael Murphy founded the Esalen Center in Big Sur. Groups at Esalen differed from those at Bethel in that they did not aim at training people for group activity. At the same time Carl Rogers set up the Western Behavioral Science Institute. It soon became a major center for spreading the use of encounter groups. Several years later a few humanists associated with the Western Behavioral Science Institute decided to leave that organization and form the Center for the Study of the Person. The name of this organization is significant when reviewing the history of the experiential group movement.

While in the 1960's there was a diminution of interest in group processes per se, which began to be considered as too academic, a greater stress was placed on personal change and emotional expressiveness. More nonverbal and sensory exercises began to be introduced as structuring activities. The group came to be seen as an environment for disinhibiting the individual and expanding his emotional expressiveness. With this new emphasis the leader's role changed. He became more directive, stimulating participants to bring out personal problems or to experiment with unaccustomed emotional expressions. Implicit in the emphasis on emotions instead of cognitive aspects of behavior was that verbal communication was relatively ineffective in breaking down

the defense mechanisms as a major obstacle to letting feelings out (Lakin, 1972).

Behind the Facts

In order to put these developments in the field of experiential groups into perspective, it is valuable to take the social and spiritual pulse of Western Society and particularly the United States at this time.

After World War II the United States entered into a period of unexcelled prosperity. Concurrent with the high employment and increasing affluence of the middle class was a desire to move out of the congested cities. With more people owning automobiles the suburbs became accessible. The promises of suburban living included better education for the children and more privacy for everyone. Although the cities had been crowded, the physical proximity of so many people had forced them into feeling part of a community. Although the suburbanites joined organizations like PTA, there was still much less of a sense of belonging to a larger group.

Coupled with the move to the suburbs was a general trend toward mobility in this country. Air travel and improved highways made it easier for people to change jobs and commute. While people in the earlier part of the century often spent their entire lives in one place, now it was only a matter of years before they would pull up stakes and move on. The title of Vance Packard's book, *A Nation of Strangers*, describes the condition of many present-day Americans. Several authors such as Carl Rogers, Alvin Toffler in *Future Shock*, and Theodore Roszak in *Where the Wasteland Ends* have described encounter groups as a possible remedy for the transitory existence of

most Americans. Whether they are part of the problem or a possible solution, encounter groups have attracted many people because they offer the chance for community to replace that sense of closeness which was once provided by the family, church, or neighborhood.

Daniel Bell (1973) further illuminating the social atmosphere in which these experiential groups have thrived has said that our society lacks a transcendant ethos; that the spiritual glue which holds our society together is coming apart. Social theorists have, therefore, described loneliness and alienation as coming from a society which stresses movement, mechanization, and impersonality. The existential movement helped to provide a philosophical understanding for society's malaise and the contribution of groups to alleviating it. A heightened awareness of the social uses of facades in order to avoid direct communication with people appeared to have a philosophical base in the writings of Martin Buber (1947). Buber's idea that the valuing of social appearances was detrimental to participating in a real dialogue with someone supported those who in the group movement wanted to do away with the sham of relating socially on the basis of relative position rather than on authentic feelings.

During the late 1950's and early 1960's Eastern Philosophies such as yoga and Zen Buddhism also came into the United States partially to fill the spiritual vacuum left by the increasing breakdown of traditional values. These philosophies with their aspects of meditation and exercises for the expansion of consciousness contributed an enhanced emphasis of nonverbal and intuitive elements and further discouraged reliance on intellect. Also the emphasis on Eastern philosophies of

transcending ego boundaries seems relevant. Several authors (Roszak, 1973; Slater, 1966; Watts, 1969) have talked about how there is a need to transcend the emphasis on the importance of the individual in society and instead concentrate on the interrelationships of individuals with themselves and with their environment.

Herbert Shepherd who describes our present culture in graphic terms and then shows how experiential groups can help change the culture, says, "Ours is a survival culture based on a mechanistic view of society and of man. It is a survival culture because the individual is alive in the world: to survive he must compete with others for the things that he needs and he is in danger of being exploited by others. The competitive nature of man is taken as a given. The institutional task is to control competition and channel it to the benefit of society" (p. 260). Shepherd goes on to say that conditions in our society were adaptive up to a point in giving us unprecedented affluence but that now new adaptive mechanisms are needed.

Shepherd describes how different experiential growth groups are from the outside culture.

> A personal growth group creates an interpersonal world which disconfirms much of what people have learned in the world outside, affirms the possibility of a different world outside, and provides a partial model of what it would be like. Love and power are not in this setting, consumables in short supply. Love is not a possession, nor affection an exchange. . . . Under these conditions, everyone has high influence with everyone else. The age old difference between freedom and responsibility disappears; expressing anger when it is felt builds trust instead of straining relations; familiarity breeds respect; people are not embarrassed by their clumsiness in learning something new; conflict is easy to confront but to win is to lose, and conflicts become an occasion for trying to increase scarce resources or seek other ways of finding a win-win solution [p. 264].

The author concludes his discussion about the paradox between

the experiential group and the world outside:

> In both laboratory culture and mechanistic culture, the way the individual manages this paradox depends on the level of personal development he has achieved, including the perceptual and cognitive clarity with which he comprehends the paradox, and in the degree of continuing support he finds for either or both systems of truth. To have a strategic comprehension of the paradox, to experience the contradictions of living in two worlds is a stimulus to intervention, to bring to a situation, organizing skills that are appropriate for transforming in the direction of a better order. These are equivalent to transcendence of survival mentality, the transcendence is rarely, if ever, achieved as a result of a personal growth laboratory alone. For persons concerned with developing their own capacity for bringing about a better order, the quest for transcendence is a lifelong project. For them, as for others, the personal growth laboratory is only one key, though an important one to unlocking mechanistic culture [pp. 264-265].

It is important to keep in mind that although these experiential groups were set up to teach people about groups their purposes as viewed by many participants have greatly enlarged.

Casualties in Groups: What Are They?

One of the real difficulties in reviewing the research on encounter groups and particularly in screening for casualties is that the definition of what a casualty is differs with various psychologists. The purpose of this section is to describe what the differences in viewing casualties is all about and to pinpoint the dangers of groups as seen by these psychologists. An appropriate place to begin is to describe what psychotherapy is and how therapy and experiential groups are different. Herbert Kelman describes the difference between individual and group therapy in this way:

> Psychotherapy can be regarded as a social influence situation in which the patient's relationship to the therapist is the primary vehicle for production of therapeutic change. In individual psychotherapy, the situation is so arranged as to maximize the probability that the patient's interactions with the therapist

> will facilitate desirable changes in his values, attitudes and action tendencies. In group psychotherapy the patient's relationships to his fellow patients and to the group as a whole become additional vehicles for the production of therapeutic change [Kelman, 1963, p. 399].

Using Kelman's ideas group psychotherapy differs from individual in that with a group the principal means of social influence are the client's interactions with other clients and with the therapist and in individual therapy the therapist is the sole means of the social influence.

Now for the differences between group psychotherapy and an experiential group experience. According to Arthur Teicher (1974), experiential groups serve to ameliorate sociocultural deficiency states while therapy groups attempt

> to correct personal deprivations which arise out of intense sibling rivalry, lack of appropriate family feelings, conflicts with maternal or paternal figures, either in perceived or actual struggles involving injustices or power clashes. The sociocultural deficiency state arises in a rapidly changing society that places great emphasis on technological solutions to human problems. With religions and transcendental values in abeyance, people are treated and treat each other in a mechanistic impersonal way [p. 168].

There are so many different ways of defining the differences between experiential and therapy groups but Teicher's idea that therapy treats personal deprivations and experiential groups treat societal ills is a prevalent one.

Teicher explains that

> the goal of therapy is not the replenishment of a social hunger but the remediation of an illness through the restoration of psychic processes which have become impaired or have not developed adequately. Psychotherapy is a time-consuming complex activity that involves the intellective, emotional, connative, and cognitive apparatus of the individual. Its aim is the resolution and reduction of conflicts in a life style that has already ravaged the individual despite the fact that he resides

> in "the midst of plenty." Persons with a history of psychopathology cannot integrate new behavior in a short-term, intensive group experience. In group psychotherapy relearning is accomplished in small graduated steps under the control and responsibility of the therapist; defenses are worked through and time is allowed for cognitive restructuring of emotional experiences. The techniques employed allow the patient to perceive his impact on others and theirs on him. In comprehending the distortions of and irrationality of his unconscious motivational system, and in seeing their manifestations in conscious behavior, he can resolve the conflict and reorder his own system of hierarchal values. The goal of group psychotherapy is individuation within a social context [p. 166].

Experiential groups generally operate in a much different way. An experiential group is called by many different names: growth group, sensitivity group, t-group, learning lab, and encounter group. An experiential group emphasizes development and improvement in interpersonal communication. These groups are usually intensive time limited with everyone finishing the group at the same time. Yalom (1971) suggests that members of encounter groups are affected with what Maslow (1968) described as "psychopathology of the average" while therapy group members have more deeply disrupted intra- and interpersonal relations and because of these disruptions, they have a more survival based orientation to learning.

The editor of the book which includes Yalom's article, Gerald Egan (1971), makes these comments:

> As Yalom suggests, therapy groups and encounter groups differ principally in their composition. The therapy group focuses principally on the D-needs or the D-concerns of its members. D-needs (for deficiency) arise when a person is deprived of basic psychological satisfactions such as the need for safety, for belonging, for intimacy, for respect, for recognition, and for competence. The principal focus of the encounter group, however, is on the M-concerns (for maintenance) and the B-needs (for being) of the participants. B-needs refer to what humanists call "self-actualization" needs, which concern the development of one's human potentiality. M-concerns center about the energies involved in preserving the status quo in all areas of human living. Most of us invest too much of our energy in preserving

> the status quo in all areas of human living. Most of us invest too much of our energy in merely keeping the enterprise "afloat." It is not that D-concerns do not come up in the encounter groups, nor is it that the members of therapy groups are in no way interested in or capable of B-functions; rather, D-needs are ordinarily so primitive, primary, and compelling that they obscure other concerns, the encounter groups whose members are mired down exclusively in D-concerns should probably be called a therapy group [p. 39].

This distinction between the different types of group participants is an important one and it will be returned to later.

Besides the time and composition differences, the leader usually has a distinctly different part to play in experiential groups. The leader in a t-group participates just as any other member of the group. As a result there is less of a gap between the leader and the group and he or she is more realistically perceived. The group therapist usually remains distant from the group, rarely disclosing anything personal about himself. He stands behind his professional front and is perceived by the group as a sagacious and powerful leader.

Yalom also says that there is a basic difference in orientation to learning. He states that the encounter group member in trying to be more interpersonally competent needs to be able to send and receive communication about his own and others behavior with a minimum of distortion. These members must basically trust the motivations of the other group members, and be willing to question themselves and experiment with new types of behavior. On the other hand, Yalom believes that psychiatric patients generally lack the basic qualities of self acceptance and awareness to trust others and risk changing their behavior.

Based on Yalom's view of the differences between the motivation of therapy groups and the encounter group members, it is rather easy

to see that one of the first dangers or possible causes for a casualty in an encounter group would be that a survival oriented individual without the basic resources for giving and receiving accurate feedback would be placed in an encounter group. Thus placed, the less self-confident and self-aware individual is in danger of losing control, of being forced to do things which he does not want to or which are damaging to him. In psychoanalytic terminology, loss of a sense of identity, loss of ego control, and the emergence of primitive id-impulses are feared. For the psychologists, particularly those who adhere to the teachings of Freud, the stripping away of defense mechanisms that protect the ego from the very primitive id impulses is what is to be feared most in encounter groups. Returning to Arthur Teicher (1974), he gives an example of how the defense mechanisms in a child are built up:

> An example of this process is the inability of the very young child to master the loss of a relationship to a loved object (the mother or surrogate). The resultant pathology manifests itself in repression, denials, and an arrest of the mourning process. The denial of reality creates a painful discordance in the child; he projects the cause of his pain onto the external world and then proceeds to act on it. These and other pathological mechanisms result from the operation of internal processes that interfere with adaptive behavior. Such identity distortion and psychic pathology requires the intervention of psychotherapy [p. 163].

In an encounter group, again in Teicher's words, "If the participant who is suffering from personal deprivations which he has learned to cope with in certain rigid patterns of behavior is forced to drop these coping mechanisms he may be faced with uncontrolled emotion" (p. 166). The fear of an emotional breakdown is probably the most central concern of those critical of experiential groups. It is true that these defense mechanisms are removed in individual or group therapy but at a

much slower rate and under the guidance and protection of an experienced therapist. The result of this emotional breakdown is a feared psychiatric hospitalization.

Even proponents of encounter groups such as Carl Rogers (1967) believe that there are negative aspects to these groups. He mentions the possibility which is true for all types of psychotherapy that the positive behavior changes experienced in the group will not last. Behaviorists are particularly concerned that behavior occurring in groups is very situationally based and that once an individual has left the group this new behavior will not be maintained. Another possible risk Whitaker describes as people who have participated in groups and who must go to a therapist to work through the feelings which were opened up in the intensive experience of the workshop and which were left unresolved. He goes on to say that it is difficult to say whether this is a negative outcome or a partially or entirely positive one. More will be said later when the attitudes of various psychologists to the increased anxiety of the participants in these groups will be discussed.

Other more minor risks are listed by Rogers. Some of these concerns can be described as return to the world outside the group. Rogers suggests that if either a husband or wife attends the group separately marital tension may be increased dramatically after the group. Other authors have worried about the same thing (Parloff, 1970; Maliver, 1973). Not only can there be tensions with a marriage partner but the same authors have talked about problems with an employer. An employer may not value the same openness that the group does.

Rogers and Maliver describe another danger which Maliver says is the participants becoming group addicts. People may just use the group as a substitute for a life devoid of emotion and closeness and just go there for emotional highs. There is a fear that group participants may confuse the life in the group with life outside.

Maliver (1973, p. 98) cites physical injury as occurring in many experiential games. He quotes the American Psychiatric Association's task force report on encounter (1970) as saying, "There have been many instances of participants suffering physical injuries. Some encounter groups focus on the mobilization and expression of rage, and physical fights between participants who have long suppressed rage are encouraged. Severe bruising and broken limbs have been recorded." As verification for the American Psychiatric Association's report, Maliver cites several other instances of people participating in encounter groups and being physically injured.

Looking at encounter groups' casualties in a different light, Bugental (1967) sees that many people lack meaning in their lives and seek therapeutic intervention in order to achieve a greater understanding of themselves as individuals. Posthuma (1974), commenting on Bugental's ideas, says that the motivation for seeking this understanding is anxiety produced by the recognition that man doesn't know all that he needs to know to cope with his life. Avoidance of this anxiety is achieved by distorting reality. It is only through confronting this anxiety that man can become more authentic. Thus, Posthuma says that in this light casualties in groups may be those who avoid this existential confrontation. Those members who refuse to face up to the anxiety are the ones who should be studied as casualties.

Reviewing this overview of casualties in groups, authors have varied opinions about the dangers possible in encounter groups. The most prevalent danger described is too much psychological distress which, according to different authors, can lead to an emotional breakdown, decompensation, a return to more primitive defense mechanisms, psychiatric hospitalization or even suicide. Psychological distress was described in Posthuma's article taking off from Stanley Schachter's ideas as perception of intense autonomic activity. Since most authors also agree that some psychological distress is needed for an individual to change, the question becomes when distress ceases to be growth-producing and becomes harmful.

Casualties in Groups: Getting More Specific

Now after a discussion of the dangers of encounter groups, let's look at the literature to see what evidence there is of these dangers actually occurring. If, as it is the intent of this paper to limit the discussion of psychological damage to cases of individuals who become more psychologically distressed or employ more maladaptive mechanisms of defense, then it seems that such damage is reported only rarely. One of the problems in reviewing the reported incidences of casualties in groups is that psychologists place different emphases on transitory psychotic manifestations. Observers and others who have not had much group experience and even those who have may be unfamiliar or even frightened by the strong emotions produced in the group and may report such events as destructive. Also, on the other hand, there is a group of psychologists who see intense emotional stress generated in the group members as evidence that an individual is changing.

For some encounter group leaders, an individual who has a psychotic reaction may be ultimately benefited as his personality is reintegrated in a new and more constructive manner. Alan Silverman (1969) states that regressed and disorganized behavior may be essential parts of schizophrenia's problem-solving process. Carl Rogers (1967) has said, "On the other side of the picture is the fact that individuals have also lived through what were clearly psychotic episodes and lived through them constructively" (p. 273). If the view of an individual having ego mechanisms of defense is accepted, the question becomes when are defenses so lowered that the individual is no longer able to function and integrate what he is learning in the group. Different researchers and different psychologists have varying ideas about when the lowering of defenses becomes destructive and how to detect it when it has reached a destructive point.

