SEX AND STYLE OF CONSULTANTS AS VARIABLES IN SELF-STUDY GROUPS

by

FRED WRIGHT

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty of Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

1972

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Psychology in satisfaction of the dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

July 7, 1972
date

Lawrence J. Gould
Chairman of Examining Committee

July 10, 1972
date

Florence Denmark
Executive Officer

Professor Morton Bard

Professor Sheldon Waxenberg
Supervisory Committee

The City University of New York

Abstract

SEX AND STYLE OF CONSULTANTS
AS VARIABLES IN SELF-STUDY GROUPS

by

FRED WRIGHT

Adviser: Professor Laurence Gould

This study sought to explore the effects of group practitioner traits like style and sex on male and female members of self-study groups. Eighty-one male and female undergraduate college students were assigned to eight one-day self-study groups; group size ranged from a low of eight Ss to a high of 13 Ss. Four male and four female consultants conducted these groups. Two from each sex were assigned a non-reciprocating (N-R) style of conducting themselves, and the remaining two from each sex were assigned a reciprocating (R) style of conducting the exercise.

A variety of personality measures were given to the Ss prior to the start of the group sessions. Each group then met for four 1½ hour sessions, and the last two of these sessions were tape recorded for each group. At the end of the last group session, responses to Murray's TAT cards and a modified form of the Semantic Differential were obtained from the Ss.

Though the four major hypotheses of the study were not

supported by the data, a number of statistically significant findings appeared. Male and female Ss differed in their responses on a number of occasions. These differences were seen as indications that female Ss had a greater need for affiliation than male Ss and that when this need was frustrated by N-R consultants and peers they tended to direct the consequent hostility onto peers rather than authority figures in a more intense fashion than male Ss.

Evidence supported the notions that male and female consultants were perceived and reacted to according to their sex rather than to their competence in performing their task, and that females in an N-R mode are experienced more negatively than males in the same mode. The opposite holds in the R mode; namely, males in this style are more often experienced negatively while R females are perceived more positively.

Variation in style did occur and did so according to the guidelines set down in the design of the experiment. Generally, this variable was effective in interaction with a second variable such as sex of consultant. Further, Ss often reacted in indirect rather than direct fashions to the different styles and this was seen as an area for future research.

Acknowledgments

There are a number of people I would like to thank for their assistance in the creation and completion of this dissertation.

First I would like to thank Professor Laurence Gould for his creative contributions and criticisms, his encouragement, and, not the least, his special ability to make what seemed like an insurmountable and anxiety-laden task not only seem possible but exciting and even enjoyable. He kept his cool which helped me keep mine.

I would also like to give a special thanks to Professor Sheldon Waxenberg for his help and advice on research techniques and measuring devices, and also for his masterful criticisms of my manuscripts. Professors Morton Bard, Irving Paul and Zeborah Schachtel were also very supportive and productively critical and this too is appreciated.

Next I would like to thank Dr. Richard Monahan and Mr. John O'Leary for their participation as clinical judges of the tape recordings of the group sessions. Mr. O'Leary in particular put in long, arduous hours rating tapes and that is especially appreciated.

These acknowledgements would not be complete if I did not also thank the Ss in the experiment and the many other people over the years who have allowed me to observe and participate in group experiences with them. These events have indeed enriched my life.

Finally I would like to express my gratitude to my most important group, my family. I particularly wish to thank my wife Phyllis for her loving patience and support as we traveled the long road through graduate school. She has made everything so much nicer. My daughter Julie and my son Chris are also thanked for adding so much fun and love to that road.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

The self-study group is a technique of group training which aims at facilitating learning about behavior in the small group setting (Klein and Astrachan, in press), and it is different in a number of ways from the more widely known laboratory training group or "T-group." Klein and Astrachan indicate that these differences are due in large measure to the fact that the study group approach was developed in clinical settings with a strong emphasis on psychoanalytic theory, while the T-group approach was developed in the late 1940's at Bethel, Maine, and is based on the socio-psychological theorizing of Kurt Lewin (1941).

In the study group approach the primary task of the group is to study its own behavior in the "here and now." This approach emphasizes a focus on the group, deals little with the dynamics of individuals, assumes that when members speak they usually speak for the group or some part of the group, and conceptualizes most of the group's behavior as a function of its relationship with the authority figure. The group consultant is an observer of and commentator on group action and reaction, and it is his goal to help group members understand the interactions and processes of the group they are participating in. He assumes the role of an impersonal 'rational' voice who eschews leadership in the traditional sense of the word. He is non-directive for the most part and he leads only to the extent that he comments on group

dynamics, on relationships to him, and on member rivalries, and by allowing the exploration of the bases for his authority.

In the T-group approach, on the other hand, the trainer rejects the role of an impersonal 'rational' voice and models the role of a good (i.e., open, honest, participating) group member. The trainer works to lower members' defenses, and acts "interdependently" as a participant-leader in the group. In the T-group the focus is not on the group but rather on the individual and his own personal growth. The trainer is very much involved in helping to bring about personal growth and he does so by "training" members to be different by offering alternatives, by modeling, to past ways of behaving.

In sum, the study group approach focuses on group processes and the relations that obtain between group members and authority figures. The study group consultant is nondirective and avoids relating to members as a participant but functions only as an observer and commentator. In the T-group the focus is on the individual member, authority related issues are not focused on, and the trainer functions in a participant-leader role.

There is considerable need for a study of the variables of consultant style and sex. Review of the literature reveals a paucity of experimental research focusing on the effects that group-practitioner traits like style and/or sex have on group members. This shortage of research prevails

despite the variety of approaches being used by group practitioners at the present time with very little research to support one approach over another or even to provide some idea of the differing impact of the various approaches.

Research on the effects of the sex of authority figures like consultants is also crucial for at least two reasons. First, in small group psychology the effects of male versus female leaders on group members has not been explored although according to Mills (1963) sex of leader appears to be a variable of considerable importance. Second, in spite of the current efforts of various individual women and of women's organizations to get a larger share of the positions of authority available in our society, there exists very little empirical research exploring the functioning of women in power positions. Research on sex and style of consultants as variables in self-study groups will contribute to understanding of the differential responses, if any, of males and females in groups to male and female authority figures.

Review of the Literature

There has been considerable speculation on the issue of the group practitioner and his (or her) relationship with the group. A number of authors have laid down prescriptions regarding the proper way practitioners such as trainers, therapists and consultants should conduct themselves in group situations. For instance, Whitman (1964) indicates that optimal results can be obtained by trainers of laboratory groups behaving somewhere between the extremes of a continum ranging between complete openness and complete impassivity. He believes that this is necessary for if the trainer acts in a highly defined and structured way there will be very little projection onto his behavior; conversely, if the trainer says nothing at all and shows no facial expression, people are likely to read into him a wide variety of motives and attitudes.

Blake (1954) maintains a trainer should seek to avoid becoming an "expert" and thus creating dependency reactions. He also recommends against participating in topical discussions, and, in general, urges trainers to maintain objective rather than affective relationships with members in contacts inside and outside the group meetings.

Horwitz (1964) distinguishes between the styles of trainers and therapy group leaders. According to him, group therapists tend to see themselves solely as transference figures, screens upon which wishes and fears are projected. To

induce the transference reaction, the therapist remains impassive and enigmatic. Horwitz describes the leader in laboratory training groups as striving to reduce transference reactions by modeling the ideal of openness in expressing feelings. Insofar as the trainer is revealed as a real person with a particular style he becomes less of a projective screen than the more silent therapist. Furthermore, the training group approach reduces the oral frustration within the group and contributes to the reduction of the more regressive fantasies of the members.

In sum, Horwitz believes that the outstanding difference between the two styles is the reduced preoccupation of members with the trainer as compared with that of patients with the therapist. T-group members go through a relatively brief period of dealing with their dependency problems toward the trainer, and then begin to focus upon peer relationships much more extensively than therapy patients, who remain preoccupied with the central figure and coming to terms with their frustrated dependency needs.

Horwitz speculates that it might be profitable to use the transference approach with a brief, time-limited group, like a T-group, to enhance the achievement of personal insights. He believes that this approach would induce T-group members to become more preoccupied with the central figure and thus spend a good deal more time expressing and coming to terms with their frustrated dependency needs. He also be-

lieves member efforts to learn about themselves from fellow group members would commensurately decrease as well.

The study group approach to learning about behavior in the small group setting presents an opportunity to do what Horwitz suggests; that is, to use the transference approach with a brief, time-limited group, like a T-group, to enhance the objective of members achieving personal insights about their feelings in regard to authority figures and related dependency needs. Since the publication of Horwitz's paper, some work has been done in this area, but before this work is looked at a brief review of the experimental research that has been done on the effects leader traits have on group members will be presented.

Lewin, Lippitt and White (1939) have produced the germinal, now classical, research on the effects of autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire leaders on the individual and group behavior of 11 year old boys. They found that children in the autocratic groups exhibited a great deal more aggression as well as more dependency on the leader than did the children in democratic groups. In the laissez faire groups, there was less dependency on the leader but greater irritability and aggressiveness among members. The democratic group showed little dependency on the leader, more friendliness and satisfaction. The way aggression was expressed also varied. Some autocratic groups expressed their aggression in inter-group wars. Other autocratic groups internalized the

aggression. The democratic and laissez-faire groups reacted against the source of frustration.

After this early work, little experimental work wherein leader style was directly manipulated was done for a number of years with the exception of a few studies on the effects of differing therapist approaches on group psychotherapy patients. For example, Singer and Goldman (1954), working with chronic schizophrenic patients in a hospital setting, compared authoritarian and democratic group therapy leaders. They hypothesized that these differing leader styles would produce differing patterns of interpersonal relationships and that these differences would be similar to those already found in studies of authoritarian and democratic leadership in non-therapeutic groups.

Twenty schizophrenic patients were assigned randomly to two groups which met weekly for five months for a total of 16 sessions. The authoritarian group therapist used a classroom atmosphere with lectures as described by Klapman (1946) in his Didactic Group Therapy. The democratic group therapist encouraged free expression and interpretation similar to Slavson's (1943) Interview Group Therapy technique. Initially the authoritarian group showed a greater proportion of relevant comments by patients, while the democratic group was less relevant and more disorganized in their communications. In later sessions, the reverse occurred, and the democratic group surpassed the authoritarian group in producing relevant

and organized communications. In general, in both actions and verbalizations, the democratic group evidenced signs of higher morale and greater cohesiveness. The latter factor, group cohesion, is considered a variable of considerable importance in the success of group therapy (Yalom, 1970).

Waxenberg, Strachstein, Leff, Laufer and Bamberger (1965) also focused on group therapy leaders' style. Six participants in a group therapy training workshop were led for two sessions by each of three female group therapists, thus the Ss were the same for all three groups -- only the leader changed. The leaders all defined themselves as psychoanalytic in orientation but coming from different schools within that orientation. For the most part, the leader's stated philosophy was recognized by observer-scorers. Differences between leaders in amount of hostility and anxiety produced by the group were found, but the authors concluded that, while leader philosophies differed, group members remained fairly consistent in their categories of verbal interaction.