Another criticism which is frequently lodged against encounter group leaders is that they don't follow up to see what participants are like six months after the group has ended (Parloff, 1970). Yalom (1973), in his study, found that several of the group participants who said that their experience had been constructive later stated that it had been destructive. So because there is little long term follow-up to the groups, it is difficult to get a very accurate idea of how many people get hurt by participating in encounter groups.

In the journals there are often cases mentioned of the author receiving correspondence from a friend who is a psychiatrist or a psychologist stating that he has a group casualty coming to see him for individual therapy. One psychiatrist in correspondence with Parloff (1970) said that while he was in residence at a two-week group the

total emotional disturbance was 0.5 percent. Again we see the major difficulty is that this therapist doesn't describe what he means by emotional disturbance.

Even a well-known psychologist and researcher like Carl Rogers sometimes doesn't describe what he means when he says that after two to twelve months, only 2 out of 481 thought the group was mostly damaging (1967). At least with Rogers one of the major criticisms is countered in that he waits several months after the group has been completed before asking the members whether or not it helped them to change. Continuing with Rogers' findings, six more participants said that it was more unhelpful than helpful. Twenty-one, or 4 percent, stated that it had been mostly frustrating, annoying, or confusing. Three and one-half percent said that it had been neutral in its impact. Nineteen percent checked that it had been more helpful than unhelpful, indicating some degree of ambivalence. But 30 percent saw it as constructive in its results and 45 percent checked it as a deeply meaningful, positive experience. Thus, three-fourths of the group thought of the experience as being positive.

Bruce Maliver (1973), whose book *The Encounter Game* is very critical of experiential groups, cites Rogers on several points. Rogers' study had no control group, no basic definition of psychiatric states, and no indication of the length of time these people were exposed to encounter. No dropout rate from the original groups is reported, and we cannot even guess the fate of the more than 100 participants who did not respond.

Other proponents of experiential groups give even more favorable accounts of what occurs in them. Bach (1968), in discussing 400 marathon

group participants, does not report a single case of a seriously pathological reaction. A subsequent report by Bach based on a cumulative sample of 612 research subjects, although less optimistic, supports this earlier finding: of not finding any instance of deterioration due to marathon group shock. Mintz's (1969) follow-up study, based on a sample of 173 respondents and the observation of a minimum of 279 participants, also didn't find any occurrences of psychotic reactions. Batcholder and Hardy (1968) report on a follow-up survey of the YMCA's sensitivity training program. Of 1,200 participants, only 4 severe psychological disruption cases came to light. In a study of 73 freshmen medical students, Cadden, Flack, Blakeslie, and Charlton (1969) indicate that there were no psychiatric casualties and also as a result of the group psychiatric consultations were down by half.

Before beginning to discuss the more negative results in experiential groups, it is important to keep in mind that the American Psychological Association Task Force on Encounter Groups (1970) was unable to reach any definite statement on encounter groups due to a lack of systematic studies and difficulty in comparing favorable results of one study and the negative results of another. The dearth of information about experiential groups is quite evident in this task force's activities. Also to be kept in mind is that most of the enthusiastic encounter proponents recognize that emotional breakdowns in groups do occur. However, some psychologists believe that psychosis is not undesirable in the process of human growth. The May 12, 1969 issue of *Newsweek* quoted Frederick Stoller, a pioneer in the development of marathons. "Everyone has the strength to deal with the encounter

experience." Admitting that psychotic breakdowns occurred in his groups, he said, "If a leader doesn't become frightened, people will go through the experience and come well out of it" (Maliver, p. 98). The American Psychiatric Association's Encounter Group Task Force thought differently. "Experience has shown that the common effect of a disorganizing psychotic episode on an individual is to leave his self-confidence and sense of mastery badly shaken. A psychotic experience is a manifestation of illness, not a way toward health and maturity" (Maliver, p. 98).

Bruce Maliver (1973), in his book, is extremely critical of encounter groups. He says that, "In my research for this book, I discovered six cases of suicide where, either in my judgment or in that of another clinician, the encounter experience was clearly the precipitating factor" (pp. 96-97). We will return later to this important point of how you can isolate the encounter group as the principal cause of a psychotic reaction. Maliver also quotes Dr. Robert Yufit, who wrote telling of two patients of his who had severe reactions to encounter groups. "One had a severe anxiety episode following an encounter group, requiring immediate therapeutic intervention. . . . A second became severely depressed immediately following a weekend encounter group and sought help when she was unable to function" (p. 97).

Several other psychologists report harm coming from a group experience. Yalom and others (1970) indicate that 10 to 15 percent of all participants in a National Training Laboratory group consulted the laboratory psychiatrist for a wide range of complaints. Gottschalk (1969) participated in one group and observed others in the course of a two week Human Relations Laboratory. In one group in which he was

a member, Gottschalk diagnosed one borderline psychotic withdrawal reaction and two severe emotional breakdowns with acute anxiety. Of 32 participants, 2 (6.5 percent) showed psychotic reactions, 4 (12.5 percent) showed severe disruptions in performance, and an additional 9 (28 percent) showed mild but substantial psychological disturbances. Reddy (1970), using self-rating scales in a controlled study comparing t-groups, group psychotherapy, and control participants, found that exacerbation of pathology increased significantly following the sensitivity groups. The psychotherapy group and the control group showed a nonsignificant decrease in self-reported disturbance. In his survey of several groups, Parloff (1970) reports that mild to moderate emotional disturbances occurred during group experiences for 0.5 percent to 28 percent of the participants. From 0.6 to 6 percent of the group members reported emotional disturbances after the experience.

In a study that will be mentioned in more detail later, Yalom, Lieberman and Miles (1973) report on a university project with 18 encounter groups, composed of 209 students. "Thus, of the 206 participants starting the groups, 16 (7.8 percent of the total, and 9.1 percent of those who completed 50 percent of the group meetings) suffered significant psychological injury" (p. 174). In the six months follow-up study three psychiatric referrals were uncovered. Two of the participants were hospitalized, one with severe depression and the second in a manic state. The third participant had committed suicide. However, a psychological postmortem of the suicide revealed a history of severe disturbance prior to the encounter group experience. Jaffe and Scherl (1969) relate how Odiorne describes how in one lab he attended one woman who never should have been admitted because of a prior mental

breakdown went berserk and was under psychiatric treatment until she returned home. Also related in Jaffe and Scherl (1969) is a recounting by Schein and Bennis of three group failures. One of these attempted suicide shortly after his return from the week long experience.

Jaffe and Scherl (1969) also discuss in great detail two cases of psychosis precipitated by an encounter group experience. Because the authors had one of these individuals in therapy before and after his group experience and because they were able to discuss their client with the group leaders it will be valuable to review what they found.

At the request of his employer a 24-year-old physicist came to see Jaffe with the complaint that things were becoming more painful from tension. The employer described the physicist as brilliant but who had recently become unproductive. The psychiatrist found him to be compliant, unassertive and moderately depressed. He described himself as always being a loner and having few friends. He had had no sexual experiences and felt cheated because of so much sexual freedom. This client did mention that he missed a secretary at work who had gone on vacation. Although he never dated her he wanted to take her out but was always afraid to ask. Given some medicine to sleep better the client was to return for another appointment the following week.

On the following Monday a day before his scheduled appointment he was brought by a co-worker to the psychiatrist's office because he was acting strangely. An exact description by the author is appropriate here.

> The patient's suit was wrinkled and his hair unkempt. He was restless and attempted to cover up his depressed feelings with a gay facade. His sense of time and direction was altered, and he was not secure with physical objects. Also he thought

> he picked up other people's problems in the group. While driving home from the group he did not trust his car. He felt he might jump out of the window. He was afraid that he would be sent to a hospital for the criminally insane. His associations were tangential and loose although he denied hallucinations. Proverbs were concrete and personalized. He willingly accepted hospitalization at a local facility. After discharge from the Michigan hospital he returned to our clinic. At that time he was slightly depressed and stated that he could not stand being alone. For the first time he had attended a singles club. His thought processes were appropriate and there were no suicidal or paranoid ideations [p. 445].

The authors' explanation of what occurred to this patient during the group is also informative.

> The t-group is a social setting that encourages openness, intimacy and closeness of a type, but that has little structure for handling the anxiety that is provoked. The patient placed himself in a setting that represented much of what he desired yet feared. It represented the extreme opposite of his isolated life style. At the Friday night meeting of the group he provoked the members with you can't touch me with feeling. This invitation to be attacked expressed both his anger at men and his fear of them. It also represented his fantasy that the alternative to being unnoticed by the group was to attack and be attacked. On Saturday morning with the group's encouragement he tried to spank a girl. It would appear that he then regressed in his behavior attempting to find a woman-mother on whom he would be dependent. His reality testing became poor and he tearfully sought to be taken care of during the rest of the weekend. On Sunday he asked the female leader to take him home. Her refusal confirmed his sense of isolation and his fear that no woman would satisfy his dependent needs and wishes. After he left the group, self-destructive and paranoid ideation predominated. The group had confronted him with his inability to fulfill his fantasy of the aggressive male or dependent child [p. 446].

The authors conclude that this patient who was anxious and depressed instead of his usual isolated and obsessive position at the time of entry into the t-group should be one type of individual who might well be excluded from these groups. The next section will give the views of other authors as to what types of people should be excluded from experiential group participation.

This detailed description of a casualty deserves some comment.

Jaffe hospitalized this man after he was brought into the clinic by a coworker. "He was unkempt, his sense of time and direction was altered, he was not secure with objects, he covered up depressed feelings with a gay front, he had trouble driving his car, he thought that he had picked up other people's problems in the group and he thought because of the strange things he was feeling that he would probably be locked up" (p. 445). I wonder if Jaffe has ever been in a group himself or been in contact with people who are leaving a weekend group. Participants driving away are always surprised to find that their sensations are heightened and that they see things differently from when they first arrived. Also very common is a feeling of taking on the qualities or in this case the problems of other people who have been in the group. My point is that the feelings this man had leaving the group were certainly more intense than most participants but certainly also many group members become quite disorganized as they prepare to head back to the world outside the group. The obvious question becomes how to know whether this psychological distress is too much for a person or merely a continuing process of positive change for the individual. It is interesting to realize that this patient was hospitalized and returned to the clinic slightly depressed and lonely, two not very uncommon feelings. After attending the clinic for a short time his thought processes were normal and there was no suicidal or paranoid ideation. Furthermore he not only returned to "normal," he even ventured out to attend a singles club to meet some new people. If this patient were tested at this point there would probably be a great change from when he was first brought to the clinic. One wonders if this change would have occurred as rapidly if he had not attended the group and merely attended the clinic for that length of time.

Another point before I leave this interesting case is that this patient was originally referred to the clinic by his boss who described him as brilliant but unproductive. He was also brought to the clinic by a co-worker after the group. I would be interested to know if his situation at work might not also have been a precipitant of some very uncomfortable feelings.

Being a physicist he may have become quite concerned that he could no longer produce what was expected of him. With the oversupply of scientists in recent years and the lay-off of highly paid workers in many fields this man might have some justification for his anxiety. Also at work the girl whom he wanted to date was away on vacation. I mention these facts because I wonder if the group can be given all the blame for so disturbing this patient. Although this is one of the few documented cases where a patient who has been seen by psychiatrists or psychologists before the group is seen immediately afterward there is still a big question in my mind of laying the cause for this man's distress on the group. The questions of whether psychological distress is positive or negative and what role the group has in causing it will continue to be major themes of this paper.

So There Are Casualties--What Kinds of People Are They?

After reviewing the evidence of the dangers of groups, it is now relevant to look at who other authors think should be deselected from the group to avoid this psychological injury. Kuehn and Crinella (1969) seem to have an almost all inclusive list: characterological neurotics, psychotics, hysterics, and individuals in crisis. Psychotics should be excluded because during the process of the group they can be expected

to rapidly regress, become cognitively disorganized, mobilize a lot of anxiety and at the end of the group be unable to pull themselves together. The authors believe that many severely troubled individuals present themselves for small group experience as a short cut to personal mental health. They describe four students in a social action group who decompensated rapidly, requiring psychiatric first aid because they couldn't put up with even minimal demands for openness and honesty.

Another group that the authors suggest should be screened out are the characterologic neurotics. These people are afraid of the view of others and tend to intellectualize and isolate themselves. At the same time they are afraid of losing control of their sexual and aggressive feelings. The authors explain that these neurotics will use the group as a vehicle for the expression of their antisocial feelings. When the group meets this behavior with disapproval they feel guilty and become obsessional. The authors conclude that these neurotics usually leave the group with their character armor stronger, and a feeling that no one including themselves is any good.

As for hysterics the authors believe that they seem excessively enthusiastic, suggestible, and dramatic and yet are actually quite shallow. The danger lies in the possibility of these individuals viewing the experience as a type of religious conversion and becoming true believers without the benefit of any emotional insight or continuing change in attitudes or behavior. The authors are troubled because they fear hysterics may convince others to become group members or even volunteer to become leaders themselves. To jump ahead to the next section the authors suggest a way to screen out these hysterics. "One way we have found to avoid this with college students is to screen

them for grades. . . . the self-discipline and self-esteem indicated by high marks seems to us a practical indication that permeability of ego boundaries is satisfactory" (p. 843).

The last group the authors mention are individuals in crisis. They believe this group should be deselected because there is usually a lot of advice giving in groups as individuals get involved and the individual in crisis might make questionable decisions as a result of the group experience.

Another author, Philip Slater, believes that there is a negative correlation between a group participant's therapeutic need and personal growth (1966). In terms of severe and moderate pathology, those potential encounter group participants who would be considered poor candidates for outpatient group psychotherapy are also poor candidates for the encounter group. These include the paranoid, brain-damaged, hypochondriacal, suicidal, psychotic and sociopathic. Slater also believes that those addicted to alcohol or drugs should not be admitted to general groups but certainly ought to be included in specialized encounter groups designed for those populations.

Reddy (1970) indicates that extremely narcissistic individuals are also undesirable, particularly for relatively short encounter groups (three days or less) since they demand and monopolize so much of the group time. In several studies, Lundgren and Miller (1965) have shown that individuals who claim a high degree of self-satisfaction overestimate others' opinion of them, and tend not to profit from group experience.

There is also evidence to support the contention that participants who might act in a deviant role in an encounter group should be deselected. For example, Schachter (1951) shows that communication between

the deviant and other group members is initially very high. However, it drops off very rapidly and the deviant is rejected by the group. Both Asch and Sherrif (1958) demonstrate that an individual will be made highly uncomfortable when he is a deviant group member. Stone and Triger (1970) suggest that participants with a history of psychosomatic illness be screened out because exacerbating of those symptoms is likely to occur under the stress of the encounter group. These authors also deselected applicants with histories of difficulty in impulse control, maintaining that they might be pressured into acting destructively or into revealing highly personal material in the encounter situation.

Yalom (1970) maintains that certain behaviors--denial, de-emphasis of intrapsychic and interpersonal factors and the tendency to attribute causality to somatic and external environmental factors--readily identify patients who become deviants in group psychotherapy. Yalom further states that these patients can and should be screened out in interviews.

Martin Lakin (1972) believes that certain people will not only not benefit from the group experience but will also so disturb the group as to make it unproductive for others. People who under stress become too anxious or too angry to listen to what others are saying are poor encounter group prospects. Those people who project such strong feelings on others that they feel victimized will come away feeling worse about themselves. Other types of people Lakin mentions are those whose self-esteem is so low that they need constant reassurance. Because of this need, they will demand too much of the group's time. Persons who are very immature, grossly insensitive to others, excessively volatile or unable to control their impulses will have a difficult time understanding their interactions with others. Also people must be able to

fully enter their experiences as well as be able to reflect upon them. Associated with this, one shouldn't think solely in terms of solving his own problems and should be willing to change the status quo.

William Schultz (1971), an advocate of encounter groups, says that many times those people with severe problems, instead of disrupting the group, actually help the members of the group to look at their own behaviors.

How Do We Select Who Shouldn't Participate?

In looking at the history of encounter groups and particularly how various psychologists and authors view casualties, it is easy to see part of the answer as to why screening for encounter groups hasn't been more common. Some authors like Posthuma see psychological stress in a continuum between a dormant existence and a full blown psychosis. Others like Claudio Naranjo in *The Quest* (1972), who talks about peak experiences and mystical enlightenment, see a circular configuration where the extremes of enlightenment and psychosis are close together. In this case it would be particularly difficult to differentiate between valuable and destructive psychological distress. Bugental (1967), a well-known humanist writer, instead of viewing distress as an indicator of psychological decompensation and the onset of psychosis, sees it as a necessary element of psychological growth. R. D. Laing (1965) is now well-known for his ideas about psychotic experiences as being a growth experience. Alan Silverman (1972) also writes about the psychotic experience as being a possible route to new health. N. Dabrowski (1968) has described the psychotic process as positive disintegration. Parloff (1970) comments on this view of

psychosis. "For some encounter group leaders the mere fact that an individual may have a psychotic reaction is not taken as unequivocal evidence of an undesirable response. Concern is tempered by a rather optimistic view of the potential gains for the disturbed individual. It is argued that he will ultimately be benefited as his personality is reintegrated in a new and more constructive manner" (pp. 283-284). Parloff warns that many encounter group leaders don't follow up on their group to ascertain what the long-term effects of the group experience has been. For some group leaders who have had much group experience, intense experiences may be viewed as evidence that something is happening. Others who are less familiar with the workings of groups may report any intense emotional reaction as a sign that something deleterious is occurring. The point should be now clear that the psychological distress in experiential groups has different meaning for different researchers and psychologists. Since this is the case, researchers in studying encounter groups will have to be careful not to reflect their own biases.

The question particularly for those who view psychological distress verging on psychosis as something to be avoided is how to predict which individuals will benefit least from the experiential experience. As already discussed, many authors have outlined different classifications of people who should be screened out from groups. The interview process, although time consuming, is probably the most advocated. Inherent in this system is that there are types of personalities which can be described and located before the group begins. Walter Mischel in *Personality and Assessment* (1968) disagrees with many psychodynamic psychologists who say that certain traits of personality can be detected in situations apart from the actual setting. The question really becomes whether

a clinical interviewer can predict an individual's behavior without having seen him in the actual situation. In order to avoid this problem several researchers (Goldstein, Heller, Sechrest, 1966; Reddy, 1970) have proposed that prospective group members be observed in actual group settings to see how they will react.

Several research problems occur in regard to how an individual will be defined as a casualty of the group. One of the first problems is how to isolate the group experience as the principal reason for a person becoming too psychologically upset. Since individuals participating in the group also continue to live outside the group, it is difficult to say which is having the stronger effect on them. A second major problem that has been addressed by researchers is that psychological distress from the group may only be shortlived. It is imperative that follow-up studies be done to ascertain whether a person continues to be in distress or comes out of the experience more capable of handling life situations. A third concern is that as a result of the group an individual may talk in more negative terms about himself but his behavior may be unchanged. Posthuma (1974) mentions a study where this problem was minimized by asking associates of the group participants whether or not their friend's behavior had changed. The author points out that this method has complications too, since these associates may have some investment in seeing change or no change occur in their friends.

In commenting on giving paper and pencil tests to select out those who might be hurt by the group experience, Ziegler and Philips (1961) explain that there is considerable doubt whether any of the current

psychiatric classifications have aided our prediction or treatment of persons classed in those categories.

The problems discussed concerning the difficulties in predicting casualties in groups are many and will be further discussed in the Methods section. Before leaving this subject, however, a quote from William C. Schutz, a leading proponent of encounter groups is in order (1971).

> I think it would be marvelous if people were screened so that those who would profit most would be admitted to encounter groups, and those who would not profit, or who would be damaged, would be excluded. But I have very little idea of how to do this. The early years of my scientific career were spent largely on the topic of group compatibility and I developed several tests, FIRO-B, FIRO-F, and COPE, which are used from time to time to compose groups to attain certain predictable aims. Later, for a year or two, I participated in the NTL effort to screen candidates for T-groups, an effort that extended over about twenty years. My clear impression from these experiences is that the effort expended to screen group members, whether it be a psychological test, a personal interview, or personal recommendations, wasn't worth it. Occasionally one technique would work, but on the whole it was much more efficacious to let the people who wanted to be in a group come unless there was some glaringly obvious reason, like his address was the back ward of a state mental hospital. . . . Further, I'm no longer sure what I want even if I would screen. The people that would most likely to be labeled prepsychotic often spark the group and send it into valuable areas that others are afraid to enter. In turn, they often work very well because they find themselves in a supportive, non-punitive atmosphere. Those who do develop psychotic episodes are often the most normal-appearing people at the beginning of the group--a surgeon, a housewife, a businessman. Also, if a person is going to go psychotic, many encounter groups, particularly those held at a residential setting with a supporting community, are among the safest situations in which it can happen. To the request for screening group members I have two final responses. I'm not sure I'd know what to screen for except in extreme cases, and if I did know, I don't know how to select such people [pp. 313-314].

Some of the methodological problems of researching casualties in groups have been discussed but there remain other more culturally determined problems.

Opponents of encounter groups claim that the reason why there are not more thorough studies done is that the possible financial gain is so high that sponsors are often profit motivated rather than humanistically or educationally motivated. Screening of participants would reduce the number in the groups and the money that would be made. Another reason is that encounter group leaders are not clinically directed and therefore do not have the interest in devising studies to help prevent people from getting harmed in groups and also they don't have the skills to detect who potentially might be hurt.

On the other side, proponents of groups argue that the detractors see the growth of the encounter movement as a threat to their business as professional psychologists. In some respects the encounter movement has had a democraticizing influence on psychology which is a threat to elitist psychologists. Another point raised which is an offshoot of the last is that the group movement is a real threat to society as it exists today. The fact that the group movement is viewed by some as a threat to our present cultural norms may be one reason why there are so many bitter attacks against it within the established psychological community. This same argument is used by proponents of experiential groups to explain the emphasis on casualties in encounter groups.

With some understanding of the history and problems of predicting casualties in groups we are now going to turn to a detailed look at one study.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

In the previous sections I have described the development of experiential groups and discussed the need for exploring the possibility of screening out those participants who might be adversely affected by the experience. I have already mentioned several studies which dealt with those harmed by experiential groups. Lieberman, Yalom, and Miles (1973) probably have done the most comprehensive study on these groups and a review of their study is an essential cornerstone of this research.

At Stanford University these researchers organized eighteen different types of experiential groups which were led by prominent exponents of various types of groups. The groups each met for a total of thirty hours; some had spaced meetings (10 three-hour meetings), others a massed format in which groups met for only a few time-extended marathon meetings. These groups were set up as part of a Stanford course on human relations. All participants were Stanford undergraduates who received three credits for their participation in the course. When the students registered for the course, they were randomly assigned to one of the eighteen groups, stratified by sex, race, and previous encounter group experience. A total of 209 students began the course, 39 dropped out (i.e., missed at least the last two meetings), and 170 completed the course. A thorough study of the process and outcome of experiential groups was the ambitious goal of this project.

The present research study was interested only in those

participants who were rated as casualties. Lieberman et al. defined a casualty as "an individual who, as a direct result of his experience in the encounter group, became more psychologically distressed or employed more maladaptive mechanisms of defense or both; furthermore this negative change was not a transient but an enduring one, as judged eight months after the group experience" (p. 171). The principal means of determining casualties was through an in-depth interview. Since it would have been impossible to interview all the 209 subjects, eight criteria for identifying those with high potential were drawn up. The criteria were as follows: (1) request for psychiatric aid; (2) dropout; (3) peer evaluation; (4) self-esteem drop; (5) subject's testimony; (6) psychotherapy; (7) leader's ratings; and (8) several miscellaneous sources. After these criteria were applied, a list of 104 casualty suspects was drawn up. The researchers then attempted eight months after the group had terminated to contact and conduct a 15-20 minute interview by phone. If the interviewer suspected that the subject had had a harmful experience, the subject was asked to come in for a personal interview. During this interview the following questions were asked the subjects:

> Did they now view the group as an overall constructive, neutral, or destructive experience?
> Was the group stressful to them?
> Had they been made uncomfortable by the group?
> For how long a period of time?
> In which ways?
> If the group had a negative effect, had they now recovered the level of comfort or adjustation that was present before the group?
> Where there concurrent life circumstances that may have also been responsible for the subject's deterioration during the period of study?
> Had they sought help from professional or informed sources? [p. 172].

A total of 104 casualty suspects were identified. Of these, 79 were contacted by telephone and 25 could not be located. Sixteen casualties were identified which represented 7.5 percent of the 209 subjects who began the groups, or 9.4 percent of the 170 subjects who completed the groups.

Those who participated in the study completed a large battery of self-report questionnaires before the beginning of the groups, after each meeting, at the end of the group experiences and again for a follow-up six months later. The investigators tested for a large number of variables which they reduced to twenty dimensions which could be used to discriminate between casualties and non-casualties. Of these twenty, six were particularly sensitive to selecting those who were later labeled as casualties. "Those who became casualties showed before the beginning of the group significantly lower levels of positive self-concept than did those who did not become casualties. Furthermore, the casualties had a higher growth orientation and a greater anticipation that the encounter group would provide opportunities for fulfillment of their needs" (Lieberman, 1971, p. 26).

Lieberman et al. (1971), in an article in the archives of General Psychiatry, said:

> What are the implications of these findings? The instruments we have examined for testing the hypothesis that personality, attitudinal, and anticipatory dimensions are related to development of casualties were in the large not designed for this purpose and, as indicated previously, becoming a casualty was in large part dependent on the particular group the participant found himself in. Nevertheless, our efforts to demonstrate casualty predictibility have yielded a model which has considerable psychological consistency. It is reasonable to assume that with closer and more deliberate study some of the individuals who are emotionally traumatized in the encounter groups could be guided away from attending such situations. It is more than likely that some

> questionnaires which particularly focus on the individual's expectations and anticipations about what it was he would gain from encounter groups would yield the best payoff for screening instruments; the measurement of mental health or its related concepts though complex and inconsistent can serve as a supplemental aid in screening [p. 28].

The purpose of this study was to determine if the instruments suggested by Lieberman et al. could indeed be used to predict those who would be most harmed by an experiential group experience.

The setting for this research study was quite similar to the Lieberman et al. study. During the winter quarter, 1974, at the University of Tennessee a course in human relations (Human Relations, Psychology 3616) was offered. The course as described by the announcement sheet "is intended to provide an opportunity for observing and for experiencing human relations in a semi-controlled environment. The participants will select dyads and will be, with their dyads, members of a small group (8-10) which will meet once a week for three hours. The co-facilitators of these small groups will be undergraduates and graduate students who have been and will continue to be in a three quarter sequence of courses on group processes."

During the first class meeting the students were randomly assigned to nine groups each with two co-facilitators. Two of the nine groups were randomly selected to be the focus of this study. Group I was composed of seven people, four women and three men. Two of the participants were married. Three had been in a group before. One of the co-facilitators was older and married while the other was single and a first year graduate student in clinical psychology. All of the co-facilitators were in a training program for leaders the previous fall and continued in training while the groups were

being run. The average age of the members of this group was 24. Group II started out with nine members and ended with eight. Six were women and three men. One man dropped out. Two of the women were married and one was divorced. Two of the group members had been in a group before. The average age of the group members was 22. The two co-facilitators, one male and one female, were both graduate students, one in educational psychology and the other in experimental psychology. A control group similar to the one used in the Yalom study was used. Twelve undergraduates who were enrolled in an abnormal psychology course were asked if they wanted to participate in this experiment for extra credit. The twelve students took the same battery of tests at the beginning of the quarter and completed the Adjective Check List and participated in the final interview just as the other two groups did. There was no observation of their behavior in a group nor any ranking by their fellow members in the control group. In general the control group was younger with an average age of 21. Two of the group were married. Four of the group dropped the abnormal psychology course but still participated in the final interview. Seven of the twelve were females. Three of the members had been in a group before. The purpose of this experiment, to determine the effects of experiential groups on participants, was explained to all three groups. (A copy of the release form signed by all the participants is included in the Appendix.)

At this point a comparison between the type of groups and leaders used in the Lieberman study and those who participated in this study is critical. The principal difference between the Lieberman and the present study is their scope. While Lieberman's study had seventeen groups and

over two hundred participants, this study limited itself to three groups with thirty participants. While the Lieberman study was interested in looking at such things as high learners and what caused change in the groups, this present study was solely concerned with group casualties. While the Lieberman study selected half the participants to be interviewed as possible casualties, this study interviewed all the participants. This method should increase the possibility of locating casualties since in the Lieberman study it was possible that some casualties were not identified in the screening process. Another major difference is that in the Lieberman study all the leaders were professionals who were experienced in leading groups while with this study the leaders had some training to be group leaders but were not professionals. The possibility of more harm coming to the participants because of the lack of professional leaders may to some extent be offset by the fact that in this study the groups were led by co-facilitators who were in a continuing training and supervisory group. It is indeed very difficult to appraise the difference that the leadership of the groups had on the outcome for the participants. Lastly, while the Lieberman study had a number of different types of groups such as Gestalt, Transactional and Psychoanalytic the orientation of this study's group leaders might be best described as non-confrontational Rogerian. Based on the outcome of the Yalom study which said that the more highly charged intense groups produced more casualties this study should not have as many hurt by the group experience because the leaders were more supportive.

In order to predict those hurt by the group experience, diagnostic

instruments were used. The two brief questionnaires used by Lieberman, Yalom, and Miles in their study to measure attitudes and expectations about groups were administered. Secondly, again as in the Lieberman study, the Rosenberg Self-Concept Scale was used. A fourth instrument was the Adjective Check List which had the advantage of being completed in about 15 minutes. (Copies of all the above are in the Appendix.)

Some information about the reliability and validity of the Adjective Check List is included below. Four experimental samples were utilized in developing the test-retest reliability of the scales: 56 college males and 23 college females tested 10 weeks apart; 100 adult males tested 6 months apart; and 34 medical school students tested 5 and 1/2 years apart. Most of the scales appear to possess adequate reliability over the 10 week interval of time, and some (such as Self-Confidence, Dominance, and Exhibition) have surprisingly high stability over the 5 and 1/2 year interval. However, the Liability and Succorance scales do show rather low reliability and the results should therefore be interpreted with caution. (This information on reliability was taken from the Adjective Check List Manual published by Consulting Psychologists Press and written by Harrison G. Gough and Alfred B. Heilbrun, Jr.)

In one study (Heilbrun, 1960) looking at the personality differences between maladjusted and adjusted college students, the Adjective Check List need scales were compared with the pooled judgments of experienced psychologists. For the male subjects, 10 of the 15 differences on the need scale were in the direction specified by the judges, whereas for females five scales showed a significant difference in the appropriate direction.

In another study (Heilbrun, 1962) it was found that 6 of the 15 need scales were significantly related to dropping out of college among females, and that an index combining these 6 scales enhanced the prediction which could be made from a measure of scholastic ability. The Adjective Check List has also shown promise in identifying students who terminate counseling prematurely (Heilbrun, 1961), and in discerning personality factors mediating adjustment in adolescents with varying child rearing histories (Heilbrun and McKinley, 1962).

The last method of predicting casualties was a situational one. Each of the two groups met for 20 minutes with their co-facilitators to discuss attitudes and expectations for the coming group meetings, after which the co-facilitators in each of the groups were asked to rank each member of the group according to how beneficial the group would be for them. The leaders were also asked to describe why they ranked the participants as they did. Also included in this mini-group meeting were two outside observers who recorded their observations about who might not benefit from the group and why. In each group two different observers were used. Three of the observers were third year clinical psychology students and one was a second year student. This situational test was included since several authors (Goldstein, Heller, and Sechrest, 1966; Reddy, 1970) have proposed that observing actual behavior of the group members may be the best way to predict casualties.

All these prediction methods with the exception of the situational evaluation were applied during the first meeting of class. At this same time the organizers of the course made clear that participation in groups may sometimes lead to casualties. An explanation of what would occur during the 10 week period was made. The names of mental

health facilities were enumerated in the event participants might want some outside help. As with the Lieberman study it is presumed that the mere fact of researchers being present had a moderating effect both upon the participants and the co-facilitators.

At the end of the 10 week quarter all of the participants were interviewed to assess what changes had occurred. Before the final interview several other methods of revealing casualties were used. The group leaders were asked, "Please rank the people in your group starting with who was hurt the most (made worse, became overly upset) by the experience and ending with those who you think were least harmed." The participants themselves were asked, "Please rank the people in your group including yourself starting with who was hurt the most (made worse, became overly upset) by the experience and ending up with those who you think were least harmed."

Several weeks after the quarter was over this researcher conducted interviews with each of the 28 participants. In looking for casualties the interviewer used the same definition of casualty as did the Lieberman study. "A casualty is an individual who as a direct result of his experience in the encounter group, became more psychologically distressed and/or employed more maladaptive mechanisms of defense" (p. 171). The same questions from the Yalom study were asked these participants.

> Was your experience in the group constructive, neutral, or destructive? Was the group stressful to you? Were you made uncomfortable by the group? In which ways? How did the group affect your academic functioning? How did the group affect your relationship with friends? As a result of the group did your self-concept remain the same, become more positive or become more negative? Have you sought help from professional or informal sources? If you changed positively during the past quarter how much can be attributed to the group? If you changed negatively during the quarter how much of the change can be attributed to the group? [p. 68].

Based on these diagnostic techniques we now want to look at what hypotheses were present at the beginning of the study.