In very recent years research on effects of varying leader traits has increased, largely as a result, it would seem, of the activity in the sensitivity training group movement. Most of this research has been in T-group or T-group-like settings.

Sansolo (1969) compared five groups, each with two co-trainers, in an undergraduate social relations laboratory at Harvard University. He was able to distinguish two differing

leadership styles amongst the 10 trainers. One type conveyed the message that members should conform to certain expressed values and norms, while the other type trainer told members to use himself as a model for imitation on how to behave. This dichotomy resembles somewhat the one posited by Schein and Bennis (1965)in their description of the two basic styles National Training Laboratory type trainers tend to use: the scanning trainer who encourages members to seek information from many sources in the group versus the identification-oriented trainer who encourages members to imitate him.

Sansolo found the first type leader, the value transmitter, to be more affectively removed, non-directive, and more "group" rather than "individual" oriented, than the trainer who focused on behavior modeling. The effect of these different styles on group members was split, with members separating their satisfaction with the trainer from their personal satisfaction. The behavior modeling style tended to be associated with greater satisfaction with the trainer's effectiveness. Consistency and moderateness in style (both within one trainer's style and between the styles of a co-trainer pair) were associated with personal satisfaction and a personalized group experience. What was actually learned in the groups, substantive issues as opposed to emotional climate, was found to be rather stable across groups. A mutual socialization process was also found to be going on between trainers and members, according to Sansolo, and, when leaders did not re-

ciprocate, members were found to be less satisfied with the group experience.

Bolman (1971) investigated relationships among (a) certain dimensions of T-group trainer behavior, (b) members' reactions to the trainer, (c) group climate and (d) participants' learning. He administered questionnaires to 118 participants and 20 trainers in a two-week long residential human relations laboratory held at Bethel, Maine. Trainer empathy, i.e., behavior by the trainer which communicates to group members that he is in touch with their thoughts and feelings, and security, i.e., trainer's own personal comfort and nondefensiveness in the laboratory situation, were found to be related both to liking for the trainer and to perceived member learning. Trainer affection, i.e., trainer expressed liking, caring and concern toward group members, was related to participants' liking for the trainer, but not to learning measures. Trainer tendencies to reward and punish were related to discomfort and tension, but not to learning. Finally, trainer openness, i.e., trainer's expressing his own feelings and reactions, showed little relationship to participants' learning.

Yalom and Lieberman (1971) studied the relationship between different encounter group leaders' styles and the rate of casualties produced in their groups. One hundred and seventy Stanford University undergraduates working in 18 encounter groups met for a total of 30 hours. Leaders were as-

signed to groups according to ideological orientation (e.g., transactional analysis, gestalt, etc.) however, these researchers found that the ideological school of the leader and his actual behavior were largely unrelated. Therefore, they derived their own taxonomy of leadership style based on participants' questionnaires and on observers' ratings of leaders. This approach differentiated seven types of encounter group leaders: a) "aggressive stimulators" (i.e., leaders who were intrusive, confrontive, challenging, charismatic, authoritarian, focused on the individual rather than the group, were caring, and self-revealing); b) "love leaders" (i.e., leaders who were caring, paternalistic, individually focused, gave information and ideas about how individuals change and learn but which they did not press on participants); c) "social engineers" (i.e., leaders who were focused on the group rather than individual or interpersonal relationships, rarely confronted or challenged individuals, low on authoritarianism, non-charismatic); d) "laissez-faire" (i.e., leaders who were non-challenging, non-confrontational, made little use of themselves as an issue in the group, offered little support, distant, cool and offered little structure to members); e) "cool, aggressive stimulators" (i.e., leaders who were aggressive stimulators, but not to the extent of the "aggressive stimulator" type, non-authoritarian, offered little positive support and rarely structured the meeting, group rather than individual focused); f) "high structure" (i.e.,

one leader who was exceedingly controlling, authoritarian, and used a large number of structured exercises per meeting); g) "tape leaders" (i.e., two groups which had as their leader an encounter tape called the "Peer Program" which gave the group instructions for the conduct of a meeting, and fostered a warm, supportive climate and de-emphasized interpersonal conflict).

Sixteen Ss were found to be casualties, defined as an enduring, significant, negative outcome which was caused by their participation in the group. The "aggressive stimulator" style of leadership was the highest-risk method, producing seven of the 16 casualties or 44% of the total casualties. Casualties from this type leadership were also the most severe. The "love leaders" produced one casualty; "social engineers" produced three; "laissez-faire" produced two; "cool, aggressive stimulators," two; the "high structure" leader, one; and the "encounter tapes" none.

The amount of learning and positive change that came from these different leader styles was also assessed (Lieberman, Yalom and Miles, in press). The learning and change pattern was different from the casualty pattern. For example, 14% of the Ss in groups with "aggressive stimulators" were considered to be high learners; and 20% were considered to be moderate changers. The "love leader" groups produced 22% high learners and 35% moderate changers. The "social engineers" produced 19% and 28% respectively; "cool, aggressive,

stimulators" 0% and 39%; "laissez-faires," 8% and 4%; "high structure" leaders, 0% and 0%; and "tape groups," 13% and 21%. These results indicate that the "love leader" provides the most positive experience with the least danger, while the "aggressive stimulator" produces moderate change and learning but with, relatively speaking, a great deal of damage.

These researchers conclude that the experience of participants in encounter groups is not a uniform event, but one which differs with particular kinds of encounter groups, not only in how much change takes place, but also in the patterning of changes and the areas of functioning affected.

As mentioned earlier, there has been research dealing directly with the issues Horwitz (1964) raised in his paper; namely, the issue of T-group members having an opportunity as a function of leader style to explore their feelings with regard to authority figures and their related dependency needs and the related issue of the effects members' relations with authority figures have on relations with fellow group members.

Harrow, Astrachan, Tucker, Klein and Miller (1971), for example, compared the study group approach to the T-group approach. Nineteen Ss, forming two groups, each attended a five-session T-group experience and a five-session study-group experience at Yale University. Each S was then asked to rate the leaders, other members, the total group and themselves. The most striking differences between the two types of groups were found for Ss' perceptions of the group leader.

Trainers, as compared to study-group consultants, were seen as more emotional, close, flexible, open, pleasant, friendly, satisfying and nonauthoritarian. Study group consultants were seen as distant, less emotional, less friendly, less gratifying and more authoritarian.

The perceptions of the leaders were generalized on many dimensions to perceptions about the other group members and the total group, demonstrating that modeling had occurred. Areas in which this modeling did occur included the T-group members as tending to view other members as being more emotional, open and friendly in this type of group setting. Despite these areas where modeling did occur, the differences between members' views of the two types of groups and of each other were, on the whole, less significant than differences in their views of the leaders. Thus, around issues of authority, members of the study groups saw the group and others as being different than the consultant, members viewing each other as significantly less powerful than the consultant. Since the members experienced both conditions, it seems apparent that the leadership style establishes a group structure and culture that has an important impact on the way members will perceive the group and one another. The authors postulate that, overall, the differences in the two types of group leaders' behavior were the prime movers for the unique type of emotional climate and behavior in the groups.

Unlike the findings on the members' views of the leaders of the groups and of each other, there were no significant differences in the members' views of themselves under the two types of group conditions.

Mills (1963) has experimented as well as speculated on the effects leader traits have on group members. In one study he varied sex of leader as well as sex of group members. The rationale for this experiment was derived from his theorizing on the dynamics that obtain between small groups and their leaders. He was particularly interested in gaining an understanding of the development of hostility toward authority and its relationship to degree of solidarity amongst group members.

Two key factors explain these developments according to Mills: sex classification of persons involved (sex of both the authority figure and the group member) and the style of the leader. Leaders who do not reciprocate affection and anger are claimed by Mills to be particularly effective in inducing hostility toward authority figures and solidarity amongst members; however this effectiveness holds only when members experiencing hostility toward the leader and solidarity towards each other are of the same sex as the leader. When the members are of the opposite sex of the leader this effect is not obtained. Mills posits an "ideal sequence" to explain this:

1. Each member desires exclusive union with the leader.

2. Overtures for such a relationship are declined by the [non-reciprocating] leader.
3. Rejected and alone, each member is afraid and angry.
4. The leader presents himself as a target, accepting attack. Rather than reciprocating, he presents the collective goal as something in lieu of himself to be desired and work toward that goal as a channel for aggressive energy.
5. The leader is a contradiction to members. On the one hand he is "absolutely narcissistic" in as much as he neither needs anyone to love nor anyone's love nor even to defend himself against attack; while on the other hand, his narcissism is fundamentally limited by commitment to a collective purpose which supersedes himself. As an object he is differentiated into two contradictory parts: (a) omnipotent narcissist; and (b) servant of a universalistic principle, based upon the collectivity as a unit.
6. In directing hostility toward the leader, members, by means of the mechanism of "identification with the target of aggression" tend to acquire, unconsciously, characteristics they find in him: first the characteristic of narcissism (which may be largely a projection of their own) and, second, subserviance to the universalistic principle.

7. In search of this "something beyond the self" to which the leader is committed and to which they want to be committed, members confront one another. They seek in each other those characteristics held in common for they are the elements which serve as the realistic basis of the universalistic principle.
8. Conflict underlies this confrontation, Even though similarities confirm the principle, they detract from each member's sense of uniqueness which is his claim to an exclusive union with the leader.
9. Though members attack the uniqueness of others, according to the mechanism of "identification with the target of aggression," they tend to exchange characteristics, each attacker incorporating elements of the partner he attacks. Such an interchange increases the number of elements which in fact are held in common, thereby reinforcing the universalistic principle. Still more important, it enables a libidinal attachment between members. Elements seen in the other are increasingly similar to elements of the self and, therefore, may be loved as one loves the self....The new relationship is, first a fusion of narcissistic selves and, second, a fusion of these with the universalistic principle.

10. At this stage the group is differentiated into two strata, each with a distinct structure:

    a) On the level of primal emotions, members resent the leader and are bound together by a narcissisticly-based libidinal attachment.

    b) On the level of the collectivity, there is an initial and tentative acceptance of a collective purpose and a history of interaction focused on the similarities and differences of members [pp.98-99].

As mentioned earlier Mills holds that this ideal sequence, which produces hostility toward the leader and solidarity among group members, will occur only when persons involved are of the same sex. Difference in sex of members and leader decreases the probability that the ideal sequence will occur:

1. By intensifying the reciprocal desires for exclusive union between leader and that member most attractive to him (or her), sex difference reduces the leader's capability to respond according to a universalistic principle, a collective goal, or any other non-narcissistic notion.
2. On the part of members, it inhibits the expression of hostility toward the leader, decreasing the likelihood that he (or she) can be made the scapegoat.

3. Consequently, the transmission of the universalistic principle by means of the mechanism of identification with the target of aggression is discouraged in two respects: (a) the leader does not clearly and emphatically present the universalistic principle and (b) aggression is less likely to be directed toward him (or her) as an object.
4. At this stage, relative to the ideal sequence outlined above, the group is arrested:
    a) On the level of primal emotions there remains on the part of all parties a wish for, and a possibility of, exclusive union with the more attractive one of the other two;and
    b) On the level of the collectivity, group purpose is undifferentiated and, therefore, cannot be an object of commitment [p.100].

There are a number of points in this formulation which can be tested. Mills himself tested a few of them: the polarization tendency and the effect of various sex combinations upon it. His hypotheses were: 1) Increase in solidarity is a function of increase in hostile feelings toward the authority; and 2) The increases are greater under same-sex conditions than in cross-sex conditions.

To test these hypotheses he instituted a case discussion course in human relations at Harvard University. Twenty-four carefully matched students took part in the course and

experiment. They were divided into twelve groups of two persons each, plus instructor. Instructors were trained to assume a non-reciprocating, yet goal-oriented, role. Male students worked with female and male leaders. Female students did the same. Data were obtained from same-sexed groups (e.g., two female members with a female leader) and cross-sexed groups (e.g., two females with a male leader).

TAT techniques were used to get measures of affect. Ss also rated one another and the instructor according to the first three factors in Osgood's Semantic Differential.

Mills found that congeniality between members (defined as solidarity, mutual tie, warmth, respect), as measured by the TAT, increased in same-sex groups and decreased in cross-sex ones. Then he obtained an estimate of change of feelings toward the instructors over time. This measure was correlated with changes in group increment in positive fantasy. He found that with an increase in negative feelings toward the instructor, there is an increase in positive feelings between members.

On the Semantic Differential Mills found that Ss ratings of one another corresponded closely with their fantasy estimates, in the sense that congenial pairs rated one another more positively than uncongenial pairs. However, this was not the case in the ratings of the instructor. In fact, these ratings were the reverse of the fantasy estimates. Where fantasy indicated a negative orientation, ratings were

positive; and where fantasy indicated a positive relation, ratings were negative. Thus, on the Semantic Differential and in contrast to the TAT findings, congenial pairs rated the instructor positively, while uncongenial pairs rated him (or her) negatively.

This review of the literature shows that a number of authors have speculated on the effects of various group practitioner variables but that relatively little experimental research has been done. The present study, taking its departure from the work of Mills, was designed to remedy this situation to some extent by experimentally varying sex of practitioner as well as style of practitioner with style governed by well-defined guidelines for practitioner behavior.

Definition of Terms Used in this Study

1. Authority-Subject Situations. These were situations which involved overt relations with authority figures, or representations of such, by Ss. They would be found in stories given to TAT cards, from ratings of the consultant on questionnaires administered at the end of the study group experience, and from interactions with the consultant during the course of the group experience.

2. Subject-Subject Situations. These were situations which involved overt relations with peers or representations of such by Ss. They would be found in stories given to TAT cards, from ratings of the group on questionnaires administered at the end of the study group experience, and from interactions with peers during the course of the group experience.

3. Responses. Ss produced verbal responses during the study group sessions which were tape recorded, as well as gave responses to TAT cards and questionnaires administered at the end of the experiment. These data were categorized into positive and negative responses.

(a) Positive Responses. Positive verbal responses of group members are defined as affectionate, accepting, dominating (of a non-hostile nature) or submissive verbal behaviors directed toward either the consultant or fellow group members during the study group sessions. A positive response on a questionnaire is one in which an S rated his consultant or

group as "pleasant" or "friendly" or "warm" and so on. A positive response to a TAT card is defined as a story that has a favorable outcome (e.g., "everything turns out fine"), or a story that has interpersonal relationships in which characters move towards each other in affectionate, accepting, dominating (actions of an authoritative but non-hostile nature) and submissive ways.

(b) Negative Responses. Negative verbal responses of group members are defined as hostile, separating and rejecting verbal behaviors directed toward the consultant or fellow group members during study group sessions. A negative response on a questionnaire is one in which an S rated his consultant as "unpleasant" or "not friendly" or "cold" and so on. A negative response to a TAT card is defined as a story that has an unfavorable outcome (e.g., "He leaves in disgust") or a story that has interpersonal relationships in which characters relate to each other in hostile, separating and/or rejecting fashions.

4. Non-Reciprocating (N-R) and Reciprocating (R) Consultant Styles. The N-R and R styles were similar in a number of ways. Both style consultants were trained to restrict themselves to an observer-commentator role in the group. This means they were to be there simply as observers, not participants, and their goal was to facilitate the learning process for group members by intervening and commenting on the occasions when they felt it would be appropriate. Their

comments were to take the form of questions, clarifications, descriptions and interpretations regarding group events.

Consultants of both styles were instructed to assume non-directive attitudes. This meant they were to avoid trying to direct, manipulate, or lead the group. They were to strive to be simply observers of and commentators on the "group" process. That is, they were instructed never to focus on any one individual in an attempt to help that person understand his own particular behavior or intra-psychic processes. However, on occasion, consultants might have referred to individual members or sub-groups with regard to their role or roles in the group in an effort to clarify what was going on in the group as a whole.

All consultants were limited to a maximum of approximately 15 comments per session, a maximum of approximately 150 words to a comment, and a maximum of approximately one minute to a comment. Minimums on these variables were to be determined by the needs of the group.

The N-R and R consultant styles differed in the following ways. Consultants in the N-R condition were instructed to maintain an impersonal, affectless, rational style of behavior. They were instructed to avoid initiating or returning any kind of affect to group members, and to even avoid the use of personal forms of communication when commenting. For example they were never to use group members' names but rather to use impersonal terms like "group members" or

"individuals."

N-R consultants were also instructed to strive to avoid all eye and physical contact with members while in the study group situation. Generally, consultants in this condition focused on the floor with occasional glances around the room to pick up data relevant to their understanding of the processes of the group. If eye contact came from this maneuver the N-R consultant was to simply and quickly end it by switching his glance elsewhere.

Consultants in the R condition, on the other hand, were allowed to reciprocate affect with group members. For example, they could laugh at jokes made by members if they found them funny. They could also let their facial expressions reflect what they were feeling. R consultants could also use personal forms of communication such as the first names of group members. Normal eye and physical contact was allowed as well.

To illustrate how this difference in style was designed to appear operationally, a brief script will present the two styles dealing with the issue of dependency:

N-R Style:

Group Member: Mr. Jones (the consultant), I don't understand why there are such long silences in this group. Could you explain this?

Consultant: (The consultant is entitled to not respond to this question if he so chooses. However, if he

should choose to respond he might say something like the following.) The group accepts the proposition that it is incapable of articulating its own processes, that the consultant is the only one who understands what is going on in the group. (The consultant avoids eye contact throughout this episode.)

R Style:

Group Member: Mr. Jones, I don't understand why there are such long silences in this group. Could you explain this?

Consultant: (Since this consultant is in a reciprocating mode it would be nearly impossible for him to avoid responding to this question. He might handle it in the following fashion.) You ask me to explain Bill, but it's my feeling that other group members understand but are unwilling to elaborate on this topic. (The consultant would look directly at the member when making this response and perhaps smile if he felt like it.)

In both conditions, the consultant has avoided doing the work for the members, thus maintaining the self-study nature of the exercise. However, the illustrations indicate that the style has changed. In the former, the consultant does not use personal names, avoids eye contact, does not reflect on his own feelings, and phrases his comment in a rational, non-expressive fashion. In the latter illustration, the

consultant looks at the member, uses his name, and refers to his own feelings. Nonetheless, he does not answer the question or try to explain the process but rather refers it back to the group.

The objective was to present Ss with two clearly defined and differentiated consultant styles; yet, the task of consultants -- to increase knowledge about group processes -- was to remain the same in all conditions. The aim was always to have groups within both conditions remain in a self-study format.

Hypotheses

I. In Authority-Subject situations, the responses of Ss in the Non-Reciprocating (N-R) condition who are the same sex as the consultant will be more negative than a) the responses of Ss in the Reciprocating (R) condition who are the same sex as the consultant, and b) the responses of Ss in the N-R condition who are the opposite sex of the consultant.

II. In Subject-Subject situations, responses of Ss in the N-R condition who are the same sex as the consultant will be more positive than a) responses of Ss in the R condition who are the same sex as the consultant, and b) responses of Ss in the N-R condition who are the opposite sex of the consultant.

Method

Subjects

Eighty-one Ss, 38 females and 43 males, were recruited for this experiment from the student population of three New York City colleges: The City College of New York, Brooklyn College, and St. Francis College.

The E recruited these Ss himself at the start of the 1971 Spring term by describing the project to the students through classroom visits (Appendix A) and an advertisement in one of the college's newspapers (The City College Observation Post). The experiment was presented to them as an opportunity for a one-day sensitivity training-group experience made available to them free in return for their cooperation in responding to two hours of questionnaires and other research procedures. One dollar for lunch money was also offered to potential Ss.

Volunteers were asked to describe their previous group experiences, if any. Those who had had or were having self-study group experiences were not included in the experiment. Despite this precaution, however, two Ss who had had study-group experiences were inadvertently included in the experiment. Their data were excluded from the analysis with the exception of the taped materials where their contributions could not be identified. Due to loss, the data from one female S were also excluded from the analysis of non-taped materials.

Procedures

Eight trained consultants, four males and four females, were recruited for this experiment. Each consultant worked with only one group, thus allowing for an unconfounded comparison of the effects contributed by personality, sex and style of consultants. Two of the male consultants assumed an N-R style with their groups, and the other two males assumed an R style. Two female consultants assumed an N-R approach and the other two assumed an R style.

All consultants were college graduates, the average age being 26. Most were Ph.D. candidates in clinical psychology and all had a considerable amount of training and experience in understanding group processes, both as participants in group exercises and as trainers or consultants to groups. All consultants dressed in semi-formal styles typical of college instructors, e.g., men wore ties and jackets. The E himself was involved in administrative matters and did not function as a consultant.

The assignment of consultants and Ss to their respective groups was determined by their availability. That is, each person indicated the day or days he could take part in the experiment and this determined which group he would be a member of or consultant to. This also determined the style a consultant would assume, since the sex and style of a particular group's consultant were planned in advance in order to meet requirements of the experimental design as well as those of the City College Psychological Center where this experiment was held.

There was an average of 10 Ss to a group. Sexual composition varied in the groups as shown in Table 1. The first group was conducted on Saturday, 3/21/71; followed by two more on Saturday, 3/28/71; another on Saturday, 4/3/71; two on Sunday, 4/4/71; and the final two on Monday, 4/5/71. Each S had only one day-long experience with one consultant.

In order to control for the possible effects of interaction between members of different groups on the occasions when two groups were conducted on the same day, group sessions and breaks were staggered in such a way that one group had a break while the other group was in session. Furthermore, the two groups meeting on the same day operated under the same experimental conditions, i.e., they both had consultants who were working in the same style and were of the same sex.

Ss were asked not to discuss their experience with anyone outside of their group for one month after the experiment. This was requested in order to control for possible effects on future Ss from conversations with Ss who already had been in the experiment (Appendix I).

Consultants did not socialize with group members during coffee and lunch breaks. They occupied a separate room designated "staff" during such breaks.