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES

The purpose of this investigation was to determine whether those casualty indicators identified in the Lieberman study would help predict the casualties in this study. The hypotheses concerning the outcome of this study were as follows:

I. Attitudes Toward Experiential Groups--Lieberman Questionnaire

1. Phoniness. Casualties would look at the group experience as being genuine.
2. Social Benefit. Casualties would give a high social benefit rating to the group.
3. Danger. Casualties would enter the group, rating it as safe.

II. Expectations--Lieberman Questionnaire

1. Interpersonal Adequacy. Casualties would view themselves as interpersonally inadequate.
2. Sensitivity. Casualties would view themselves as very sensitive.
3. Opportunity for Feeling Expression. Casualties would say that they have adequate opportunity for feeling expression.
4. Opportunity for Peer Communication. The casualties would say they have few opportunities for peer communication.
5. Experiencing. The Casualties would have a low experiencing rating.
6. Changing. Casualties would have a high change score.

III. Rosenberg Self Esteem Ratings

1. Self Esteem. Casualties would rate low on self esteem.
2. Stability of Self Concept. Self concept for casualties would change often.
3. Faith in Others. Casualties would have little faith in others.
4. Criticism. Casualties would take criticism seriously.
5. Depression. Casualties would be more depressed than other entering members of the group.
6. Psychosomatic Problems. Casualties would have more psychosomatic problems.
7. Interpersonal Threat. Casualties would have a higher interpersonal threat rating.

IV. Leader and Observer Rating

The group leaders would be less able to predict casualties than would the outside observer. This hypothesis is based on the Lieberman study which found that: "The leaders were particularly insensitive in casualty identification: of the twenty four subjects who were rated by the leaders as having decreased the most in mental health areas only two were casualties. Or to put it another way, of the sixteen casualties only two were seen by the leaders as having significantly worsened. During a postgroup interview when the leaders were informed that some subjects in the group had had a negative effect, they were still unable to identify them" (Lieberman, 1971, p. 28).

V. Adjective Check List

The 24 scales for the Adjective Check List are described below. Hypotheses based on each of the individual scales are

presented with their descriptions. The descriptions are taken from the Adjective Check List Manual.

1. Number of Adjectives Checked. The individual high on this variable tends to be described as emotional, adventurous, wholesome, conservative, enthusiastic, unintelligent, frank and helpful. He is active, apparently means well, but tends to blunder. The man with low scores tends more often to be quiet and reserved, more tentative and cautious in his approach to problems, and perhaps at times unduly taciturn and aloof. He is more apt to think originally and inventively, but is perhaps less effective in getting things done.
2. Defensiveness. The higher scoring person is apt to be self-controlled and resolute in both attitude and behavior, and insistent and even stubborn in seeking his objectives. His persistence is more admirable than attractive. The lower scoring subject tends to be anxious and apprehensive, critical of himself and others, and given to complaints about his circumstances. He not only has more problems than his peers, but tends to dwell on them and put them at the center of his attention.
3. Number of Favorable Adjectives Checked. The higher scoring person is motivated by a strong desire to do well and impress others, but always by hard work and conventional endeavor. The low scoring person is seen as clever, sharp-witted, headstrong, pleasure-seeking, and original in thought and behavior. His emotions are more accessible; he also more often experiences anxiety, self-doubts, and perplexities.

4. Number of Unfavorable Adjectives Checked. The higher scoring individual strikes others as rebellious, arrogant, careless, conceited and cynical. He tends to be a disbeliever, a skeptic, and a threat to the complacent beliefs and attitudes of his fellows. The lower scorer is more placid, more obliging, more mannerly, more tactful, and probably less intelligent.
5. Self-Confidence. The higher scorer is assertive, affiliative, outgoing, persistent, an activist. He wants to get things done, and is impatient with people or things standing in his way. The low scoring person is much less effective in the everyday sense of the word--he has difficulty in mobilizing himself and taking action, preferring inaction and contemplation. Others see him as unassuming, forgetful, mild, preoccupied, reserved and retiring.
6. Self-Control. High scorers tend to be serious, sober individuals, interested in and responsive to their obligations. They are seen as diligent, practical, and loyal workers. At the other end of the scale one seems to find the inadequately socialized person, headstrong, irresponsible, complaining, disorderly, narcissistic, and impulsive.
7. Lability. The high scoring subject is seen as spontaneous. The low scorer is more phlegmatic, routinized, planful and conventional. He reports stricter opinions on right and wrong practices and a greater need for order and regularity. He is described by observers as thorough, organized, steady, and unemotional.

8. Personal Adjustment. The high scorer is seen as dependable, peaceable, trusting, friendly, practical, loyal, and wholesome. He fits in well, asks for little, treats others with courtesy, and works enterprisingly toward his own goals. The low scorer sees himself at odds with other people and as moody and dissatisfied.
9. Achievement. The high scorer is hard-working and intelligent. He is determined to do well and usually succeeds. The low scorer tends to be withdrawn and dissatisfied with his current status.
10. Dominance. The high scorer is forceful, strong-willed and persevering. The low scorer is unsure of himself, and indifferent to both the demands and challenges of interpersonal life.
11. Endurance. The high scorer is self-controlled and responsible, but also idealistic and concerned about truth and justice. The lower scorer is erratic and impatient, intolerant of prolonged attention, and apt to change in an abrupt and quixotic manner.
12. Order. High scorers are usually sincere and dependable, but at the cost of individuality and spontaneity. Low scorers are quicker in temperament and reaction and might often be called impulsive.
13. Intraception. The high scorer is reflective and serious; he is also capable, conscientious, and knowledgeable. The low scorer is aggressive in manner and quickly becomes bored or impatient with any situation where direct action is not possible. He is a doer, not a thinker.

14. Nurturance. The high scorers are helpful and nurturant. The low scorer is too self-centered and too little attentive to the feelings and wishes of others.

15. Affiliation. The high scorer is ambitious and concerned with position, and may tend to exploit others and his relationships with them in order to gain his ends. The low scorer is more individualistic and strong-willed, though perhaps not out of inner resourcefulness and independence. He tends to be less trusting, more pessimistic about life, and restless in any situation which intensifies or prolongs his contacts with others.

16. Heterosexuality. The high scorer is interested in the opposite sex as he is interested in life, experience and most things in a healthy, direct, and outgoing manner. He may even be a bit naive in the friendly ingenuousness in which he approaches others. The low scorer thinks too much and dampens his vitality; he tends to be despirited, inhibited, shrewd, and calculating in his interpersonal relationships.

17. Exhibition. Persons who are high on this scale tend to be self-centered and even narcissistic. They are poised, self-assured, and able to meet situations with aplomb, but at the same time they are quick-tempered and irritable. In their dealings with others they are apt to be opportunistic and manipulative. Persons who score low tend toward apathy, self-doubt, and undue inhibition of impulse. They lack self-confidence in themselves and shrink from any encounter in which they will be visible or "on stage."

18. Autonomy. The high scorer is independent and autonomous but also assertive and self-willed. He tends to be indifferent to the feelings of others and heedless of their preferences when he himself wishes to act. The low scorer is of a moderate and even subdued disposition. He hesitates to take the initiative, preferring to wait and follow the dictates of others.

19. Aggression. The individual high on this scale is both competitive and aggressive. His impulses are strong and often undercontrolled. The individual who scores low is much more a conformist, but not necessarily lacking in tenacity. He tends to be patiently diligent, and sincere in his relationships with others.

20. Change. People high on this scale are typically perceptive, alert, and spontaneous individuals who comprehend problems and situations rapidly and incisively and who take pleasure in change and variety. The low scorer seeks stability and continuity in his environment and is apprehensive of ill-defined and risk-taking situations.

21. Succorance. Succorance appears to depict at its high end a personality which is trusting, guileless, and even naive in his faith in the integrity and benevolence of others. The high scorer is dependent on others, seeks support, and expects to find it. The low scorer, on the contrary, is independent, resourceful, and self-sufficient, but at the same time prudent and circumspect.

22. Abasement. The high scorers on this scale are not only

submissive and self-effacing, but also appear to have problems of self-acceptance. They see themselves as weak and undeserving, and face the world with anxiety and foreboding. The low scorer is optimistic, poised, productive, and decisive. Not fearing others, he is alert and responsive to them.

23. Deference. The individual scoring high on this scale is conscientious, dependable and persevering. The individual scoring low is more energetic, spontaneous, and independent; he likes attention, likes to supervise and direct others and to express his will.

24. Counseling Readiness. The high scorer is worried about himself and ambivalent about his status. He feels left out of things, unable to enjoy life to the full, and unduly anxious. The low scorer is more or less free of these concerns. He is self-confident, poised, sure of himself, and outgoing. He seeks the company of others, likes activity, and enjoys life in an uncomplicated way.

Before we review the findings of this present study, it will be valuable to see some of the conclusions and interpretations that were presented in the Lieberman study.

> The participants who became psychological casualties rated themselves lowest in interpersonal adequacy (deficient in relating to others); they saw themselves as having significantly fewer opportunities for open peer communication than did the unchanged. They saw encounter groups as safe and as very genuine, attitudes distinct from the more suspicious or cautious High Learners. Thus the Casualties came to the encounter groups with a generally favorable attitude and saw themselves as needing the group to correct certain relationship problems. The value structure of those who became Casualties was characterized by a unique emphasis on growth. The Casualties expressed a very high personal commitment to changing, to growing, to developing. Perhaps the intensity of these orientations was an

> expression of their neediness, their desire for salvation. This may explain part of the problem these individuals experienced in the encounter group; their hopes for change were perhaps far beyond the realistic limitations of a thirty-hour experience. The other major value area that distinguishes the Casualties from other groups was their low interest in Hedonism, in pleasurable sensory activities. The Casualties were not swingers in the value domain. They did not subscribe to contemporary claims about the value of experiencing. Rather, they expected the encounter experience to offer direct personal benefit, therapeutics [pp. 324-25].
>
> If the interest were in the practical application of these findings, how could those who are most likely to become Casualties be screened out, while, at the same time, maximizing the number of individuals who could benefit most from the encounter group experience? The key to answering this question lies in the detection of ostensible differences between the two extreme groups. One may be that those who become Casualties overvalued changing and developing. Their very high growth score suggests that the casualties may have entered the encounter group with the expectation that it would offer them salvation. Such a speculation is borne out by the major differences between Casualties and High Learners in respect to attitudes: although needing much and expecting much, the High Learners initially had a cautious view of encounter groups. In contrast the attitude of the Casualty toward the forthcoming encounter experience was totally positive and uncritical. He was perhaps overly eager to be influenced or unrealistically hopeful. His freedom from the initial caution evidenced in the High Learner may also have meant this difference: High Learners expected to find pain in the growth process: Casualties expected pleasant magic to be worked upon them. If so when pain was experienced the High Learner was not required to alter his expectations (he experienced no dissonance), whereas the Casualty may not only have been shocked by the demand for his own involvement in the change process; he may have been moved to perceive the encounter as another light that failed him.
>
> Such a possibility is supported by the finding that the major psychological difference between those who became Casualties and those who became High Learners lay in their conception of others. The Casualties expressed a misanthropic view towards others who were important to them, even their closest friend. Perhaps their extremely negative and disciminatory view of others made it difficult for them to utilize an experience that is basically interpersonal; or perhaps they assigned to the demands of their cohorts in encounter a repetition of the disappointments they must have associated with their other acquaintances [pp. 331-32].

We are now ready to look at the results of this study and compare them to the hypotheses generated from the Lieberman study.

CHAPTER IV

INTERVIEWS WITH THE PARTICIPANTS AND IDENTIFICATION OF CASUALTIES

A casualty was defined as an individual who, as a direct result of his experience in the encounter group, became more psychologically distressed and/or employed more maladaptive mechanisms of defense. The eight principal indicators used to identify the casualties in the Lieberman study were:

1. Request for Psychiatric Aid
2. Dropouts from Groups
3. Peer Evaluation
4. Low Testimony
5. Self-Concept Change
6. Psychotherapy
7. Leaders' Ratings
8. Post Interview

Only one of the thirty people involved in the study showed signs of being hurt by the group experience. Of the eight indicators seven signaled that Paul had been hurt by the group.

1. Request for Psychiatric Aid

Paul, because of the high tension he was feeling, went to a doctor and was prescribed valium, a tranquilizer. He was the only one of the 28 people interviewed who sought professional help.

2. Dropout from the Group

Two people who signed up for the course, took the pre-group

tests and were assigned to a group, failed to show for the first meeting. One person in Group II showed up for the first meeting but then dropped out of school for financial reasons. Paul could, in some sense, be considered a dropout because during the last meeting he left crying.

3. Peer Evaluation

In Group I six of the seven group members said that one member of the group had benefited least but they didn't think anyone in the group had been hurt by the experience. In Group II all of the other seven group members said that Paul had been hurt by the group experience.

4. Low Testimony

Only two people said that they had gotten worse during the quarter. One was Paul and the other was a member of the control group.

5. Self-Concept Change

Of the 24 scales on the Adjective Check List Paul, at the beginning of the quarter, had 4 scales that fell greater than or equal to 1 standard deviation from the mean. At the end of the quarter 13 scales fell greater than or equal to 1 standard deviation from the mean. The difference of 9 was the greatest increase of anyone participating in the study.

6. Psychotherapy

None of the people interviewed had entered psychotherapy during the quarter.

7. Leaders' Ratings

In Group I neither of the leaders thought that anyone had been hurt by the group experience. In Group II both leaders thought

that Paul had been hurt the most by the group.

8. Post Interview

After interviewing all of the participants in the groups the outside observer (a graduate student in clinical psychology) rated Paul as the only casualty of the three groups. A summary of all the post group interviews follows. As in the Lieberman study, it was the post group interview that defined whether or not a person had been hurt during the group.

Although the major emphasis of this study is looking at whether the Lieberman questionnaire would in fact have predicted the casualty in this group, it is also valuable to look at whether some people might have been labeled casualties when in fact they were not. Looking at those people who scored in the high 10 percent of the scales, the following information emerges. Two participants in the study scored high on three of the Lieberman predictors. Six scored high on two of the Lieberman predictors and six others scored high on only one of the Lieberman predictors. Based on these predictors, none of the participants would have been eliminated because they were probable casualties.

Interview Summaries

The purpose of this section is to summarize the information gained about each of the participants in all three groups in the post quarter interview. The same questions that were asked in the Lieberman study were used to determine if anyone was a casualty of the group experience. Based on the Lieberman criteria only one person was judged to be a casualty. The interviews were conducted by a third-year clinical

psychology graduate student. The names of the participants have been changed. The questions used by the interviewer are again listed below:

> Did you view the group as an overall constructive, neutral, or destructive experience? Was the group stressful to you? Were you made uncomfortable by the group? For how long a period of time? In which ways? If the group had a negative effect have you recovered the level of comfort that was present before the group? What other concurrent life experiences were you having while the group was in progress? Did you seek any professional help during this period?

The information given below has been condensed so that the participants in the study can remain anonymous. Of the 28 people interviewed, 17 were women. Four women were married and one was divorced. The ages of the participants ranged from 19 to 36.

Group Participants

The individuals in the groups who said that they felt better as a result of being in the group listed heightened self-esteem as the principal benefit. With this better self image they recounted decisions made and actions taken in regard to their jobs and relationships with friends. Several explained how they had finally quit a job that they didn't like or stood up to someone they had been afraid to talk to before. Several women who were in relationships or were married said they felt better because they had realized they could be liked and could have friends apart from their husbands or boyfriends. Several people mentioned that they were talking more in the group and felt less withdrawn. This increased talking indicated to them that they were making positive changes.

Those who felt the group had been neutral or unhelpful complained that the meetings were boring and that they felt apart and different from the other members of the group. In discussing the

stressful times in the group several people mentioned they disliked being pressured to say something and others disliked the behavior of the group leaders. The leaders were criticized because they remained aloof from the group and participated as observers. Several people also felt quite uncomfortable when the group leaders would openly voice their discontent with each other.

Control Participants

Control group members emphasized changes in their lives such as getting a new job, getting better grades or buying a new car. Unlike the group participants they talked less about changes that involved emotional awareness. Of those who felt better about themselves, several mentioned the change was due to religious or social groups that they had joined. These groups seemed to bolster the self esteem of these individuals.

For those who felt worse about themselves, getting drunk and sick more often were examples of why they felt worse about themselves. In general the control participants talked less about emotional and feeling changes and more about externals.

Summary of Interview with the Participant Most Harmed by the Experience

In the interview this individual explained that things were generally worse for him. He said that people in the group took themselves and him too seriously. He said that group members didn't know how to rationalize very well and took everything too seriously. He felt that he had personal troubles outside the group and that he had come to learn how to relax. He said he had felt uncomfortable because the people were trying to get inside of him. Group members felt

that he was putting up a front to protect himself. In general he didn't trust the other members of the group.