Table 2 illustrates the schedule followed each day of the experiment by each group with the exception of three groups whose time schedules were changed to allow for different break periods, thus allowing two groups to be conducted

Table 1

Number of Subjects and Sex Composition

by Groups

	N-R Groups				R Groups				
Sex	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	Total
Male	5	5	6	5	5	8	5	4	43
Female	4	5	5	5	6	5	3	5	38
Total	9	10	11	10	11	13	8	9	

Table 2

Illustration of a Day's Schedule

Time	Activity
9:00-10:00	Introduction; demographic questionnaires, personality and attitude scales administered
10:00-11:30	Group session 1
11:30-11:45	Coffee break
11:45-1:15	Group session 2
1:15-2:15	Lunch break
2:15-3:45	Group session 3
3:45-4:00	Coffee break
4:00-5:30	Group session 4, final session
5:30-6:30	Administration in group of individual TATs
6:30-7:00	Administration of Semantic Differentials
7:00-7:30	Review of sessions and de-briefing with erasure of experimental role of consultant

on the same day and yet avoiding interaction between members from different groups.

As Table 2 shows Ss arrived at The Psychological Center at 9:00 A.M. and were introduced to the experiment by the E. He explained that one hour would be immediately devoted to filling out research instruments. Demographic questionnaires and personality scales were then administered (Appendices B,C, D and E). After this data were collected the E then introduced the group to their consultant and to the group experience in the following fashion: "Your consultant for this workshop is Mr./Miss/Mrs.____ _____. This is a sensitivity-training group-workshop to be conducted in what is often referred to as the 'Tavistock' fashion. I would like you to take the time now to thoroughly read the contract describing this event (the contract was then distributed to Ss, see Appendix F) and then we shall review the schedule which is attached at the end of the contract." The schedule was reviewed after Ss read the contract.

Ss were then asked if they had any questions. These were answered with the E being careful not to reveal information that might contaminate the experiment. Ss and their consultant were then escorted to the door of their group room by the E.

The Study Group sessions were then conducted as Table 2 indicates with coffee breaks and lunch breaks in between sessions.

At the completion of the fourth group session TATs and Semantic Differentials were administered to the Ss by the E (Appendices G and H). Then, Ss met for one last de-briefing session with their consultant who dropped his experimental role and reviewed the Study Group sessions with the Ss. Consultants were instructed to strive to help the Ss understand the theoretical rationale behind this particular group exercise with its accompanying restricted consultant behavior. Then consultant gave them memos from the E requesting that they not discuss the experiment with non-group members for one month after the experiment in order to prevent contaminating future Ss with advance knowledge about consultant behavior (Appendix I).

Measures

1. Analyses of Tape Recordings. The last two sessions for each group were tape recorded. Fifteen one-minute samples were then taken from each group approximately every 10 minutes. The samples from one group were rated by two judges and the data obtained were used to obtain reliability measures for the rating systems as well as for the experimental analyses. The samples from the remaining seven groups were rated by one judge.

Four measuring devices were applied to data on the tapes. Three of these were obtained by adapting Fine's (1955) scoring scheme for TAT stories to this medium, i.e., a judge scored the first four speakers within a one-minute unit with regard to whether they were either "moving towards" or "moving against or away from" either peers or authority figures. Sex of speaker was also identified by the judge. A comparison of two judges on fifteen one-minute samples from the same group produced an agreement score of 80%.

Three difference scores were then derived from the data produced by the above method: peer oriented responses minus authority oriented responses for each sex (P-A); toward minus against responses for each sex - within peer ($T-A_p$); and, toward minus against responses for each sex - within authority $T-A_a$).

The fourth measuring device was a judge's estimation of the percentage of time males and females spoke during each

one-minute unit. A comparison of two judges on fifteen one-minute samples produced an agreement score of 91% within a 10% error range.

2. Semantic Differential. The second instrument was a modified Semantic Differential which was designed to tap Ss' feelings about their consultants and their fellow group members (Appendix H). This instrument used by Harrow, Astrachan, Tucker, Klein and Miller (1971) in a comparative study of the affect of different kinds of group training experiences, requires Ss to rate pairs of bipolar adjectives and phrases on a six-point scale. The adjectives and phrases cover such dimensions as whether the consultant or the group was trusting during the session, whether he or they were emotional or unemotional, whether the consultant was close to the other group members, whether they were close to each other, etc.

3. TAT. A third measure was obtained through the administration of ten TAT cards. The content of five of these cards (cards 1, 5, 6BM, 7GF, and 7BM) is of such a nature that they have a high probability of "pulling" stories with Authority-Subject themes. The other five cards (cards 4, 9GF, 9BM, 10, and 13MF) contain content that has a high probability of "pulling" stories with Subject-Subject themes. Judgments as to what kind of themes cards 7GF and 9GF would pull were made on an a priori basis. The work of Eron (1950) determined the use of the others. He found that cards 1, 5, 6BM, and 7BM have a strong tendency to pull Authority-Subject

themes, while cards 4, 9BM, 10 and 13MF tend to pull Subject-Subject themes.

Stories were obtained in written form from Ss as individuals in the presence of their groups. Immediately at the end of the final group session the E entered the room and asked group members to remain in their seats and then presented them with the above-described TAT cards. Cards were presented one at a time, and each S received a copy of each card. Authority-Subject related pictures were alternated with the Subject-Subject related pictures.

Sheets of writing paper containing instructions on how to write a TAT story at the top of each sheet accompanied each TAT card. Ss were given six minutes to write each story (Appendix G).

Fine"s (1955) scoring scheme for projective techniques allowed for the scoring of TAT stories on two major calssifications: Outcome and Interpersonal Relationships. There are three categories of Outcome: favorable, unfavorable and indeterminate. There are three main types of Interpersonal Relationships: "moving towards," "moving against," and "moving away from."

Using a formula that produces an empirical r, Fine found inter-rater agreement r's for five independent observers of .91, .81, .89, .88 and .85. A method developed by Osgood and Nunnally (Katz, 1965) was used in this research to measure per cent agreement between two scorers who scored nine proto-

cols consisting of a total of 90 stories. This method divides twice the number of agreements in scoring a set of protocols by the total number of scores given by both scorers. This figure is then converted to a percentage. This method produced an agreement figure of 94% for the two scorers in this experiment.

4. Personality Measures. A number of measures designed to tap salient personality orientations were administered to the Ss before the group sessions started. These were Schutz's (1966, Appendices D and E) FIRO-B and FIRO LIPHE scales and an abbreviated version of the "Short Form of the Sex-Role Questionnaire" (Broverman, et. al., 1970, Appendix C).

5. Consultant Style Measures. Two methods were used to obtain data on consultant styles and behavior. First, eleven style relevant items from the Semantic Differential filled out by Ss were analyzed and compared; second, two judges rated taped samples of consultants' verbal behavior using the same eleven style relevant items from the Semantic Differential.

Results

1. Analyses of the Tape Recorded Proceedings of the Group Sessions. Four analyses of variance (sex of consultant X style of consultant X sex of subject) were performed on the data obtained from the tape recordings of the group sessions. Significant interactions were found on three of these, while the fourth produced a significant main effect.

Table 3 shows variables associated with significant interactions between style of consultant and sex of member.

In general, Table 3 shows that males and females are differentially effected by the styles of authority figures. Specifically, male Ss in the R situation become much more active verbally than do female Ss, speaking an average of 58.98% of the time while females had a mean per cent time spoken score of 45.40% ($F=5.68$, $p<.025$). (These scores have been corrected to account for the difference in n's between the two groups and thus sum to more than 100%).

Males are also more peer-oriented in the R condition as the mean scores of 4.60 for females and 5.22 for males on the P-A variable indicate ($F=4.43$, $p<.05$). Males are also more positive toward peers than females in the R condition as the means of 4.65 and 5.08 for females and males respectively on the $T\text{-}A_a$ variable shows ($F=5.38$, $p<.025$).

Furthermore, comparison of males in both conditions (N-R and R) shows that a similar effect, but with less intensity, obtains on the P-A and $T\text{-}A_p$ variables. That is, on the P-A

Table 3

Summary of Results of Analyses of Variance

for Interacting Variables

Variable	N-R		R		F	df
	Female Member (N=19)	Male Member (N=21)	Female Member (N=19)	Male Member (N=22)		
	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean		
% Males-Females Spoke	47.80	42.85	45.50	58.93[a]	5.68**	1/224
Peer-Authority (P-A)[b]	5.23	4.98	4.60	5.22	4.43*	1/224
Toward-Against--within peer ($T\text{-}A_p$)	5.12	4.83	4.65	5.08	5.38**	1/224

a The % scores have been corrected to account for the difference in N's between the sexes and thus, in one instance, sum to more than 100%.

b The P-A and T-A scores represent averages, by subject sex and consultant style, for one-minute tape segments. The number "four" was added to each raw score to eliminate minus signs. Thus, for example, female Ss in the N-R condition made an average number of 5.23-4 or 1.23 P.A oriented responses per one minute sample.

*$p < .05$

**$p < .025$

variable, males in the R condition had a mean of 5.22 while males in the N-R condition averaged 4.98. On the $T\text{-}A_a$ variable the means were 5.08 and 4.83 for males in the R and N-R condition respectively.

Female Ss follow the opposite pattern. Not only are they less active, less peer-oriented and less positive toward peers than are males in the R condition, the reverse also holds for their counterparts in the N-R situation. That is, when authority figures do not reciprocate females have a mean P-A score of 5.23 while in the R situation they average 4.60. On the $T\text{-}A_a$ variable their means were 5.12 in the N-R condition and 4.65 in the R condition.

In sum, the two different styles clearly have opposite effects on the two sexes: male Ss being more active, more peer-oriented and more positively so, in the R condition with the reverse occurring in the N-R condition. Female Ss, on the other hand, were less active, less peer-oriented and less positive toward peers in the R condition, with the reverse also occurring in the N-R condition.

Table 4 presents statistics associated with a significant main effect on the variable sex of consultant on the measure "Toward-Against Authority."

As Table 4 shows, overall, male authority figures were responded to in a significantly more positive fashion by all Ss (male and female) than were female authority figures; the total mean score for female authority figures being 3.80,

Table 4

Mean "Toward-Against Authority"[a] ($T\text{-}A_a$)[b] Scores

		Consultant Groups Female					Consultant Groups Male				
		1	2	3	4	Total	1	2	3	4	Total
Female Subjects	Mean	3.40	4.30	4.00	3.63	3.83	3.87	4.07	3.87	4.20	4.00
	N	4	5	6	5	20	5	5	3	5	18
Male Subjects	Mean	4.00	3.80	3.53	3.73	3.77	4.07	4.33	4.13	3.80	4.08
	N	5	5	5	8	23	6	5	5	4	20
					Total	3.80				Total	4.04

a. For the most part the authority figures being spoken about were the consultants. However, on occasion, outside authority figures would be mentioned, e.g., the male experimenter or a female teacher.

b. The $T\text{-}A_a$ scores represent averages for male and female Ss for one-minute tape segments. The number "four" was added to each raw score to eliminate minus signs. Thus, for example, in the female consultant condition Ss made an average of 3.80-4.00 or -.20 $T\text{-}A_a$ responses per one-minute sample.

while for males it was 4.04 ($F=6.23$, $p<.025$).

2. Analyses of the Responses to the Semantic Differential. The responses to the Semantic Differential scales are presented in two parts: a) Ss' responses to the Semantic Diferentials and b) judges' responses to the Semantic Differential.

(a) Ss' Responses to the Semantic Differential.

Table 5 presents the mean scores for the group members' views of the consultants on 11 items from the 26 item Semantial Differential. These 11 items were selected on an a priori basis as being the most appropriate for describing consultants' styles.

Three of the 11 variables listed in Table 5 distinguish between the two consultant styles at statistically significant levels. N-R consultants, with a mean score of 5.87, were perceived as "stronger" than R consultants, whose average score was 4.95 ($F=7.75$, $p<.01$). N-R consultants were also seen as significantly less "pleasant" than R consultants, the former having a mean score of 2.95 while the latter had a mean of 3.58 ($F=4.14$, $p<.05$). Contrary to expectation, N-R consultants, with a mean of 3.90, were also seen as significantly more "giving" than R consultants who achieved a mean of 3.17 ($F=4.34$, $p<.05$).

On the variable "friendly" a trend in the anticipated direction was found, i.e., R consultants had a mean score of 2.92 on "friendly," while N-R consultants averaged 2.25

Table 5

Mean Scores for Individual Consultants on 11 Semantic Differential Variables Rated by Subjects

Variable[a]	N-R Consultants					R Consultants				
	Female		Male			Female		Male		
	C1 (N=8)	C2 (N=9)	C1 (N=11)	C2 (N=10)	Total Mean	C1 (N=10)	C2 (N=13)	C1 (N=8)	C2 (N=9)	Total Mean
1. Emotional	2.12	1.95	1.57	2.20	1.96	1.40	4.05	1.45	2.32	2.31
2. Flexible	2.00	2.30	1.74	2.70	2.19	1.50	2.37	2.04	2.20	2.03
3. Expresses Feelings	2.63	2.28	2.89	3.40	2.80	1.60	2.65	1.90	2.28	2.11
4. Strong	6.13	6.05	6.00	5.30	5.87	5.60	5.27	3.94	5.00	4.95
5. Satisfying	2.25	2.25	2.15	2.30	2.24	2.20	2.24	1.64	2.35	2.11
6. Close	1.75	2.15	1.20	2.70	1.95	1.30	2.05	1.57	2.48	1.85
7. Pleasant	2.63	2.58	3.49	3.10	2.95	3.70	3.72	2.80	4.08	3.58
8. Friendly	2.00	1.48	2.40	3.10	2.25	2.90	3.30	2.54	2.95	2.92
9. Warm	2.13	1.68	2.34	2.90	2.26	2.50	2.50	1.37	2.53	2.23
10. Giving	3.63	3.28	3.69	5.00	3.90	3.20	3.32	2.77	3.40	3.17
11. Active	3.38	4.23	3.62	4.30	3.88	4.20	4.63	2.24	3.28	3.59

[a]A low score indicates Ss rate the consultant as low on the variable listed

($F=3.43$, $p<.10$). On the variable "expresses feelings" a trend contrary to expectation was found when comparing consultants. That is, R consultants averaged 2.11 while N-R consultants had mean score of 2.80 ($F=3.17$, $p<.10$).

Sex of consultant produced significant main effects on two variables, "strong" and "active." Female consultants were seen as "stronger" than male consultants, the mean score for the former being 5.76, while the mean for the latter was 5.01 ($F=4.50$, $p<.05$). On "active," female consultants again had a significantly higher mean score, 4.11, while male consultants scored 3.36 ($F=4.07$, $p<.05$).

There was also a significant interaction effect on the variable "active." R male consultants, with a mean score of 2.76, were perceived as being far less "active" than the other consultants, while R female consultants, who had a mean of 4.42, were seen as a good deal more "active" than all other consultants. The remaining consultants, N-R male and N-R female, had mean scores on "active" of 3.96 and 3.81 respectively ($F=6.00$, $p<.025$.)

There were also two interaction trends on the variable "warm" and "friendly." N-R female consultants with a mean of 1.90 and R male consultants with a mean of 1.95 were seen as "cold" compared to R female and N-R male consultants whose respective means were 2.50 and 2.62 ($F=3.62$, $p<.10$). While on "friendly," N-R female consultants with a mean of 1.74 were perceived as the least "friendly," R females the

most "friendly" with a mean of 3.10. N-R and R male consultants had the same mean score of 2.75 ($F=3.51$, $p<.10$).

The major independent variable sex of subject revealed two statistically significant differences. Female group members saw the consultants as less "giving" ($F=4.57$, $p<.05$), and less "expressive of feelings" ($F=4.56$, $p<.05$) than did male group members.

Finally, consultants varied significantly as a function of personality on four variables: "emotional" ($F=7.95$, $p<.01$) "flexible" ($F=5.36$, $p<.05$), "close"($F=7.95$, $p<.01$), and"active" ($F=4.07$, $p<.05$). Personality effects can be seen on two of these variables if, for example, R female consultants 1 and 2 are compared. As Table 5 shows, consultant 2 in the R condition with means of 4.05 and 2.37 respectively, was seen as a good deal more "emotional" and "flexible" than most of the other consultants. While consultant 1 of the same condition was seen as relatively "unemotional" and"inflexible," her respective means being 1.40 and 1.50.

In sum, analyses of the Ss responses to the style relevant items on the Semantic Differential show that on three of these variables Ss perceived significant differences in the two different consultant styles. N-R consultants were perceived as "stronger," less "pleasant" and more "giving" than R consultants.

There were also other findings approaching the .05 level of significance wherein N-R consultants were seen as less

"friendly" but more "expressive of feelings" than R consultants.

Female consultants were also seen as significantly "stronger" and more "active" than male consultants, while female Ss saw consultants as significantly less "giving" and significantly less "expressive of feelings" than male Ss.

Finally, consultants varied significantly as a function of personality on four different variables: "emotional," "flexible" "close" and "active."

Table 6 presents the results of the analysis of variance of the Ss ratings of their group consultants on the 26 item Semantic Differential. These 26 items were algebraically summed to produce a single score for each S. This score then indicates how an S felt about his or her consultant, a minus score indicating,overall, feelings were negative while a plus score indicates that the overall feeling toward the consultant was positive.

Table 6 shows that statistically reliable differences were found for the main effects of consultant style ($F=5.16$, $p<.025$), and personality of consultant within style and sex ($F=6.68$, $p<.025$), as well as for the A X B interaction (consultant style by consultant sex, $F=4.26$, $p<.05$).

Table 7 presents the mean scores for Ss' ratings of their group consultants on the 26 item Semantic Differential. This table shows the effect the variable personality of consultant had on these ratings. Consultant 7, a R male consul-

Table 6

Source Table for the Analysis of Variance of the Subjects' Ratings of the Group Consultants on the Semantic Differential

Source	df	MS	F
Consultant Style (A)	1	1178.23	5.16**
Consultant Sex (B)	1	665.48	
Subject Sex (C)	1	88.14	
Personality of Consultant within Style and Sex (D)	1	1523.75	6.68**
A X B	1	971.21	4.26*
A X C	1	1.22	
B X C	1	5.21	
A X B X C	1	478.71	
A X D	1	448.08	
B X D	1	522.22	
C X D	1	66.35	
A X C X D	1	478.71	
B X C X D	1	19.99	
A X B X C X D	1	402.77	
Error	62	228.17	

*$p < .05$
**$p < .025$

Table 7

Mean Scores for Subjects' Ratings of the Group Consultants on the Semantic Differential

Group	Subject Sex	M	N	Consultant	M	N	Consultant Style by Consultant Sex		M	N	Consultant Style	M	N
	F	-3.50	4										
1	M	-1.25	4	1	-2.38	8							
							N-R	F	-2.16	17			
	F	-7.25	4										
2	M	3.40	5	2	-1.93	9					N-R	-1.53	38
	F	2.20	5										
3	M	-11.83	6	3	-4.80	11							
							N-R	M	-0.90	21			
	F	-1.40	5										
4	M	7.40	5	4	3.00	10							
	F	-4.00	5										
5	M	-8.80	5	5	-6.40	10							
							R	F	-2.56	23			
	F	1.40	5										
6	M	-0.12	8	6	1.28	13							
											R	-9.13	40
	F	-35.33	3										
7	M	-17.60	5	7	-26.47	8							
							R	M	-16.06	17			
	F	-4.80	5										
8	M	-6.50	4	8	-5.65	9							

tant, had a substantially lower score (-26.47) than any other consultant, while consultant 4, a N-R male consultant, had, relatively speaking, a quite positive score (3.00). Variations of this sort clearly contributed to the significant differences found for the variable consultant style, and in the consultant style by consultant sex interaction. It should be noted, however, that the variable of consultant style appears to have made some contribution to the effect achieved, for the three lowest mean scores for consultants are produced in the R consultant condition (consultant 5= -6.40, consultant 7 = -26.47, and consultant 8= -5.65). Also R male consultants are seen in a considerably more negative fashion than N-R male consultants as their respective interaction scores of -16.06 and -0.90 indicate.

Means for interactions that would show support for hypotheses Ia and Ib of this study were also computed and compared by Tukey type b tests(Winer, 1962). No significant differences were found on any of these comparisons.

Table 8 presents the results of the analysis of variance of the Ss' ratings of their fellow group members on the 26 item Semantic Differential. These items were algebraically summed to produce a single score for each S.

Table 8 shows that statistically reliable differences were found for the main effects of consultant style ($F= 7.12$, $p<.01$) and subject sex ($F= 5.39$, $p<.025$),as well as for the

Table 8

Source Table for the Analysis of Variance of the Subjects' Ratings of the Other Group Members on the Semantic Differential

Source	df	MS	F
Consultant Style (A)	1	2390.43	7.12***
Consultant Sex (B)	1	913.98	
Subject Sex (C)	1	1809.14	5.39**
Personality of Consultant within Style and Sex (D)	1	452.09	
A X B	1	5441.40	16.22****
A X C	1	234.66	
B X C	1	50.23	
A X B X C	1	1182.87	3.53*
A X D	1	581.21	
B X D	1	60.12	
C X D	1	321.50	
A X C X D	1	134.34	
B X C X D	1	814,48	
A X B X C X D	1	65.26	
Error	62	335.44	

*p<.10
**p<.025
***p<.01
****p<.001

interaction of consultant style and consultant sex ($F=16.22$, $p<.001$).

Table 9 presents the mean scores for group members' ratings of their fellow group members on the Semantic Differential.

As Table 8 indicates a significant interaction was obtained between style and sex of consultant, and, as Table 9 shows, the biggest effect is in the N-R female consultant condition where Ss rated their peers in a much more negative fashion than in any of the other conditions.

The variable of consultant style also produces a significant effect as Table 8 shows, however, examination of Table 9 indicates that this is primarily due to the impact that the N-R female consultant condition had on Ss' ratings. That is, the Ss in the N-R male consultant condition have produced scores similar to those produced in the R condition.

The variable subject sex produced significant differences, and examination of Table 9 shows that this is consistent through all groups with the exception of group five. Thus it can be concluded that, for the most part, female members felt significantly less positive toward their peers than did male group members.