A Review of What People the Group Participants Thought Could Be Harmed in the Group Situation

It is interesting to see that some members of the experiential groups who commented on how the group could be harmful said that certain people should not participate in these groups. They suggested the following types might be harmed: someone who doesn't have a strong self image, soneome who isn't trusting, someone who can't take constructive criticism and someone who has an emotional need to pick on someone else. These types of people don't sound so very different from the areas mentioned in the first chapter by some of the psychological researchers. (See Table 1.)

Table 1. Results of Post Group Interview: Summary of Participants' Replies to Interviewer's Questions

Group/ Participant Number	How the Quarter or the Experience Was Viewed[a]	Meetings Missed	Grades	Dropped Out	Group Caused Stress	Major Changes	Changes Due to Group	Outside Help
Group I								
1	C	0	same	no	yes	broke relationship	yes	no
2	C	0	better	no	yes	quit job	yes	no
3	C	0	same	no	yes	better relationship	yes	no
4	N	0	better	no	yes	better relationship	DN[b]	no
5	C	1	worse	no	yes	better relationship	yes	no
6	C	0	better	no	no	new relationship	no	no
7	N	0	same	no	yes	better relationship	no	no
Group II								
8	C	1	same	no	yes	stood up for self	yes	no
9	N	NA[c]	same	yes	NA	no	NA	no
10	D	2	better	no	yes	no	DN	yes
11	C	2	same	no	no	better communication	yes	no
12	C	0	better	no	yes	closer to friends	yes	no
13	N	1	worse	no	yes	no	no	no
14	C	0	same	no	yes	no	no	no
15	N	2	same	no	no	no	no	no
16	C	0	better	no	no	better communication	yes	no
17	C	0	same	no	no	better relationship	yes	no

Table 1 (continued)

Group/ Participant Number	How the Quarter or the Experience Was Viewed[a]	Meetings Missed	Grades	Dropped Out	Group Caused Stress	Major Changes	Changes Due to Group	Outside Help
Control Group								
18	C	NA	better	no	NA	quit job	NA	no
19	C	NA	better	no	NA	moved from home	NA	no
20	C	NA	better	yes	NA	more religious	NA	no
21	C	NA	same	yes	NA	no	NA	no
22	C	NA	same	no	NA	quite school	NA	no
23	C	NA	worse	no	NA	broke relationship	NA	no
24	C	NA	better	no	NA	no	NA	no
25	N	NA	same	yes	NA	no	NA	no
26	D	NA	same	no	NA	no	NA	no
27	N	NA	same	no	NA	no	NA	no
28	N	NA	same	yes	NA	no	NA	no

[a]C=constructive; N=neutral; D=destructive.

[b]DN=don't know.

[c]NA= not applicable.

CHAPTER V

LEADERS' AND OBSERVERS' RANKINGS

Each of the two observers and the two co-facilitators in both Groups I and II were asked at the beginning of the quarter to rank all the group participants according to who they felt would be harmed by the group experience. This ranking was done after a 20-minute observation period. With the rankings the observers and the leaders were asked to make a brief statement about why they ranked each individual as they did. These comments are included below for they shed some light on the opinions of these observers and leaders as how people get harmed in experiential groups.

All of the four leaders had spent the previous quarter participating in a leader's group, learning how to run a group. All of the observers were either second or third year clinical psychology graduate students and all had previously lead experiential groups. These ranks start with the potentially most harmed and end with the potentially least harmed.

Group I

Observer #1

1. Arnold has darting eyes and talks compulsively. He has a lot at stake in the group. He may have trouble with people ganging up on him.

2. Ann didn't talk much. She has darting eye movements. She looks young which suggests there may be some conflict and difficulty interacting with others.

3. Cindy has no particular problems and no particular strengths.

4. Barbara also has no particular problems and no particular strengths.

5. Richard intellectualizes and talks about being close but maintains distance.

6. Sally has a specific goal for the group, verbal ability, seemed confident, and will interact without harm.

7. Bob is relaxed, confident, and somewhat distant; he will lead rather than change.

Observer #2

1. Ann seemed to be physically uncomfortable in the group.

2. Cindy was extremely quiet.

3. Bob seemed tense and uncomfortable.

4. Sally is perhaps the hardest to rank because she only said a few words in the group.

5. Barbara is a little older and seems more self assured than some of the participants.

6. Richard spoke a lot, has been in a group before and seems to know what to expect.

7. Arnold also spoke a lot, is a little older and knows what to expect.

Leader #1

1. Cindy was very quiet.

2. Barbara appeared to be very sensitive. She was hopeful but hesitant.

3. Sally didn't say much during the group so this ranking is just a guess.

4. Arnold is sensitive, but he is hesitant to show it.

5. Richard seems stable and pretty much in control.

6. Bob is relaxed and easy going.

7. Ann is calm, stable. She may have had some previous group experience.

Leader #2

"I couldn't be comfortable doing this without saying that I find this hard to do. I don't expect anyone to be harmed."

1. Richard seemed tense.

2. Arnold took the group too seriously.

3. Cindy didn't say very much. I felt she was not as comfortable, but might hold back.

4. Barbara

5. Sally

6. Ann

7. Bob seemed relaxed and I don't expect him to take the group as seriously.

Group II

Observer #1

1. Karen is naive; too much too soon for her. She will be rattled since she is an obese type.

2. Pat is withdrawn. She will have to respond to this threatening situation.

3. Connie is also naive and sweet. Failing herself will hurt.

4. John is probably self-conscious because of his speech.

5. Claudia's age makes me suspicious. Does she need this and her previous groups.

6. Peter's ego is going to be deflated. Narcissistic.

7. Paul will be called for leaving the here and now.

8. Susan said her previous group experience was a bore. So she made it okay once.

9. Louise is probably an hysteric. She can deny or repress anything that she doesn't like hearing and forget it soon after.

Observer #2

1. Paul seems a bit paranoid. Sometimes a little manic.
2. Karen seems defensive and quite sensitive.
3. Peter could get some people angry.
4. Claudia is older and more guarded.
5. John is not very aware of himself.
6. Pat didn't say much.
7. Connie seems a little withdrawn.
8. Louise didn't say much but when she did she spoke confidently.
9. Susan's past experience will put her in good stead.

Leader #1

1. Peter is very defensive. He came on strong.
2. Paul couldn't trust people.
3. Karen is afraid of a non-traditional class.
4. Pat
5. John's only comments seemed like echoes.

6. Louise's comments seemed general and nonpersonal.

7. Connie is quiet but calm.

8. Susan is open and not afraid to be vulnerable.

9. Claudia is calm and in control of herself.

Leader #2

1. Paul is less secure, not trusting.

2. John made me uneasy about his strength in intense situations.

3. Marcia's nervousness made me uneasy.

4. Connie voiced apprehension, looked down, avoidance and nervous hands.

5. Susan was apprehensive.

6. Louise was reserved. I felt solid about her.

7. Peter knows the ropes. He will escape into gamesmanship before he allows himself to be harmed.

8. Claudia seemed solid but she also makes me feel she might be acting.

9. Pat looked and felt strong and adjusted.

Casualty Ranking Correlations

In examining the correlations between the rankings of the group leaders, the outside observers and the group participants, the following questions were asked:

Before the group began were the two leaders in agreement as to who would be hurt the most in the group?

Were the two observers more in agreement at the beginning of the quarter than the group leaders?

If they were or were not are there any apparent reasons for the difference?

These questions were asked to see how much agreement there was as the quarter began as to who would be a casualty. In comparing the two groups are the observers or the leaders consistently more in agreement?

After the group were the leaders more in agreement on defining who was hurt by the group than they were predicting at the beginning of the quarter? If the leaders are or are not more in agreement at the end of the quarter is the pattern in one group the same as the pattern in the other group? A very significant question is whether or not the leaders at the beginning of the quarter were in agreement with their rankings at the end of the quarter? In other words, how good were they in making predictions about who was going to be hurt? A final question is was there much agreement between the leaders and the participants at the end of the group as to who was a casualty? If not, are there any reasons for the differences?

In looking at the rankings of the two leaders in Group I (Table 2) before the group began, they had a correlation of .39. The observers in the same group did not do as well with a negative correlation of -.07. When the rankings of the two leaders are compared with the rankings of the two observers, there is a correlation of .07. In Group II at the beginning of the quarter the correlation between Leader 1 and Leader 2 was .27 and the correlation between Observer 1 and Observer 2 was .32. When the rankings of the two leaders are combined with the rankings of the two observers, the correlation is

Table 2. Comparison of Group I and Group II Casualty Rankings

	Group I	Group II
Before Group Rankings		
Two leaders compared	.39	.27
Two observers compared	-.07	.32
Two leaders and two observers compared	.07	.45
After Group Rankings		
Two leaders compared	-.46	.57
Before and after leaders compared	.42	-.17
Before observers and after leaders	.46	.07
After leaders compared with participants	.15	.92

.45. In Group I the leaders are more in agreement than the observers. In Group II the observers are more in agreement than the leaders. In Group II the overall agreement between the leaders and observers is better than the agreement in Group I of the leaders and observers.

After the quarter rankings of the group leaders for Group I showed a correlation of -.46. In Group II the same correlation was .57. As might be expected the group leaders in Group II after having spent 10 weeks in a group together were more in agreement with their rankings at the end of the quarter than at the beginning. However, the group leaders in Group I were less in agreement. In Group I when comparing the before the quarter leader rankings and after the quarter leader rankings, there is a correlation of .42. In Group II the same comparison shows a correlation of .17. Although the leaders in Group I were better than the leaders in Group II in predicting casualties, the correlations for both groups are very low. The leaders weren't very good in predicting casualties. In Group I a comparison between the

rankings of the observers before the group and the rankings of the leaders afterward shows a correlation of .46. This is a higher correlation than when the before and after leader reankings are compared. In Group II the story is the same because there is more agreement between the before observer rankings and the after leader rankings than between the before and after leader rankings. The correlation for the before observer and after leader rankings is .07. The comparison of the after leader rankings and the participants after the quarter rankings in Group I shows a correlation of .15. In this group there was little agreement between the leaders and the participants when they ranked the casualties. In Group II there is a much higher agreement between the group leaders and participants. The correlation is .92.

The Appendix contains a more complete list of the casualty correlations.

CHAPTER VI

EXAMINING THE RESULTS IN LIGHT OF THE ORIGINAL PREDICTIONS

The purpose of this section is to take an in-depth look at Paul's pre-quarter responses on Lieberman's two *Questionnaires on Attitudes Toward the Group, Personal Anticipations*, the *Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale* and the *Adjective Check List*, and compare them with the responses of the other participants in the other groups and in the control groups and with the hypotheses set forth at the beginning of the study. The percentages represented a comparison with all the other participants in the three groups.

Attitudes Toward the Group--Lieberman Questionnaire

1. Phoniness. 89.3 percent of the participants thought the encounter experience was more genuine. This score was in contrast to the Lieberman study which said that casualties would look at the encounter experience as more genuine.

2. Social Benefit. 74.3 percent of the participants thought the encounter experience had more social benefit than did Paul. This score was in contrast to the Lieberman study which said that casualties would look at encounter groups as having more social benefit.

3. Danger. 78.6 percent of the participants thought that the encounter group was safer than did Paul. This score is in contrast to the Lieberman study which said that casualties would view encounter groups as being safe.

Personal Anticipations--Lieberman Questionnaire

1. Sensitivity. 59.7 percent thought they were more sensitive than Paul. The Lieberman study predicted that casualties would view themselves as very sensitive.

2. Interpersonally Adequate. Paul thought that he was interpersonally adequate. Only 7.1 percent of the participants thought they were more interpersonally adequate than Paul. This finding is in contrast to the Lieberman study which said that casualties would rate themselves very low on the interpersonal adequacy scale.

3. Opportunity for Feeling Expression. 42.9 percent said that they had more of an opportunity for feeling expression. The Lieberman study predicted that Cs (Casualties) would rate themselves high on this scale.

4. Opportunity for Peer Communications. This scale is in direct contradiction to what the Lieberman study predicted. Paul said that he had more opportunity for peer communication than did any of the other participants.

5. Experiencing. 67.9 percent thought that experiencing was less important than did Paul. This finding is in contrast with the Lieberman study which said that casualties would see experiencing as a less important goal.

6. Changing. The Lieberman study said that changing would be an important goal for Cs. 32.1 percent valued changing more than Paul. This finding tends to support the Yalom study but is not a very significant indicator because six people wanted change more than Paul.

Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale

1. Self-esteem. 78.6 percent had a lower self esteem rating than Paul. Paul was among six of the participants who had the highest self esteem rating. This finding is in direct contradiction to the Lieberman study which said Cs had very low self esteem ratings going into the encounter experience.

2. Stability of Self. 53.6 percent thought that their self concept changed more than Paul. This is in contrast to the prediction that Cs would view their self concept as changing often.

3. Faith in Others. All of the other participants had more trust in others than did Paul. This result coincides with the Lieberman study which said that Cs would not trust others.

4. Sensitive to Criticism. This scale showed that one person was less sensitive to criticism and four were more sensitive to criticism. 82.1 percent had the same score.

5. Depression. Only 17.9 percent rated themselves as more depressed. This finding tends to concur with the beginning hypotheses.

6. Psychosomatic. 28.6 percent had a higher psychosomatic rating than did Paul. This scale tends to support the original hypotheses but a higher score was expected.

7. Interpersonal Threat. Paul at 42.9 percent had the lowest possible interpersonal threat score. This score is in contrast to an expected high interpersonal threat score.

Leader and Observer Ratings

One observer said that Paul was the most likely to be hurt. The other observer, however, ranked him seventh. One leader ranked him

first, and the other leader ranked him second as being possibly hurt. The leaders seem to have a pretty good idea of who the casualties might be, better than the observers. This finding is not in agreement with the expectation that the group facilitators would not be very good predictors.

Adjective Check List

1. Number Checked. 95.7 percent had a higher score than Paul.
2. Defensiveness. 42.9 percent scored higher on this scale.
3. Favorable Checked. 53.9 percent checked more favorable adjectives.
4. Unfavorable Checked. 25 percent checked more unfavorable adjectives.
5. Self Confidence. 60.7 percent had the same self confidence score or lower.
6. Liability. 32.1 percent had a higher score.
7. Personal Adjustment. 32.1 percent had the same or lower score.
8. Achievement. 92.9 percent had the same or lower achievement score.
9. Dominance. 78.6 percent had the same or lower score.
10. Endurance. 78.6 percent had the same or a lower score.
11. Order. 60.7 percent had the same or lower score.
12. Intraception. 50 percent had the same or lower score.
13. Nurturance. 14.3 percent had the same or lower score.
14. Affiliation. 42.9 percent had the same or lower score.
15. Heterosexuality. 92.9 percent had the same or lower score.
16. Exhibition. 78.6 percent had the same or lower score.

17. Autonomy. Only one person scored higher on this scale.

18. Aggression. Only 10.7 percent had a higher score.

19. Change. 75 percent had the same or lower score.

20. Succorance. 60.7 percent had a higher score.

21. Abasement. 57.1 percent had the same or lower score.

22. Deference. Paul had the lowest deference score.

23. Counseling Readiness. 85.7 percent had a higher score.

24. Self-Control. 39.3 percent had the same or lower score.

25. Begin Number of Extreme Values. 46.4 percent had higher scores.

26. Magnitude of Extreme Values. 46.4 percent had higher scores.

As can be seen from Table 3 there is no agreement on any of the eight predictor scales described in the Lieberman study. Only on the high desire for change scale did Paul come close to agreement with one of the Lieberman predictions. The top 10 percent of the scales was used as the cut-off point.

Table 3. Summary of Paul's Test Scores Compared with the Lieberman Study of What the Profile of a Casualty Should Look Like

	Paul's Scores	
	Agreement	Disagreement
Lieberman's Predictions		
Low Self Esteem		X
Experiencing Not Important		X
Changing Important		X
Interpersonally Inadequate		X
Needing More Open Peer Communication		X
Group Safe		X
Group Genuine		X
Group has High Social Benefit		X

CHAPTER VII

COMMENCEMENTS

> Kuhn (1970) describes the element of arbitrariness implicit in the natural history of scientific schools and the manner in which they came to see the world and practice science in it. Assumptions such as the nature of the fundamental entities which compare the universe, the interaction of those entities with the senses, and the legitimate questions to be asked and techniques employed in seeking answers came to institute the basis of educational initiation into a field of science. To a degree, psychological theory is shaped by autobiography, the personal history of theoreticians directly influencing their articulations of and emphasis in theory. Freud for example in his introduction to *Civilization and Its Discontents* tells of receiving a letter from the poet Romain Rolland, who became a student of the great Indian saint Sri-Ramakrisna. Rolland described a feeling of something "limitless and unbounded," which he saw as "the psychological basis of much of the wisdom of mysticism." Freud labeled the feeling "oceanic" and admitting his puzzlement and failure to discover this oceanic feeling in himself, went on to interpret this part of experience in a manner consonant with his own world view, positing as its origins a feeling of infantile helplessness which he saw as the source of religious feeling [Goleman, 1974, pp. 73-74].