Examination of Table 8 also shows that a trend toward significance was also obtained for the three-way interaction between the variables consultant style, consultant sex and subject sex ($F=3.53$, $p<.10$). Comparisons were made between

Table 9

Mean Scores for Subjects' Ratings of the Other Group Members on the Semantic Differential

Group	Subject Sex	Mean	N	Consultant	Mean	N	Consultant Style by Consultant Sex		Mean	N	Consultant Style	Mean	N
	F	-9.25	4										
1	M	4.25	4	1	-5.00	8							
							N-R	F	-3.95	17			
	F	-11.50	4										
2	M	14.40	5	2	-2.90	9							
											N-R	9.67	38
	F	21.00	5										
3	M	31.33	6	3	26.17	11							
							N-R	M	23.29	21			
	F	19.00	5										
4	M	22.80	5	4	20.40	10							
	F	36.00	5										
5	M	17.40	5	5	26.70	10	R	F	27.85	23			
	F	23.00	5										
6	M	35.00	8	6	29.00	13							
											R	22.82	40
	F	-0.33	3										
7	M	17.20	5	7	8.45	8							
							R	M	17.79	17			
	F	20.00	5										
8	M	34.25	4	8	27.13	9							

the means of the groups making up this interaction in order to see if there was any statistical support for hypotheses IIa and IIb. No support was found; however, there were a number of significant differences between various groups.

Table 10 presents the means and groups involved in these comparisons. As this table shows, female Ss in the N-R female consultant groups, with a mean rating of -10.38, were less positive toward their peers than female Ss in the R female consultant groups who had a mean peer rating of 29.50. This is significant according to a Tukey type b test (Winer, 1962), and it is the opposite direction of that predicted by hypothesis IIa.

Female Ss in the N-R female consultant condition were also found to be significantly less positive toward their peers according to the Tukey type b tests than the following groups of Ss: male Ss in the N-R male consultant group who had a mean score of 27.07, male Ss in the R female consultant condition who had an average of 26.20 and male Ss in the R male consultant condition who averaged 25.73. Thus the only male Ss whom they did not differ significantly from were the male Ss sharing the N-R female consultant condition with them, and who had a mean score of 9.33. The remaining two groups whom they did not differ from according to the Tukey test were both female S groups, and they were the female Ss in the N-R male consultants groups, who had an average score of 20.00, and the female Ss in the R male consultant groups.

Table 10

Mean Scores for the Subjects' Ratings of the Other Group Members on the Semantic Differential for the Interaction Variable of Consultant Style X Consultant Sex X Subject Sex

Group	Sex
N-R, Female Consultant, Female S	-10.38
N-R, Female Consultant, Male S	9.33
N-R, Male Consultant, Female S	20.00
N-R, Male Consultant, Male S	27.07
R, Female Consultant, Female S	29.50
R, Female Consultant, Male S	26.20
R, Male Consultant, Female S	19.67
R, Male Consultant, Male S	25.73

who had an average of 19.67. Thus three of the four groups rating peers the least positively were female S groups. Finally, Table 10 shows that the highest peer rating mean score came from female Ss working with R female consultants while the lowest peer rating mean came from the female Ss who were in the N-R female consultant condition.

In sum, the analyses of the Ss' ratings of their consultants and peers on the Semantic Differential scales showed that Ss' perceptions of consultants were often influenced by the consultants' style and/or sex. The data also showed that the consultants' personalities had a considerable impact on how Ss experienced them.

The data also indicated that the style of the consultant, in interaction with the variable of consultant sex, had a very significant effect upon Ss' perceptions of each other. The variable of subject sex also produced significant differences with females generally feeling less positive toward peers than males. The consultant style x consultant sex x subject sex interaction produced a trend toward significance.

Comparisons were made to clarify this effect and to find out if there was support for hypotheses IIa and IIb. No support was found, but significant non-hypothesized findings were obtained in these comparisons. It was shown that female Ss were more often effected in a negative fashion than male Ss when the consultants were not clearly reciprocating, and that both male and female Ss are least positive toward their

peers when they are in a group with a female consultant working in an N-R mode.

(b) Judges' Responses on the Semantic Differential.

A 2 (judges) X 2 (consultant style) X 4 (consultant within style) analysis of variance was performed on the judges' ratings of the consultants on the degree to which they were reciprocating or non-reciprocating on the 11 style relevant items from the Semantic Differential. Table 11 shows the results of the analysis.

Table 11 shows that the two judges differed significantly in their ratings of the consultants ($F=7.05$, $p<.01$). Both judges saw the N-R and R consultant styles differing at significicant levels ($F=61.79$, $p<.001$). Withing a particular style judges rated the consultants as being significantly different ($F=22.91$, $p<.001$), however, the judges did not differ from each other in their ratings of consultants within a single style (the A X C interaction).

Table 12 presents the means of the judges' ratings of the consultants. This table shows how both judges perceived the N-R consultants as being less reciprocating than the R styled consultants, i.e., judge 1's total mean rating of N-R consultants was 2.91, while his total mean rating of R consultants was 4.93. Judge 2 rated all N-R consultants with an average of 2.82 while rating R consultants with an average score of 3.96.

Table 11

Source Table for the Analysis of Variance of the Judges' Ratings of the Consultants on 11 Style Relevant Items from the Semantic Differential

Source	df	MS	F
Judge (A)	1	12.55	7.05**
Consultant Style (B)	1	109.78	61.79***
Consultant within Style (C)	3	40.79	22.91***
A X B	1	8.64	4.85*
A X C	3	3.73	
B X C	3	5.75	3.22*
A X B X C	3	12.34	6.93***
Error	160	1.78	

*$p < .05$
**$p < .01$
***$p < .001$

Table 12

Judges' Mean Ratings of Consultants on 11 Style Relevant Items from the Semantic Differential[a]

	Consultant	Judge 1	Judge 2
N-R	1	2.27	2.36
	2	1.64	2.00
	3	2.73	4.09
	4	5.00	2.82
		N-R Mean 2.91	N-R Mean 2.82
R	1	3.18	3.00
	2	5.18	3.36
	3	5.45	3.91
	4	5.91	5.55
		R Mean 4.93	R Mean 3.96

[a]A lower score indicates the judge rated the consultant as less reciprocating.

Table 12 also depicts how within a given style category consultants varied considerably according to both judges. For example, Judge 2 saw N-R (male) consultant 4, with an average rating of 5.00, as being a good deal more reciprocating than the other three N-R consultants, while Judge 2 rated N-R (male) consultant 3 in a similar fashion with a mean score of 4.09. Both judges saw N-R (female) consultants 1 and 2 as being consistently less reciprocating than all other consultants, Judge 1 rating consultant 1 at 2.27 and consultant 2 at 1.64, while Judge 2 rated consultant 1 at 2.36 and consultant 2 at 2.00. R female consultant 1 was perceived as relatively non-reciprocating by both judges, Judge 1 rating her at 3.18 and Judge 2 at 3.00.

Judge 2 was more conservative than Judge 1 with regard to "high reciprocating" ratings. He saw only one R consultant, male consultant 4, as being highly reciprocating with a rating of 5.55, while seeing the remaining R consultants as only moderately reciprocating. Judge 1 on the other hand, saw all R consultants, with the exception of R female consultant 1, as highly reciprocating..

In sum, the above analysis shows the experimental manipulation of the style of consultants was effective. Consultants, for the most part, were perceived to differ according to the guidelines prescribed in the design of the experiment. There was however, significant disagreement between judges in their ratings and significant differences between individual

consultants within a particular style according to the ratings of the judges (Tables 11 and 12).

3. Analyses of the Responses to the TAT Cards. Eight analyses of variance were performed on the data derived from the TAT cards. Two categories from Fine's scoring system (1955) were used, Interpersonal Relationships and Outcomes.

Per cent of positive authority-oriented interpersonal relationship responses or per cent of responses directed "towards" authority-figures were compared and did not produce any statistically significant differences. However, a similar comparison on per cent of responses directed "towards" peers did produce one significant main effect, and that was for the variable of subject sex. Female Ss produced a mean "towards" peer or positive response score of 67%, while male Ss averaged 62% ($F=7.13$, $p<.01$) This finding is the opposite of that obtained on the Semantic Differential, i.e., on that measure female Ss moved "against" peers to a significantly greater degree than male Ss. This discrepancy will be dealt with in the discussion section of this study.

Outcome responses to the TAT cards were also analyzed with regard to their favorable or unfavorable qualities and with regard to the stimulus "pull" of each card, i.e., cards having a high probability of "pulling" stories having to do with authority issues were distinguished from those which "pull" peer-oriented fantasies. None of these analyses produced statistically significant differences.

Pearson product moment correlations were also performed on these data. Table 13 shows the correlation between authority-oriented TAT interpersonal relationship scores and peer-oriented interpersonal relationship scores as well as the correlations between the authority-oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship scores and TAT Outcome scores for N-R and R groups.

A significant correlation ($r=.34$, $p<.05$) was found relating authority-oriented TAT scores to peer-oriented TAT scores in the N-R condition, but not in the R condition. Authority-oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationships scores also correlated significantly with a number of Outcome categories in the N-R condition: authority favorable ($r= .40$, $p<.01$), authority unfavorable ($r=-.38$, $p< .02$), peer favorable ($r=37$, $p<.02$) and peer unfavorable ($r= .52$, $p<.001$). In the R condition there was only one significant correlation and that was between authority-oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship scores and the Outcome category of peer indeterminate ($r=.31$, $p<.05$).

Table 14 shows the correlation between peer-oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship scores and authority-oriented Interpersonal Relationship scores as well as the correlations between the peer-oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship scores and TAT Outcome scores for the N-R andR groups.

Table 14 shows the significant relationship between authority-oriented TAT scores and peer-oriented scores in the

Table 13

Relationship of Authority-Oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship Scores to Peer-Oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship and TAT Outcome Scores for N-R and R Groups

	N-R (N=38)	R (N=40)
Authority-Oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship Scores with:		
Peer-Oriented TAT Scores	.34**	.11
Outcome Scores		
Authority Favorable	.40****	.14
Authority Unfavorable	-.38***	-.16
Authority Indeterminate	.01	.02
Peer Favorable	.37***	-.08
Peer Unfavorable	-.52*****	-.23
Peer Indeterminate	.07	.31**

**p< .05
***p< .02
****p< .01
*****p< .001

Table 14

Relationship of Peer-Oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship Scores to Authority-Oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship Scores and TAT Outcome Scores for N-R and R Groups

	N-R (N=38)	R (N=40)
Peer-Oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship Scores with:		
Authority-Oriented TAT Scores	.34**	.11
Outcome Scores		
Authority Favorable	.34**	.08
Authority Unfavorable	-.39***	-.20
Authority Indeterminate	.08	.13
Peer Favorable	.37***	.30**
Peer Unfavorable	-.52*****	-.41****
Peer Indeterminate	.07	.16

**p<.05
***p<.02
****p<.01
*****p<.001

N-R condition noted above in Table 13. Peer-oreinted TAT Interpersonal Relationship scores also correlated significantly with the following Outcome categories in the N-R condition: authority favorable ($r=.34$, $p<.05$), authority unfavorable ($r=-.39$, $p<.02$), peer favorable ($r=.37$, $p<.02$) and peer unfavorable ($r=.52$, $p<.001$). In the R condition there were significant correlations between peer-oriented TAT scores and two outcome categories: peer favorable ($r=30$, $p<.05$) and peer unfavorable ($r=-.41$, $p<.01$).