I have entitled this last section Commencements instead of Conclusions because I think it is a more honest description of what is usually said at the end of dissertations and certainly is a more honest description of what I am about to say.

I began this chapter with a quotation which helps to set the tone of this investigation into casualties in encounter groups. The message is that the term casualty is quite relative to the social, scientific and cultural background of the investigators. We have talked of this already and more will be said before we close.

Although it is not customary to introduce new information from the literature at this point, studies continue to be published and the one I am about to mention is relevant: another reason why this section is more aptly entitled commencements instead of conclusions. Posthuma

(1974), in an article describing a study he designed after reviewing Lieberman's results, says that there is a risk of a sampling bias from a clinical evaluation. He goes on to say that there is a difficulty in predicting a potential casualty since there are limits to the extent with which the results of a clinical evaluation can be generalized.

Posthuma mentions another follow-up study to the Lieberman, Yalom and Miles study (1973) which was conducted by one of those researchers, Matthew Miles. Friends of the participants in the Lieberman study were contacted and asked if they noted any incidences of positive or negative behavior change. Results indicate only very little difference between the participants and the controls in proportion of positive and negative incidents reported and only a slight increase in the mean number of changes per subject reported by encounter group participants. Of the original 16 casualties found in the Lieberman study, data was included for only 6 of these in the Miles study. However, only 1 of these 6 received a negative change mention from associates. One's first reaction might be to question the investment of these associates in seeing their friends change for the better or worse. But it also may be a reflection on the bias of the researchers in the Lieberman study. As was quoted in the introduction to this chapter, psychologists' approach to how they view distress in groups is strongly influenced by their personal history and their identification with a particular scientific school or way of viewing the world.

One method Posthuma used to avoid the problem of researcher bias was to design a behavior index instead of taking the verbal

comments as indicating distress. Let me describe his study and its results. Three groups were included in the study with a total of about 30 participants. One group was a control, another the author described as a placebo, which meant the group met and discussed intimate problems, heard lectures and saw films. The last was an experiential group. Each of the participants at the end filled out a behavior change index containing six sections: social, vocational, health, personal, domestic and miscellaneous. Each subject was asked to list specific behavior changes in each of these six sections. He was also asked to indicate if they were positive or negative. Only behaviors that represented real or overt changes in behavior that could be noticed by an observer were counted. For example, I Have More Periods of Depression was not scored but I Cried Last Week was scored. The authors concluded that the encounter group did not produce any more psychological distress than would normally occur in people coping with the normal exigencies of life. In the earlier sections I mentioned the many differing views psychologists have about psychological distress in a group. Posthuma may be centering in on an important bias of the interviewer but there are also other investigators who see psychological distress in a different light. Crying in view of Schutz (1971), Silverman (1972), or some other psychologist may be more a sign of health.

Although the purpose of this study was not to compare encounter groups with placebos and controls, it is interesting to note that based on the self portrait drawn by the Adjective Check List before and after the quarter, there was no significant difference on a t-test between the two encounter groups and the control group. Proponents of encounter groups may not look favorably at this result because

the members of the experiential group didn't make positive changes but the same conclusion that Posthuma came to is appropriate here. The experiential groups also didn't produce any more psychological distress than did the control group.

Looking at these same data, the question also arises whether or not it is profitable to spend one's time in an encounter group since there was in effect no difference between the people participating in the abnormal psychology course and those who were in the experiental groups. It is possible, however, that the Adjective Check List is not a very good indicator of change.

Another comparison between the experiential groups and the control group is that while one person in the encounter group dropped out of school and the class for financial reasons, four participants dropped the abnormal psychology course. It is interesting to note that the Lieberman study placed some emphasis on dropouts as being indicators of casualties.

In this partial replication of the Lieberman study the reader has already seen that the predictors that Lieberman said would help to pinpoint possible casualties wouldn't have predicted the casualty in this group. The Lieberman study suggested that casualties would be positive and uncritical toward the group, they would rate themselves as having low self esteem, being interpersonally inadequate and needing more open peer communication. Also they would want to change but would not be interested in joining the group just for the sake of the

experience. In contrast to these predictions are the attitudes with which Paul entered the group. He saw the group as dangerous and phony with little social benefit. He rated himself high in self esteem and interpersonal adequacy with plenty of opportunity for open peer communication. He ranked among the top third of the participants who came to the group wanting new experiences but he was also included among the top third who came to the group wanting change. It is only on this last scale, the desire for change, that the casualty tends to agree with the Lieberman study. So out of the original eight predictions taken from the Lieberman study, none would have helped to pinpoint Paul.

Before turning to further discussion of these findings, the Lieberman study (1973) also said: "the casualties expressed a misanthropic view towards others who were important to them, even their closest friends. Perhaps their extremely negative and discriminatory view of others made it difficult for them to utilize an experience that is basically interpersonal; or perhaps they assigned to the demands of their cohorts in encounter a repetition of the disappointments they must have associated with their other acquaintances" (p. 332). During the last meeting of the group, one of the members, Connie, asked Paul how she could help him. He replied, "Throw money," and she began to cry. Paul was criticized for being insensitive and he too began to cry and left the group.

In the interview with Paul he said that he had "enjoyed Connie trying to get inside me." He then said, "I reacted to her like someone I hate. I was pissed off and didn't want to be discovered." The misanthropic view that Lieberman mentions seems to be central to Paul's

view of the group. He wants to be helped by the members of the group but he doesn't trust them.

On one scale of the Rosenberg Self Concept Scale that was not used in the Lieberman study, Paul had the lowest Faith in Others score. It does seem strange that although Lieberman talks about casualties having a misanthropic view of others, his casualty indicators don't point to the possible casualties viewing groups as being dangerous and phony. Paul's distrust of others is quite clearly indicated in the high Dangerous and Phony scores he places on groups.

It does seem apparent in reviewing how groups work that since the experience is basically interpersonal as Lieberman says, the participants are going to have to trust the others in the group if they are going to benefit from it. Paul saw the other members as trying to get inside him and was very wary of their motives. One of the problems with this conclusion is that although too much distrust of the group may be harmful, how much is too much? And so we have our first partial conclusion and with it a partial commencement.

Although the ratings of the leaders after the group's meeting for 10 weeks have already been discussed in regard to Paul, their opening rankings and those of the observers have not been.

Observer #1, out of nine people, ranked Paul seventh and said that "he will be called for leaving the group." Observer #2 said, "Paul seems a bit paranoid. Sometimes a little manic." And said he was the most likely to be hurt by the group. Leader #1 ranked Paul second and said he couldn't trust people. And Leader #2 said that Paul

was less secure and not trusting and he was the one most likely to be hurt. So two of the four rightly predicted that Paul would be most hurt and one predicted that he would be the second most hurt. All three said that Paul wasn't very trusting and one observer even said that he seemed paranoid. It is therefore obvious that as far as predictors go the observation of Paul in the group was better than Paul's scores based on the Lieberman's suggested casualty predictors. This observation should be viewed in the context that none of the two leaders or two observers were instructed to look for anything in particular when trying to decide who would be a casualty. If all were told that distrust of the other group members was an important determinant of who might be hurt in groups, the four observers might have even bettered their prediction record.

Looking at Paul and seeing how his distrust of the group caused him to become more disturbed does open the possibility of further research in this area. The obvious questions once again arise as to how much distrust of the group is too much and how distrust of the group can be located in any one individual. Since the unguided observation of the group in its initial meeting led three of the four observers to state that Paul was not very trusting, it seems that more investigation into how this distrust was communicated would be appropriate. Based on this study I recommend that leaders should observe potential group members in an actual group setting before deciding whether or not they would be harmed by the group experience.

I began this study with an injunction from the American Psychological Association that all participants should be screened before they enter the group situation. This study with its limited population of

participants did point up the great difficulties in accomplishing this screening. The five year Lieberman study itself has drawn heavy criticism because of its use of a clinical evaluation to determine casualties. This method of identification can be heavily biased on the researcher's method of casualty selection. Also, once a relatively unbiased method of selecting casualties is found it is an equally difficult task to know beforehand what kinds of people or what kinds of behavior may in a particular group situation be indicative of a possible casualty. To quote William Schutz (1971) again, "to the request for screening group members I have two final responses. I'm not sure I'd know what to screen for except in extreme cases, and if I did know, I don't know how to select such people. My suspicion is that there is a bit of righteous arrogance on the part of the established profession" (p. 316).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ackerman, Nathan W. Interacting processes in a group and the role of the leader, *Psychoanalysis and the Social Sciences*, 1955, *5*, 111-120.

Apfelbaum, Bernard & Apfelbaum, Constance, Encountering encounter groups, *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Winter 1973, pp. 53-67.

Bach, G. R. Discussion, *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 1968, *18*, 244-249.

Back, Kurt W. *Beyond Words--The Story of Sensitivity Training and the Encounter Movement*. Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1973.

Bell, Daniel. *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*. Basic Books, New York, 1973.

Bradford, L. P.; Gibb, J. R.; & Benne, K. D. *T-group theory and laboratory method*. Wiley, New York, 1964.

Bredesen, K. N. Small group work--the need for some guidelines. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1969, *126*, 876-877.

Buber, Martin. *Between Man and Man*. Paul Kegan, London, 1947.

Bugental, J. F. T. *A Search for Authenticity: An Existential Analytic Approach to Psychotherapy*. New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1965.

Carkhuff, R. R. & Berenson, B. G. *Beyond Counseling and Psychotherapy*. Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1967.

Egan, Gerard. *Encounter: Group Processes for Interpersonal Growth*. Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, Belmont, California, 1970.

Egan, Gerard. *The Skilled Helper: An Introduction to Systematic Counselor and Human Relations Training*. Unpublished draft, 1973.

Freud, Sigmund. *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. Liveright, London, 1972.

Gibb, J. R. The effects of human relations and training, in A. E. Bergin and S. Garfield (eds.), *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change*, Wiley, New York, 1971. Pp. 829-862.

Goldberg, Carl. *Encounter: Group Sensitivity Training Experience*. Science House, New York, 1970.

Goldstein, A. P., Heller, K., & Sechrest, L. B. *Psychotherapy and the Psychology of Behavior Change.* Wiley, New York, 1966.

Goleman, Daniel, Perspectives on psychology, reality, and the study of consciousness, *Journal of Transpersonal Psychology*, 1974, *6*(1), 73-85.

Gottschalk, L. A., Myerson, P., & Gottlieb, A. A. Prediction and evaluation of outcome in an emergency based psychotherapy clinic, *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease*, 1968, *144*, 77-96.

Gottschalk, L. A. & Pattison, E. M. Psychiatric perspectives on T-groups and the laboratory movement: An overview, *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1969, *126*, 823-839.

Halleck, S. L. *The Politics of Therapy.* Science House, New York, 1971.

Hampden-Turner, C. *Radical Man.* Schankman, Cambridge, Mass., 1970.

Harrison, R. & Lubin, B. Personal style, group composition and learning. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1966, *1*(3), 286-301.

Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. Male and female personality correlates of termination in counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1961, *8*, 31-36.

Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. Personality differences between adjusted and maladjusted college students, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 1960, *44*, 341-346.

Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. Sex-role identity and achievement motivation, *Psychological Reports*, 1963, *12*, 483-490.

Heilbrun, A. B., & McKinley, R. Perception of the maternal child-rearing attitudes, personality of the perceiver, and incipient psychopathology, *Child Development*, 1962, *33*, 73-83.

Hobbs, M. Sources of gain in psychotherapy, *American Psychologist*, 1965, *17*(11), 741-747.

Hoffman, Lynn. Deviation-Amplifying process in natural groups, *Changing Families*. Jay Haley, Science and Stratton, New York, 1971. Pp. 285-311.

Jaffe, S. L., and Scherl, D. J. Acute psychosis precipitated by T-group experiences, *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 1969, *21*, 443-448.

Jourard, S. M. *The Transparent Self: Self Disclosure and Well Being.* Van Nostrand, Princeton, 1971.

Kelman, Herbert C. The role of the group in the induction of therapeutic change, *The International Journal of Group Psychotherapy,* 1963, *13*, 399-451.

Kessen, W., & Mandler, George. Anxiety, pain, and the inhibition of distress, *Psychological Review*, 1961, *68*, 394-404.

Klein, Alan F. *Effective Group Work.* Association Press, New York, 1972. Pp. 363-375.

Klein, H. & Astrachan, B. Learning in groups: A comparison of T-groups and study groups, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1971, *7*, 659.

Kuehn, J. L. & Crinella, F. M. Sensitivity training; interpersonal "overkill" and other problems, *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1965, *126*, 840-845.

Laing, R. D. *The Divided Self.* Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1965.

Lakin, Martin. *Interpersonal Encounter: Theory and Practice in Sensitivity Training.* McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1972.

Lazarus, A. A. *Behavior Therapy and Beyond.* McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.

Lieberman, Martin A., Yalom, Irvin D. & Miles, Matthew B. *Encounter Groups: First Facts.* Basic Books, Inc., New York, 1973.

Lieberman, Martin A., Yalom, Irvin D. & Miles, Matthew B. A study of encounter groups casualties, *Archives of General Psychiatry,* 1971, *25*, 15-30.

Lubin, B. & Zurkerman, M. Level of emotional arousal in laboratory training, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1969, *5*, 483-490.

Mal-ver, Bruce L. *The Encounter Game.* Stein and Day, New York, 1973.

Maslow, Abraham H. *Toward a Psychology of Being.* Van Nostrand, Princeton, N.J., 1968.

Mathis, A. G. Trainability as a function of individual valency patterns, in D. Stock and H. Thefen (eds.), *Emotional Dynamics and Group Culture*, New York University Press, New York, 1958. Pp. 150-156.

Miale, George. Feeling versus thinking, *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Spring, 1973, pp. 53-60.

Mintz, E. E. Marathon groups, a preliminary evaluation, *Journal Centerny Psychotherapy*, 1969, *1*, 91-94.

Mischel, Walter. *Personality and Assessment*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc., New York, 1968.

Myers, G. E., Myers, M. T., Goldberg, A. & Welch, C. E. Effect of feedback in interpersonal sensitivity in laboratory training groups, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1969, *5*, 175-185.

Parloff, Morris B. Group therapy and the small group field. An encounter, *International Journal of Group Psythotherapy*, 1970, *20*, 267-304.

Posthuma, Alan B. & Posthuma, Barbara W. Some observations on encounter group casualties. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1973, *5*, 595-607.

Rochman, A. W. Marathon group psychotherapy: Its origins, significance and direction, *Journal of Group Psychoanalysis and Practice*, 1969-70, *2*, 57-75.

Reddy, W. B. Sensitivity training or group psychotherapy: The need for adequate screening, *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 1970, *20*, 366-371.

Rogers, C. R. *On Encounter Groups*. Harper & Row, New York, 1970.

Rogers, C. R. The process of the basic encounter groups, in J. F. Bugental (ed.), *Challenges of Humanistic Psychology*. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967.

Rosenberg, Milton. *Society and the Adolescent Self Image*. University of Princeton Press, Princeton, N.J., 1965.

Rothaus, P. Human relations training for psychiatric patients, *Archives of International Psychiatry*, 1963, *8*, 572-581.

Roszak, Theodore. *Where the Wasteland Ends: Politics and Transcendence in Post-Industrial Society*. Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1972.

Rueveni, V. & Speck, R. V. Using encounter group technique in the treatment of the social network of the schizophrenic. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 1969, *19*, 495-500.

Schachter, S. Deviation, rejection, and communication, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1951, *46*, 190-207.

Schachter, S. & Singer, J. E. Cognitive, social, and physiological determinants of emotion, *Psychological Review*, 1962, *69*, 379-399.

Scherdlinger, S. The concept of regression in group psychotherapy, *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 1968, *18*, 3-20.

Schein, E. H. & Bennis, W. G. *Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 1965.

Schutz, W. C. *Here Comes Everybody*. Harper & Row, New York, 1971.

Schutz, W. D. *Joy: Expanding Human Awareness*. Grove Press, New York, 1967.

Schutz, W. D. & Allen, V. L. The effects of a T-group laboratory on interpersonal behavior, *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1966, *2*, 265-286.

Shepherd, Herbert A. Personal growth laboratories: Toward an alternative culture, *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 1970, *6*(3), 259-266.

Shostrom, E. Group therapy: Let the buyer beware, *Psychology Today*, 1969, *2*(12), 36-40.

Silverman, Julian. Acute schizophrenia: Disease or dis-ease? *Readings in Psychology Today*. CMR Books, Del Mar, California, 1969. Pp. 554-557.

Slater, Philip. *Earthwalk*. Anchor Press/Doubleday, Garden City, N.Y., 1974.

Slater, Philip. *The Pursuit of Loneliness*. Beacon Press, Boston, 1970.

Slater, Philip. *Microcosm: Structural, psychological and religious. Evolution in groups*. Wiley & Sons, New York, 1966.

Spotnitz, H. Discussion of Stoller's accelerated interaction, *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 1969, *18*, 236-239.

Spotnitz, Hyman. Failures in group psychotherapy, *GGroup Therapy Today*. Hendrick M. Ruitenbeck. Atherton Press, New York, 1969. Pp. 177-183.

Stoller, F. H. Accelerated interaction: A time-limited approach based on the brief, intensive group, *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 1969, *18*, 220-235.

Stone, W. N. & Tieger, M. E. Screening for T-groups: The myth of healthy candidates, Paper presented at the American Psychiatric Association Meeting, San Francisco, 1970.

Strean, H. S. Check social change and the proliferation of regressive therapies, *Psychoanal. Review*, 1971-72.

Teicher, Arthur, deFreitus, Laura, & O'shusen, Adele. Group psychotherapy and the intense group experience: A preliminary rationale for encounter as a therapeutic agent in the mental health field. *International Journal of Group Psychotherapy*, 1974, *24*(2), 159-173.

Toffler, Alvin. *Future Shock*. Random House, New York, 1970.

Watts, Alan. *Psychotherapy East and West*. Ballantine, New York, 1969.

Whitaker, Dorothy Stock & Lieberman, Morton A. *Psychotherapy Through the Group Process*. Atherton Press, New York, 1964.

Yalom, I. D. & Lieberman, M. A. A study of encounter group casualties, *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 1971, *25*, 16-30.

Zigler, E. & Phillips, L. Psychiatric diagnosis: A critique, *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1961, *63*, 607-618.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Table A-1. Comparison of Control and Encounter Groups on the Two Lieberman Questionnaires, the Rosenberg Scales and the Adjective Check List, Using a t-Test to Measure Significant Difference (Pregroup Comparisons)

Pregroup Comparisons	Two Tailed Probability Scores
Attitude Toward Group--Lieberman Scale	
1. Phony	.632
2. Social Benefit	.245
3. Dangerous	.599
Personal Anticipation--Lieberman Scale	
4. Present Sensitivity	.294
5. Interpersonal Adequacy	.805
6. Opportunity for Feeling Expression	.362
7. Opportunity Peer Communication	.505
8. End Sensitivity	.701
9. End Interpersonal Adequacy	.592
10. End Opportunity Feeling Expression	.708
11. End Opportunity Peer Communications	.227
12. Experiencing	.189
13. Changing	.102
Rosenberg Scales	
14. Self Esteem	.890
15. Stability	.348
16. Trust in Others	.597
17. Criticism	.074
18. Depression	.495
19. Psychosomatic	.669
20. Interpersonal Threat	.080
Adjective Check List	
21. Before Checked	.374
22. Before Defensiveness	.685
23. Before Favorable	.712
24. Before Unfavorable	.833
25. Before Self Confidence	.572
26. Before Liability	.152
27. Before Personal Adjustment	.725
28. Before Achievement	.847
29. Before Dominance	.251
30. Before Endurance	.207
31. Before Order	.151

Table A-1 (continued)

Pregroup Comparisons	Two Tailed Probability Scores
32. Before Intraception	.876
33. Before Nurturance	.198
34. Before Affiliation	.287
35. Before Sex	.205
36. Before Exhibition	.561
37. Before Autonomy	.181
38. Before Aggression	.580
39. Before Change	.408
40. Before Succorance	.645
41. Before Abasement	.467
42. Before Deference	.088
43. Before Readiness	.510
44. Before Self Control	.418

The t-test scores are for the comparison of the two Lieberman scales, the Rosenberg Scales and the Adjective Check List which were administered at the beginning of the quarter. Only three scales were significantly different at the beginning of the quarter between the control and the encounter groups (experiential group members = 12; control group members = 16).

The participants of the encounter group differed with the control group significantly at the beginning of the quarter on the following three scales:

1. Criticism: They thought they were more sensitive to criticism.
2. Interpersonal Threat: They said they were less willing to take opposing points of view in a conversation.
3. Deference: They said they were more conscientious, dependable, and persevering.

Since only three of these scales are significant, placing too much emphasis on them or deriving much meaning from them is probably questionable. Just by chance more than three should have been significant.

Table A-2. Comparison of Control and Encounter Groups on the Adjective Check List, Using a t-Test to Measure Significant Difference (After Group Comparisons)

After Group Comparisons	Two Tailed Probability Scores
Adjective Check List (Comparison)	
1. After Checked	.126
2. After Defensiveness	.315
3. After Favorable	.674
4. After Unfavorable	.746
5. After Self Confidence	.649
6. After Lability	.744
7. After Personal Adjustment	.500
8. After Achievement	.754
9. After Dominance	.769
10. After Endurance	.298
11. After Order	.616
12. After Intraception	.389
13. After Nurturance	.693
14. After Affiliation	.455
15. After Sex	.181
16. After Exhibition	.360
17. After Autonomy	.858
18. After Aggression	.770
19. After Change	.947
20. After Succorance	.872
21. After Abasement	.815
22. After Deference	.824
23. After Readiness	.399
24. After Self Control	.555

These t-test scores are a comparison of the control and encounter groups (experiential group members = 12; control group members = 16) on the Adjective Check List after the quarter was over. At the end of the quarter none of the scales were significantly different on the Adjective Check List, the only test to be re-administered.

Table A-3. Lieberman's Casualty Indicators

	Request for Professional Help	Dropout From Group or Class	Self Concept Change	Psycho-therapy	Low Testimony	Peer Evaluation	Leader Evaluation	Post Evaluation	Total
Group I									
1 Cindy	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Ann	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3 Barbara	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4 Arnold	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	1
5 Richard	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 Bob	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	1
7 Sally	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	1
Group II									
8 Susan	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 John	0	+	0	0	0	x	x	0	1
10 Paul	+	0	+	0	+	+	+	+	6
11 Karen	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	1
12 Connie	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13 Claudia	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14 Peter	0	0	+	0	0	0	0	0	1
15 Pat	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 Louise	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Control Group									
17 Pamela	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	0	0
18 Irene	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	0	0
19 Freddy	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	0	0
20 Betty	0	+	0	0	0	x	x	0	1
21 Ralph	0	+	0	0	0	x	x	0	1
22 Kelly	0	0	0	0	0	x	x	0	0

Table A-3 (continued)

	Request for Professional Help	Dropout From Group or Class	Self Concept Change	Psycho-therapy	Low Testimony	Peer Evaluation	Leader Evaluation	Post Evaluation	Total
23 Flo	0	0	+	0	0	x	x	0	1
24 William	0	0	+	0	0	x	x	0	1
25 Laurie	0	+	0	0	0	x	x	0	1
26 Kristen	0	0	+	0	+	x	x	0	2
27 Randy	0	0	+	0	0	x	x	0	1
28 Ethel	0	+	+	0	0	x	x	0	2

+ = yes; 0 = no; x = not recorded.

Table A-4. Pre Group Ranking of All Group Members By Two Observers and By Two Group Leaders Indicating Who Will Be Harmed by the Group Experience (Group I)

Most Harmed to Least Harmed	Group Members/Group Numbers							
	Observers				Group Leaders			
	1		2		Doris		Sam	
1	Arnold	4	Ann	2	Richard	5	Cindy	1
2	Ann	2	Cindy	1	Arnold	4	Barbara	3
3	Cindy	1	Bob	6	Cindy	1	Sally	7
4	Barbara	3	Sally	7	Barbara	3	Arnold	4
5	Richard	5	Barbara	3	Sally	7	Richard	5
6	Sally	7	Richard	5	Ann	2	Bob	6
7	Bob	6	Arnold	4	Bob	6	Ann	2

Table A-5. Pre Group Ranking of All Group Members By Two Observers and By Two Group Leaders Indicating Who Will Be Harmed by the Group Experience (Group II)

Most Harmed to Least Harmed	Group Members/Group Numbers							
	Observers				Group Leaders			
	1		2		Albert		Frances	
1	Paul	10	Karen	11	Paul	10	Peter	14
2	Karen	11	Pat	15	John	9	Paul	10
3	Peter	14	Connie	12	Karen	11	Karen	11
4	Claudia	13	John	9	Connie	12	Pat	15
5	John	9	Claudia	13	Susan	8	John	9
6	Pat	15	Peter	14	Louise	16	Louise	16
7	Connie	12	Paul	10	Peter	14	Connie	12
8	Louise	16	Susan	8	Claudia	13	Susan	8
9	Susan	8	Louise	16	Pat	15	Claudia	13

Table A-6. Post Group Ranking of All Group Members By Each Group Member and By Each Leader Indicating Who Was Harmed by the Group Experience (Group I)

Most Harmed to Least Harmed	Group Members/Group Numbers												Group Leaders			
	Sally	7	Barbara	3	Richard	5	Bob	6	Cindy	1	Ann	2	Arnold	4	Sam	
1	Ann	2	Bob	6	Bob	6	Bob	6	Bob	6	Bob	6	Bob	6	Arnold	4	Cindy	1
2	Bob	6	Ann	2	Arnold	4	Ann	2	Ann	2	Richard	5	Ann	2	Ann	2	Barbara	3
3	Richard	5	Cindy	1	Ann	2	Cindy	1	Arnold	4	Arnold	4	Sally	7	Bob	6	Sally	7
4	Cindy	1	Arnold	4	Richard	5	Barbara	3	Richard	5	Barbara	3	Arnold	4	Cindy	1	Bob	6
5	Sally	7	Sally	7	Barbara	3	Sally	7	Cindy	1	Sally	7	Richard	5	Barbara	3	Richard	5
6	Arnold	4	Richard	5	Cindy	1	Arnold	4	Sally	7	Ann	2	Barbara	3	Sally	7	Arnold	4
7	Barbara	3	Barbara	3	Sally	7	Richard	5	Barbara	3	Cindy	1	Cindy	1	Richard	5	Ann	2

Table A-7. Post Group Ranking of Each Group Member by Each Group Member and by Each Leader Indicating Who Was Harmed By the Group Experience (Group II)

Most Harmed to Least Harmed	Group Member/Group Number																Group Leaders			
	Paul	10	Karen	11	Pat	15	Connie	12	Peter	14	Claudia	13	Louise	16	Susan	8	Albert		Frances	
1	Paul	10	Paul	10	Paul	10	Paul	10	Paul	10	Paul	10	Paul	10	Paul	10	Paul	10	Paul	10
2	Peter	14	Pat	15	Claudia	13	Pat	15	Louise	16	Pat	15	Claudia	13	Pat	15	Claudia	13	Pat	15
3	Louise	16	Claudia	13	Pat	15	Claudia	13	Susan	8	Karen	11	Karen	11	Claudia	13	Susan	8	Susan	8
4	Pat	15	Louise	16	Susan	8	Karen	11	Pat	15	Claudia	13	Susan	8	Susan	8	Louise	16	Karen	11
5	Susan	8	Susan	8	Peter	14	Peter	14	Peter	14	Connie	12	Louise	16	Karen	11	Pat	15	Claudia	13
6	Claudia	13	Peter	14	Louise	16	Susan	8	Karen	11	Susan	8	Peter	14	Louise	16	Peter	14	Louise	16
7	Connie	12	Karen	11	Karen	11	Connie	12	Claudia	13	Louise	16	Pat	15	Connie	12	Karen	11	Connie	12
8	Karen	11	Connie	12	Connie	12	Louise	16	Connie	12	Peter	14	Connie	12	Peter	14	Connie	12	Peter	14

Note: John (9) is not included in this table because he dropped out of the group after the first meeting.

Table A-8. Correlations of Leaders, Observers, and Participants Rankings of Casualties (Group I)

	Pre Group Rankings							Post Group Rankings			
	Leader 1	Leader 2	Before Leaders	Observer 1	Observer 2	Before Observers	Before Leaders & Observers	Leader 1	Leader 2	After Leaders	Group
Pre Group Rankings											
Leader 1	1.00										
Leader 2	.39	1.00									
Before Leaders	.80	.80	1.00								
Observer 1	-.18	.68	-.37	1.00							
Observer 2	.07	.39	.36	-.07	1.00						
Before Observers	.05	.18	.07	.52	.77	1.00					
Before Leaders & Observers	.57	.54	.77	-.07	.82	.68	1.00				
Post Group Rankings											
Leader 1	.86	.04	.54	.11	-.36	-.13	.21	1.00			
Leader 2	.32	.29	-.24	.18	.61	.70	.32	-.46	1.00		
After Leaders	.56	-.09	.42	.17	.22	.46	.56	.56	.45	1.00	
Group	.86	-.40	-.66	.22	-.02	.06	-.16	-.72	.58	.16	1.00

Key: Before Observers--Combined rankings of the two observers.
Before Leaders--Combined rankings of the two leaders.
Before Leaders & Observers--Combined rankings of the two leaders and the two observers.
Leaders--Combined rankings of the two leaders after the group.
Group--Combined rankings of the group participants after the group.

Table A-9. Correlations of Leaders, Observers, and Participants Rankings of Casualties (Group II)

	Pre Group Rankings							Post Group Rankings			
	Leader 1	Leader 2	Before Leaders	Observer 1	Observer 2	Before Observers	Before Leaders & Observers	Leader 1	Leader 2	After Leaders	Group
Pre Group Rankings											
Leader 1	1.00										
Leader 2	.27	1.00									
Before Leaders	.80	.77	1.00								
Observer 1	.67	.37	.06	1.00							
Observer 2	.17	-.08	.73	.32	1.00						
Before Observers	.55	.16	.45	.66	.73	1.00					
Before Leaders & Observers	.77	.44	.80	.90	.59	.86	1.00				
Post Group Rankings											
Leader 1	.18	.05	-.22	.12	-.61	-.08	-.30	1.00			
Leader 2	.08	.27	.04	.18	.05	.42	.11	.57	1.00		
After Leaders	-.14	.06	-.17	.06	-.38	.07	-.22	.90	.85	1.00	
Group	-.05	-.12	-.19	.21	-.17	.29	-.07	.83	.86	.92	1.00

Key: Before Observers--Combined rankings of the two observers.
Before Leaders--Combined rankings of the two leaders.
Before Leaders & Observers--Combined rankings of the two leaders and the two observers.
Leaders--Combined rankings of the two leaders after the group.
Group--Combined rankings of the group participants after the group.

APPENDIX B

SUBJECT CONSENT FORM

I am aware that the purpose of this study is to understand the experiences people have while participating in small groups. I agree to answering two questionnaires concerning my attitudes and expectations about the group. I also agree to filling out two personality tests which will be used in an attempt to look at the changes that have occurred during the group. Finally I agree to being interviewed at the end of the group with the full understanding that anything discussed at that time will be kept confidential.

Signed _____

Date _____

ATTITUDES TOWARD ENCOUNTER GROUPS--LIEBERMAN QUESTIONNAIRE

During the past few years, groups variously labeled as sensitivity-training or encounter groups have grown greatly in a variety of settings. Such groups have been used as: a place to provide people opportunities for self-exploration, as a means of personal change, as a way of aiding in intergroup conflict, as a mechanism for dealing with current urban problems, as a hoped-for new educational direction, and as a means of changing organizational life.

The rapid expansion of encounter groups has not been without its critics. The following is a series of statements about the value of and problems with such groups. How closely do these opinions fit your own? Please indicate your agreement or disagreement by circling the phrase that most closely fits your own opinion.

1. The open and direct expression of feeling toward one another in a group usually degenerates into criticism without leading to productive change.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

2. Encounter groups are at the forefront of what needs to be done. They offer a unique way of breaking down the barriers between people.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

3. The situations that arise in encounter groups have no relevance to the real world.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

4. People play the sensitivity game--they give out a lot of caring and bluntness, but it's just a thing they do to earn group acceptance.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

5. Encounter group experience is good preparation for living in a really democratic society.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

6. Encounter groups encourage people to be open and frank too fast.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

7. I think this would have been a better world if every child had started in encounter groups in the first year of school.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

8. In these times of black-white impasse we ought to be spending a lot more money on encounter groups as a way of opening up channels of communication.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

9. A person's individuality is frequently pushed aside in encounter groups.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

10. The first exciting thing that's been on the education horizon in the last decade.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

11. Group members develop the ability to be more direct about their feelings, but it's artificial because they really don't have to take responsibility for the consequences of what they say.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

12. It is a hit-and-run kind of relating that gives the illusion of being in contact.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

13. Although some may learn, too many people get hurt in encounter groups.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

14. Encounter groups are one of the few places where genuine feelings can be expressed and received.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

15. Just an adult plaything.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

16. Emphasis on encounter groups detracts from individual responsibility to society.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

17. Encounter groups are the modern equivalent of a lonely hearts club.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

18. People may be forced to reveal things against their better judgment.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

19. People are attracted to encounter groups because of their own personal needs; the groups operate on too emotional and personal a level to be much use in solving social problems.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

20. We are raised with all sorts of inhibitions that prevent us from relating to others; encounter groups help us to become more truly ourselves.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

21. If businessmen, military men, and politicians went through the the experience of an encounter group, they would be less likely to treat other people the way they do now.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

22. This kind of intense experience is more than some people can take.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

23. People express their genuine selves in encounter groups.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

24. Since the relationships in a group are only temporary, people may behave cruelly and irresponsibly toward each other.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Strongly Agree	Agree	Have an Open Mind	Disagree	Strongly Disagree

PERSONAL ANTICIPATIONS

Participation in an encounter T-group is a very personal thing. In many ways it is a human laboratory in which each person can meet a variety of needs, carry away a range of learnings, and find many different kinds of experiences. We are interested in knowing, from your perspective at this time, some of the ways you anticipate how, if you were to participate, an encounter group might be meaningful to you.