In sum then the data presented in this section indicates that female Ss produced significantly more positive peer-oriented responses on the TATs than did male Ss, and that the N-R consultant style produced a variety of statistically significant correlations between the various TAT measures while similar patterns did not occur for the sub-group in the R consultant style or on any of the other independent variables of this experiment.

4. Analyses of the Responses on the Personality Measures

Pearson product moment correlations were performed on the data produced by the Semantic Differentials and the personality measures, as well as the data obtained from the TATs. Significant correlations were found relating some of the scores obtained from the personality measures to the Ss ratings of the consultants on the Semantic Differential. Table 15 shows these relationships for 6 sub-groups.

Table 15

Relationship of Subjects' Scores on the Personality Measures to Subjects' Semantic Differential Ratings of Consultants for 6 Sub-Groups

Personality Measures	N-R Consultant (N=38)	R Consultant (N=40)	Male Consultant (N=38)	Female Consultant (N=40)	Male Subject (N=42)	Female Subject (N=36)
FIRO-B						
1. Expressed Inclusion	-.33**	.05	.04	-.23	-.30**	.11
2. Wanted Inclusion	-.39***	.03	.02	-.31**	-.32**	.02
3. Expressed Control	-.04	-.31**	-.16	-.10	-.12	-.20
4. Wanted Control	-.12	-.05	-.01	-.10	-.09	.001
5. Expressed Affection	-.12	-.16	-.03	-.18	-.07	-.22
6. Wanted Affection	-.29*	-.16	-.21	-.21	-.31**	-.10
FIRO-LIPHE						
Father:						
1. Inclusion Behavior	.05	-.07	.06	-.08	-.18	.16
2. Inclusion Feelings	-.15	-.03	-.05	-.10	-.26*	.15
3. Control Behavior	-.45****	.12	-.14	-.15	-.29*	.03
4. Control Feelings	-.27*	.12	.04	-.14	-.36***	.28*
5. Affection Behavior/Feelings	-.17	-.06	.05	-.22	-.29*	.15
6. Perceived Parental Approval	-.28*	.30**	-.07	.05	-.04	.06
Mother:						
1. Inclusion Behavior	-.09	-.17	-.19	-.18	-.30**	-.05
2. Inclusion Feelings	-.11	-.02	-.05	-.16	-.25	.09
3. Control Behavior	-.47****	.11	-.16	-.18	-.28*	-.03
4. Control Feelings	-.26*	.10	-.13	-.14	-.14	-.10
5. Affection Behavior/Feelings	-.09	-.05	-.07	-.15	-.23	.07
6. Perceived Parental Approval	.15	.20	.22	.14	.09	.26
Sex Stereotype	-.20	.01	.01	-.13	-.15	-.02

*p<.10
**p<.05
***p<.02
****p<.01

As can be seen in this table the N-R consultant and male subject sub-groups had a high number of significant and negative relationships when compared to the other sub-groups. Two FIRO-B scales, Expressed Inclusion (i.e., S indicates he makes efforts to be with people) and Wanted Inclusion (i.e., S indicates he wants others to include him in their activities), correlate significantly and negatively with Ss' ratings of the N-R consultants on the Semantic Differential (r_s=-.33 and -.39, respectively, $p < .05$ and $< .02$). Another FIRO-B scale, Wanted Affection (i.e., S wants others to be friendly and affectionate with him), correlates at the .10 level with ratings of N-R consultants on the same measure (r=.29).

Two FIRO-LIPHE scales, Control Behavior/father and mother (i.e., when S was a child he wanted father/mother to allow him more freedom and to allow him to think for himself), correlate negatively and at a significant level with ratings of N-R consultants on the Semantic Differential (r_s=-.45 and -.47, respectively, $p < .01$). Three other FIRO-LIPHE scales, Control Feelings/father and mother (i.e., when S was a child he wanted father/mother to have more respect for his ability to think and do things well) and Perceived Parental Approval/father (i.e., when S was a child he perceived his father as wanting him to be a better person), correlate at the .10 level with ratings of N-R consultants (r_s= -.27, -.26 and -.28 respectively).

In the R consultant sub-group the two following scales correlate at statistically significant levels with Semantic Differential ratings of consultants: Expressed Control on FIRO-B (i.e., S strives to exert control and influence over people and things) and Perceived Parental Approval/father on FIRO-LIPHE (r_s= -.31 and .30, respectively, $p<.05$). Only one of these is a negative correlation, and nearly half of the correlations for the R consultant sub-group are positive while only 2 are positive for the N-R sub-group.

For the male S sub-group, FIRO-B scales Expressed Inclusion and Wanted Inclusion, and Wanted Affection correlated significantly and negatively with Ss' Semantic Differential ratings of the Consultants (r_s= -.30, -.32 and -.32, respectively, $p<.05$).

On the FIRO-LIPHE scales male Ss have negative and significant correlations between the scales Control Feelings/father (r= -.36, $p<.02$), Inclusion Behavior/mother (i.e.,when S was a child he wanted his mother to spend more time with him and to give him more attention; r= -.30, $p<.05$) and ratings of the consultants on the Semantic Differential.

There are also four correlations at the .10 level between FIRO-LIPHE scales and ratings of consultants by the male S sub-group: Inclusion Feelings/father (i.e., when S was a child he wanted his father to feel more strongly that he was a significant person; r= -.26), Control Behavior/father and mother (r_s= -.29 and -.28, respectively), and

Affection Behavior - Feelings/father (i.e., when S was a child he wanted his father to show and feel more love and affection for him, r= -.28).

Comparisons of male to female S sub-groups in Table 15 indicates that all but one of the male S scales were negatively correlated with Semantic Differential ratings, while only 7 out of 18 were negative for female Ss. Males generally produced larger correlations than females as well, producing five significant correlations while there are none for females.

In summary, Table 15 shows that the N-R consultant and male subject sub-groups had a relatively high number of significant and negative relationships between their Semantic Differential ratings of their consultants and their personal needs as reflected on the personality measures. This means, for example, that Ss in the N-R condition who had indicated they made efforts to be with people or would like others to include them in their activities would tend to rate their consultants more negatively than Ss with similar needs in the R condition would rate their consultants. Or Ss in the N-R condition who had childhood memories of their mother and father as not allowing them enough freedom and right to think for themselves would also tend to rate their consultants more negatively than Ss with similar memories in the R condition would rate their consultants.

Comparing Ss by sex also produces a similar pattern with male Ss. For example, male Ss who indicated they wanted

to be included and wanted affection from others as well as those who felt their mother and father were over-controlling tended to rate consultants more negatively than did females with similar needs.

Finally Table 15 indicates that the measure of sex stereotypy produced no statistically significant correlations.

Significant correlations were also found relating some of the scores obtained from the personality measures to the Ss' Semantic Differential ratings of their peers. Table 16 shows these relationships for 6 sub-groups.

This table shows that the R Consultant and male subject sub-groups produced, relatively speaking, a number of large correlations. The FIRO-B scale, Expressed Inclusion, correlates in a positive and significant way with Ss' Semantic Differential ratings of their peers in the R condition ($r = .35$, $p < .02$). The FIRO-LIPHE scale, Control Feelings/mother, also correlates significantly with Ss' ratings of their peers in this condition ($r = .33$, $p < .05$), while a positive correlation at the .10 level obtains between Control Behavior/mother and ratings of peers in the R condition ($r = .27$).

Table 16 also shows that male Ss have significant positive correlations between FIRO-B scales Expressed Inclusion and Expressed Affection (i.e., S makes efforts to become personal and intimate with people) and ratings of peers ($rs = .46$ and .43, respectively, $p < .01$). For males there is also a significant positive relationship between Control Behavior/

Table 16

Relationship of Subjects' Scores on the Personality Measures to Subjects' Semantic Differential Ratings of Peers for 6 Sub-Groups

Personality Measures	N-R Consultant (N=38)	R Consultant (N=40)	Male Consultant (N=38)	Female Consultant (N=40)	Male Subject (N=42)	Female Subject (N=38)
FIRO-B						
1. Expressed Inclusion	.20	.35***	.29*	.23	.46****	.06
2. Wanted Inclusion	.04	.09	.29*	-.13	.08	.05
3. Expressed Control	-.01	-.20	-.01	-.33**	.01	-.29*
4. Wanted Control	.03	-.21	-.18	-.08	-.20	-.07
5. Expressed Affection	.32**	.03	.13	.20	.43****	.12
6. Wanted Affection	-.09	-.07	.02	-.19	.12	-.22
FIRO-LIPHE						
Father:						
1. Inclusion Behavior	-.02	.19	.20	-.03	.12	.01
2. Inclusion Feelings	-.15	.12	.21	-.22	.06	-.07
3. Control Behavior	-.22	.18	.16	-.12	.15	-.12
4. Control Feelings	-.03	.14	.30*	-.19	.18	-.08
5. Affection Behavior/Feelings	.05	.02	.23	-.22	.06	-.03
6. Perceived Parental Approval	.0002	.13	.05	.15	.14	-.002
Mother:						
1. Inclusion Behavior	-.07	-.03	-.04	.09	.08	.08
2. Inclusion Feelings	-.16	-.02	.06	-.10	.10	-.07
3. Control Behavior	-.05	.27*	.32**	.04	.32**	-.05
4. Control Feelings	-.05	.33**	.21	.16	.27*	.09
5. Affection Behavior/Feelings	-.16	-.15	-.08	-.15	.04	-.16
6. Perceived Parental Approval	.20	.009	.15	.07	.15	.05
Sex Stereotype	.02	.13	.05	.02	.28*	-.25

*$p < .10$
**$p < .05$
***$p < .02$
****$p < .01$

mother and peer ratings ($r = .32$, $p < .05$), and a positive correlation at the .10 level between Control Feelings/mother and peer ratings ($r = .27$).

Table 16 also indicates that the R consultant, male consultant and male S sub-groups have considerably fewer negative correlations between personality measures and peer ratings than the other three sub-groups. In the R consultant condition only three FIRO-LIPHE scales correlate negatively with other peer ratings, and many of the positive correlations are large in comparison to the correlations in the N-R condition, the majority of which are negative.

In the male consultant sub-group all the FIRO-LIPHE/father scales correlate positively with peer ratings while five out of the six same scales correlate negatively in the female consultant sub-group. All FIRO-LIPHE scales (both father and mother) correlate positively with peer ratings for male Ss, while eight out of 12 of the same scales for female Ss correlate negatively with peer ratings. Furthermore, males' correlations tend to be larger than females which in most instances, are near zero correlation.

Finally, Table 16 shows relatively large correlations between male and female Ss' Sex Stereotype scores and ratings of peers. There is a positive correlation between males' ratings and Sex Stereotype scores that is significant at the .10 level ($r = .28$), while females produce a negative correlation between the same measures ($r = -.25$).

In sum, Table 16 shows that in the R consultant, male consultant and male S sub-groups there are a number of positive and significant relationships between Ss personal needs and their Semantic Differential ratings of their peers. For example, there are positive and often significant relationships between Ss in these three sub-groups' wishes to be with people (Expressed Inclusion) and their ratings of their peers. Similar patterns appear on the scales that reflect their memories of their childhood relationships with their parents, i.e., Ss in the R consultant, male consultant and male S sub-groups tend to have positive and relatively large correlations between these measures and ratings of peers, while the opposite holds in the other sub-groups.