The following seven items refer to some of the ways previous participants have used such group experiences.

First, read through the entire seven items and show by putting an X on the line how you would describe yourself as you are now.

After you have completed the seven items, read through them again and show by putting a circle on the line where you think you would be at the end of an encounter group experience.

1.	Seldom express my true feelings to others.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Usually express to others what I feel inside.
2.	Difficult to know how others feel and think about me.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Usually know how others feel about me.
3.	Would like to change some of the ways I relate to people.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Pretty satisfied about the way I relate to people.
4.	Hard for me to get close to others.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Easy for me to get close to others.
5.	Frequently don't understand my inner feelings.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Usually understand my inner feelings.
6.	Often am not sensitive to how others feel.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Usually am sensitive to how others feel.
7.	Difficult for me to be spontaneous.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	Easy for me to be spontaneous.

REMINDER: Now read through the seven items again and indicate with a circle where you think you'll be at the end of the encounter group experience.

The following eight items represent how some people have viewed their experiences in encounter groups.

First, read through the entire eight items and show by putting an X on the line to what extent in your life as it is now you have an opportunity for such experiences.

After you've completed the eight items, read through them again and show by putting a circle on the line the extent to which you think an encounter group would give you such an opportunity.

8.	Rarely have a chance to get information from others about my behavior.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Have as many opportunities as I need to get feedback about my behavior.
9.	I do not have enough opportunities to know other people deeply.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have enough situations where I can know others deeply.
10.	Rarely have an opportunity to have an open and honest encounter with my peers.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	I have as many open and honest encounters with my peers as I want.
11.	Not enough opportunity to share with peers.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Many opportunities to share with peers.
12.	Rarely get the chance to have novel experiences.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Have a number of opportunities to have novel experiences.
13.	Rarely have a chance to put others straight.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Have many opportunities for putting others straight.
14.	Seldom in situations where I can trust other people.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Often in situations where I can trust other people.
15.	Seldom in a situation where I can get out all the anger I feel.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Often in a situation where I can get out all the anger I feel.

REMINDER: Now read through the eight items again and indicate by a circle the extent to which you expect the encounter group will provide such an opportunity.

You have just completed a list of items in which you described where you are now and some of your anticipations about group experiences. We would like to know which of these possibilities offered in the encounter group experience are personally important to you. Please read the following statements and indicate their importance to you by marking the line at the place that best reflects your feelings.

16. Being able to express my feelings.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

17. Being able to tell it like it is.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

18. Learning about how others view me.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

19. Being sensitive to others' feelings.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

20. Having new experiences.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

21. Being flexible and letting things happen.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

22. Expressing anger directly to people.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

23. Changing some of the ways I relate to people.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

24. Becoming closer to others.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

25. Understanding my inner self.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

26. Sharing with peers.

Extremely important 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Unimportant

Other ways this experience may be important to you.

ROSENBERG SELF CONCEPT SCALE

Put an X after the most appropriate response.

1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.

   _____ 1. Strongly agree
   _____ 2. Agree
   _____ 3. Disagree
   _____ 4. Strongly disagree

2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.

   _____ 1. Strongly agree
   _____ 2. Agree
   _____ 3. Disagree
   _____ 4. Strongly disagree

3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.

   _____ 1. Strongly agree
   _____ 2. Agree
   _____ 3. Disagree
   _____ 4. Strongly disagree

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.

   _____ 1. Strongly agree
   _____ 2. Agree
   _____ 3. Disagree
   _____ 4. Strongly disagree

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.

   _____ 1. Strongly agree
   _____ 2. Agree
   _____ 3. Disagree
   _____ 4. Strongly disagree

6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.

   _____ 1. Strongly agree
   _____ 2. Agree
   _____ 3. Disagree
   _____ 4. Strongly disagree

7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.

   _____ 1. Strongly agree
   _____ 2. Agree
   _____ 3. Disagree
   _____ 4. Strongly disagree

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.

_____ 1. Strongly agree
_____ 2. Agree
_____ 3. Disagree
_____ 4. Strongly disagree

9. I certainly feel useless at times.

_____ 1. Strongly agree
_____ 2. Agree
_____ 3. Disagree
_____ 4. Strongly disagree

10. At times I think I am no good at all.

_____ 1. Strongly agree
_____ 2. Agree
_____ 3. Disagree
_____ 4. Strongly disagree

11. Does your opinion of yourself tend to change a good deal, or does it always continue to remain the same?

_____ 1. Changes a great deal
_____ 2. Changes somewhat
_____ 3. Changes very little
_____ 4. Does not change at all

12. Do you ever find that on one day you have one opinion of yourself and on another day you have a different opinion?

_____ 1. Yes, this happens often
_____ 2. Yes, this happens sometimes
_____ 3. Yes, this rarely happens
_____ 4. No, this never happens

13. I have noticed that my ideas about myself seem to change very quickly.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

14. Some days I have a very good opinion of myself; other days I have a very poor opinion of myself.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

15. I feel that nothing, or almost nothing, can change the opinion I currently hold of myself.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

16. No one is going to care much what happens to you, when you get right down to it.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

17. Human nature is really cooperative.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

18. Some people say that most people can be trusted. Others say you can't be too careful in your dealings with people. How do you feel about it?

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

19. If you don't watch yourself, people will take advantage of you.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

20. Would you say that most people are more inclined to help others or more inclined to look out for themselves?

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

21. How sensitive are you to criticism?

_____ 1. Extremely sensitive
_____ 2. Quite sensitive
_____ 3. Somewhat sensitive
_____ 4. Not sensitive

22. Criticism or scolding hurts me terribly.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

23. How disturbed do you feel when anyone laughs at you or blames you for something you have done wrong?

_____ 1. Deeply disturbed
_____ 2. Fairly disturbed
_____ 3. Not disturbed

24. On the whole, how happy would you say you are?

_____ 1. Very happy
_____ 2. Fairly happy
_____ 3. Not very happy
_____ 4. Very unhappy

25. On the whole, I think I am quite a happy person.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

26. In general, how would you say you feel most of the time--in good spirits or in low spirits?

_____ 1. Very good spirits
_____ 2. Fairly good spirits
_____ 3. Neither good nor low spirits
_____ 4. Fairly low spirits
_____ 5. Very low spirits

27. I get a lot of fun out of life.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

28. I wish I could be as happy as others seem to be.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

29. How often do you feel downcast and dejected?

_____ 1. Very often
_____ 2. Fairly often
_____ 3. Occasionally
_____ 4. Rarely
_____ 5. Never

30. Do you ever have trouble getting to sleep or staying asleep?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

31. Do your hands ever tremble enough to bother you?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

32. Are you bothered by nervousness?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

33. Are you ever bothered by your heart beating hard?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

34. Are you ever bothered by pressures or pains in the head?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

35. Do you ever bite your fingernails now?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

36. Are you ever bothered by shortness of breath when not exercising or not working hard?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

37. Are you ever troubled by your hands sweating so that they feel damp and clammy?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

38. Are you ever troubled with sick headaches?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

39. Are you ever bothered by nightmares?

_____ 1. Often
_____ 2. Sometimes
_____ 3. Almost never
_____ 4. Never

40. If you were to offer your opinion on some subject of national or international importance and someone were to laugh at you for it, how would this make you feel?

_____ 1. Deeply hurt and disturbed
_____ 2. Somewhat hurt and disturbed
_____ 3. Wouldn't bother me very much

41. When national or international questions are discussed, I often prefer to say nothing at all then to say something that will make a bad impression.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

42. In discussions of public affairs, I think I would prefer to say nothing at all than to say something that will make people angry with me.

_____ 1. Agree
_____ 2. Disagree

THE ADJECTIVE CHECK LIST

Name _____

Date _____

DIRECTIONS: Please read this list of adjectives and put an X in the box beside each one you would consider to be self-descriptive. Do not worry about duplications, contradictions, and so forth. Work quickly and do not spend too much time on any one adjective. Try to be frank and check those adjectives which describe you as you really are, not as you would like to be.

_____ 1. absent-minded
_____ 2. active
_____ 3. adaptable
_____ 4. adventurous
_____ 5. affected
_____ 6. affectionate
_____ 7. aggressive
_____ 8. alert
_____ 9. aloof
_____ 10. ambitious
_____ 11. anxious
_____ 12. apathetic
_____ 13. appreciative
_____ 14. argumentative
_____ 15. arrogant
_____ 16. artistic
_____ 17. assertive
_____ 18. attractive
_____ 19. autocratic
_____ 20. awkward
_____ 21. bitter
_____ 22. blustery
_____ 23. boastful
_____ 24. bossy
_____ 25. calm
_____ 26. capable
_____ 27. careless
_____ 28. cautious
_____ 29. changeable
_____ 30. charming
_____ 31. cheerful
_____ 32. civilized
_____ 33. clear-thinking
_____ 34. clever
_____ 35. coarse
_____ 36. cold
_____ 37. commonplace
_____ 38. complaining
_____ 39. complicated
_____ 40. conceited
_____ 41. confident
_____ 42. confused
_____ 43. conscientious
_____ 44. conservative
_____ 45. considerate
_____ 46. contented
_____ 47. conventional
_____ 48. cool

_____ 49. cooperative
_____ 50. courageous
_____ 51. cowardly
_____ 52. cruel
_____ 53. curious
_____ 54. cynical
_____ 55. daring
_____ 56. deceitful
_____ 57. defensive
_____ 58. deliberate
_____ 59. demanding
_____ 60. dependable
_____ 61. dependent
_____ 62. despondent
_____ 63. determined
_____ 64. dignified
_____ 65. discreet
_____ 66. disorderly
_____ 67. dissatisfied
_____ 68. distractible
_____ 69. distrustful
_____ 70. dominant
_____ 71. dreamy
_____ 72. dull
_____ 73. easy going
_____ 74. effeminate
_____ 75. efficient
_____ 76. egotistical
_____ 77. emotional
_____ 78. energetic
_____ 79. enterprising
_____ 80. enthusiastic
_____ 81. evasive
_____ 82. excitable
_____ 83. fair-minded
_____ 84. fault-finding
_____ 85. fearful
_____ 86. feminine
_____ 87. fickle
_____ 88. flirtatious
_____ 89. foolish
_____ 90. forceful
_____ 91. foresighted
_____ 92. forgetful
_____ 93. forgiving
_____ 94. formal
_____ 95. frank
_____ 96. friendly
_____ 97. frivolous
_____ 98. fussy
_____ 99. generous
____ 100. gentle
____ 101. gloomy
____ 102. good-looking
____ 103. good-natured
____ 104. greedy
____ 105. handsome
____ 106. hard-headed
____ 107. hard-hearted
____ 108. hasty
____ 109. headstrong
____ 110. healthy
____ 111. helpful
____ 112. high-strung
____ 113. honest
____ 114. hostile
____ 115. humorous
____ 116. hurried
____ 117. idealistic
____ 118. imaginative

____ 119. immature
____ 120. impatient
____ 121. impulsive
____ 122. independent
____ 123. indifferent
____ 124. individualistic
____ 125. industrious
____ 126. infantile
____ 127. informal
____ 128. ingenious
____ 129. inhibited
____ 130. initiative
____ 131. insightful
____ 132. intelligent
____ 133. interests narrow
____ 134. interests wide
____ 135. intolerant
____ 136. inventive
____ 137. irresponsible
____ 138. irritable
____ 139. jolly
____ 140. kind
____ 141. lazy
____ 142. leisurely
____ 143. logical
____ 144. loud
____ 145. loyal
____ 146. mannerly
____ 147. masculine
____ 148. mature
____ 149. meek
____ 150. methodical
____ 151. mild
____ 152. mischievous
____ 153. moderate
____ 154. modest
____ 155. moody
____ 156. nagging
____ 157. natural
____ 158. nervous
____ 159. noisy
____ 160. obliging
____ 161. obnoxious
____ 162. opinionated
____ 163. opportunistic
____ 164. optimistic
____ 165. organized
____ 166. original
____ 167. outgoing
____ 168. outspoken
____ 169. painstaking
____ 170. patient
____ 171. peaceable
____ 172. peculiar
____ 173. persevering
____ 174. persistent
____ 175. pessimistic
____ 176. planful
____ 177. pleasant
____ 178. pleasure-seeking
____ 179. poised
____ 180. polished
____ 181. practical
____ 182. praising
____ 183. precise
____ 184. prejudiced
____ 185. preoccupied
____ 186. progressive
____ 187. prudish
____ 188. quarrelsome

____ 189. queer
____ 190. quick
____ 191. quiet
____ 192. quitting
____ 193. rational
____ 194. rattlebrained
____ 195. realistic
____ 196. reasonable
____ 197. rebellious
____ 198. reckless
____ 199. reflective
____ 200. relaxed
____ 201. reliable
____ 202. resentful
____ 203. reserved
____ 204. resourceful
____ 205. responsible
____ 206. restless
____ 207. retiring
____ 208. rigid
____ 209. robust
____ 210. rude
____ 211. sarcastic
____ 212. self-centered
____ 213. self-confident
____ 214. self-controlled
____ 215. self-denying
____ 216. self-pitying
____ 217. self-punishing
____ 218. self-seeking
____ 219. selfish
____ 220. sensitive
____ 221. sentimental
____ 222. serious
____ 223. severe
____ 224. sexy
____ 225. shallow
____ 226. sharp-witted
____ 227. shiftless
____ 228. show-off
____ 229. shrewd
____ 230. shy
____ 231. silent
____ 232. simple
____ 233. sincere
____ 234. slipshod
____ 235. slow
____ 236. sly
____ 237. smug
____ 238. snobbish
____ 239. sociable
____ 240. soft-hearted
____ 241. sophisticated
____ 242. spendthrift
____ 243. spineless
____ 244. spontaneous
____ 245. spunky
____ 246. stable
____ 247. steady
____ 248. stern
____ 249. stingy
____ 250. stolid
____ 251. strong
____ 252. stubborn
____ 253. submissive
____ 254. suggestible
____ 255. sulky
____ 256. superstitious
____ 257. suspicious
____ 258. sympathetic

____ 259. tactful
____ 260. tactless
____ 261. talkative
____ 262. temperamental
____ 263. tense
____ 264. thankless
____ 265. thorough
____ 266. thoughtful
____ 267. thrifty
____ 268. timid
____ 269. tolerant
____ 270. touchy
____ 271. tough
____ 272. trusting
____ 273. unaffected
____ 274. unambitious
____ 275. unassuming
____ 276. unconventional
____ 277. undependable
____ 278. understanding

VITA

Bruce Alan Abt was born in Buffalo, New York, on August 17, 1940. While getting his undergraduate degree at Hamilton College in Clinton, New York, he spent his junior year studying in Spain. After graduating in 1962, he continued his education by getting a Master's degree in Business Administration at Columbia University. Once out of graduate school, lured by the glamor of Madison Avenue, he took a job as an assistant account executive with an advertising agency.

After one year he left to join the Department of State in Washington and became a Foreign Service Officer. In 1966 he was sent to the United States Embassy in the Philippines where he eventually became the personal aide to the then current ambassador. Upon completing a two-year assignment there, he applied and was assigned for two years to the Department of Housing and Urban Development Model Cities Program in San Francisco.

While in San Francisco he became interested in psychology and was accepted by the University of Tennessee Graduate School. Before coming to Knoxville he spent a year in San Francisco continuing his therapy and working as a community development consultant to various poverty programs on the West Coast.

He is married to the former Evet Lowen who is preparing to go to law school. At present, his other family consists of his dog Leroy and four cats--Fritz, Tobey, Big Orange, and Patrick. In December, 1974, he and his wife will be returning to California to do his internship at Palo Alto Veterans' Hospital.

He is a vegetarian and an optimist who likes people.