Table 16 also shows that male and female Ss have converse relationships between their Sex Stereotype scores and peer ratings.

FIRO-LIPHE scales also produced some significant relationships with authority-oriented TAT interpersonal relationship scores for some the of sub-groups, as Table 17 shows. In the N-R sub-group three FIRO-LIPHE scales, Control Behavior/mother, Control Feelings/mother and Perceived Parental Approval/mother all correlate negatively and significantly with authority-oriented TAT interpersonal relationship scores (r_s= -.49, $p<.01$; -.35, $p<.05$; and -.33, $p<.05$; respectively). Also, the correlations for this sub-group are generally larger and more often negative than those for the R subgroup

Table 17

Relationship of FIRO-LIPHE Scales for 4 Sub-groups to Authority-Oriented TAT Interpersonal Relationship Scores

FIRO-LIPHE Scales	N-R Consultant (N=38)	R Consultant (N=40)	Male Consultant (N=38)	Female Consultant (N=40)
Father:				
1. Inclusion Behavior	-.06	-.02	-.13	.04
2. Feelings	-.20	-.10	.01	-.25
3. Control Behavior	-.27*	-.07	-.14	-.18
4. Control Feelings	-.17	.03	.15	-.22
5. Affection Behavior/Feelings	-.24	-.06	-.03	-.25
6. Perceived Parental Approval	-.17	.16	.14	-.11
Mother:				
1. Inclusion Behavior	-.02	.01	-.09	.04
2. Inclusion Feelings	-.14	-.12	-.04	-.21
3. Control Behavior	-.49***	.01	-.15	-.26*
4. Control Feelings	-.35**	.002	-.07	-.30**
5. Affection Behavior/Feelings	.02	-.08	.01	-.07
6. Perceived Parental Approval	-.33**	-.04	-.04	-.29*

*$p < .10$
**$p < .05$
***$p < .01$

throughout all FIRO-LIPHE scales.

A similar pattern prevails when comparing the female consultant sub-group to the male consultant sub-group, i.e., correlations are larger (one being significant at the .05 level while two others reach the .10 level of significance) and more often negative for the female consultant sub-group.

Table 17 shows, in sum, that differences between the N-R and R sub-groups and male and female consultants' sub-groups are reflected in the correlations between authority-oriented TAT responses and Ss' recollections of their relationships with their parents. Ss in female consultant groups and Ss in the N-R condition tend, for example, to move against or away from authority in their TAT fantasies the more often they recall their parents as being overly-controlling.

Summary of the Results.

Analyses of the Tape Recordings. Consultant style effected Ss in a differential fashion. Male Ss in the R condition were found to speak more, to be more peer-oriented and to be more positive toward peers than female Ss in the R condition and male Ss in the N-R condition. In the N-R condition the opposite pattern prevailed. That is, female Ss spoke more, were more peer-oriented and more positive toward peers than male Ss in the N-R condition and female Ss in the R condition (Table 3). All the Ss spoke in a more positive fashion about male authority figures (e.g., consultants) than about female authority figures (Table 4).

Analyses of the Semantic Differential. Findings from the Semantic Differential showed that Ss perceived N-R consultants to be "stronger," less "pleasant" and more"giving" than R consultants. Ss also perceived female consultants as "stronger" and more "active" than male consultants, while female Ss saw consultants as less "giving" and less "expressive of feelings" than male Ss. Finally consultants were seen to vary as a function of their individual personality traits on four different Semantic Differential items, namely, "emotional," "flexible," "close" and "active" (Table 5).

Further analyses of Semantic Differential data showed that the personality of the consultant had a considerable impact on how Ss felt about him or her (Tables 6 and 7). The data also indicated that the style of the consultant in inter-

action with the variable of sex of consultant had a powerful effect upon how Ss experienced each other (Tables 8 and 9). The sex of the S also produced differences in Ss' ratings of each other, with female Ss feeling a good deal less positive toward peers in all conditions except the R female consultant condition where they felt the most positively toward peers (Tables 8, 9 and 10).

Two judges listened to tapes of the group session and rated the consultants on style relevant Semantic Differential items. According to these judges, consultant style differed, for the most part, according to the guidelines prescribed in the design of the experiment. However, both judges perceived significant differences between individual consultants within a particular style, and they did not always perceive the consultants assigned to a certain style as varying in similar ways (Tables 11 and 12).

Analyses of the TAT. Data derived from the TAT showed that female Ss produced significantly more positive peer-oriented responses than did male Ss. Further, the N-R consultant style produced a variety of statistically significant correlations between the various TAT measures. Similar results did not occur for the R consultant style or for any of the other independent variables (Tables 13 and 14).

Analyses of the Personality Measures. The data derived from the various instruments used to assess personality administered prior to the group experience were correlated with the

data from the Semantic Differential scales and the TATs. These analyses revealed that certain kinds of personal needs influence the manner in which Ss will respond to consultant style and consultant sex. Also sex of S often appeared to interact with personal needs to influence the way in which Ss experienced the consultant and their fellow group members as well (Tables 15, 16 and 17).

Discussion

A number of statistically significant results arose from this research though no statistically significant support was found for the four major hypotheses of this experiment which were derived from earlier work of T. M. Mills (1964).

The Effect of Sex of Subject

An outstanding and consistent finding was the difference between the two sexes taking part together in self-study group sessions. The process measures (scores derived from the taped group sessions) showed that consultants' style affected male and female Ss in different and consistent ways on three different measures (Table 3). First, women spoke more than men when the consultant was in the N-R style. Men, on the other hand, spoke more than women when the consultant was in the R mode. Second, the same pattern held when amount of peer-oriented as opposed to authority-oriented comments were analyzed. That is, females were more peer-oriented than were males when the consultant was N-R, and males were more peer-oriented than authority-oriented when the consultant was R. Third, females were more positive toward peers in the N-R condition than were males. Males, on the other hand, were more positive toward peers than females were when consultants were R.

Data from the other measures expand on these findings. TAT stories were elicited from Ss at the end of the group ex-

perience. Females were significantly higher on "moving towards" peers scores than were males though Murstein (1963) has reported that women generally produce more negatively toned TAT stories than males do. In addition on two Semantic Differential items measuring consultant style females rated consultants significantly less "giving" and significantly less "expressive of feelings" than males rated them. An explanatory hypothesis linking these findings is that female Ss have stronger affiliation needs than male Ss and when these needs are frustrated by authority figures females turn to peers to gain gratification.

This explanation is not supported by other data, however. On the Semantic Differential ratings, female Ss tended to rate peers lower than did male Ss with the exception of one group of female Ss who had R female consultants (Table 10). This group rated their peers higher than any other group. On the other hand, female Ss who had N-R female consultants rated peers a good deal lower than all other groups of Ss. The remaining two groups of female Ss, those with N-R male consultants and those with R male consultants, were relatively low in their ratings of peers. Thus three of the four groups of female Ss listed in Table 10 rated peers low and the fourth group rated them the highest.

The distinguishing characteristic of these three groups of female Ss who rated peers low, relatively speaking, appears to be that they had consultants who were not exper-

ienced as clearly reciprocating. Four of the consultants to these females were N-R as defined by the experimental design, while the two R male consultants were, first of all male, which, it could be argued, automatically reduces their chances of being perceived as reciprocating -- and there is evidence from this experiment to support that position which will be discussed below. Furthermore, one of the two R male consultants was experienced in a highly negative fashion as the Ss' rating of this consultant on the Semantic Differential show, i.e., he was rated as quite N-R by Ss according to the 11 style relevant items from the Semantic Differential (Table 5), and he also received considerably more negative ratings from the Ss in his group in their over-all evaluation of him on the Semantic Differential than did the other consultants, and the female Ss in his group were nearly twice as negative toward him as were the male Ss (Table 7).

Thus, according to the Semantic Differential, when female Ss had consultants experienced as N-R they became a good deal less positive in their ratings of their peers than did male Ss, and when the N-R consultants were female the female Ss rated their peers the least positively. On the other hand, when they had consultants who were experienced by them as R, and who were females, they became the most positive toward their peers of all the groups according to the Semantic Differential ratings (Tables 9 and 10).

These data suggest that the explanatory hypothesis

posited above must be qualified in the following manner: Females have stronger affiliation needs than males and when this need is frustrated by authority figures they turn to peers to satisfy it, and if not satisfied there they direct the consequent hostility onto peers rather than authority figures.

If this hypothesis is correct it would account for some of the seemingly contradictory results produced by the female Ss in this experiment. That females have stronger affiliation needs than males is supported by the findings on TAT stories in which females had higher "moving toward" peers scores or need for affiliation with peers scores than men and by two Semantic Differential items where females indicated they felt consultants were less "giving" and "expressive of feelings" than males did.

Other research lends support to this interpretation. Witkin, Lewis, Hertzman, Machover, Meissner & Wapner (1954) in their research on the relationships between perceptual and personality variables found females to be more field dependent than males and suggest this may be due to the more passive cultural and biological roles imposed upon the female in our society. Hartley (1959) indicates that our culture expects boys to be more independent than girls during the developmental years. Lynn (1959) postulates that the method of learning differs for boys and girls. For example, because of the availability and specificity of their model, girls learn

by "lesson," i.e., by direct imitation rather than by restructuring the field. The boy, on the other hand, learns by "method," i.e., the boy must identify the proper goal by restructuring the field and abstracting principles. The greater need for external context by girls results in their greater need for affiliation and their greater dependency according to Lynn.

Another factor which Kagan (1964) considers contributory to the greater independence of the male concerns the type of skills he is to develop, namely, gross motor skills which involve solitary practice. These kinds of skills are such that the boy does not require the reactions of others to determine whether he has reached adequate level of mastery, according to Kagan. The girl, on the other hand, in order to assess whether she is attractive, socially poised, and so on, does require feedback from others and is therefore forced to depend on other people. Both Kagan and Lynn agree that independence is manifested in greater physical as well as psychological distance from the mother. In sum, there is theoretical and empirical support for the notion that females in our culture have a greater need for affiliation than males.

If this is so then the more intense affiliation maneuvers displayed by the female Ss in the N-R condition on the process measures utilizing the tape recordings during the group sessions can be seen as attempts by females to compensate for the underlying experience of deprivation and anxiety

that the N-R consultant style induces and which they are less prepared to cope with than are male Ss. These considerations provide a basis for the part of the hypothesis which states that if the affiliation need is frustrated by authority figures they turn to peers to satisfy the need.

The following part of the hypothesis indicates that in order for the process to complete itself Ss must not be satisfied by peers. There is evidence that this is likely to happen to Ss who have N-R consultants. Harrow, et.al.(1971) have shown that a modeling process goes on in T-groups and study groups. Using Semantic Differential scales similar to the ones used in this experiment they found that when T-group members perceived trainers as more emotional or friendly, they would see their fellow T-group members similarly. The same process occurred in study groups. If Ss emulate their consultants or trainers or if Ss see their fellow group members as similar to their consultants, then it is very likely that an N-R consultant condition will produce a situation where Ss seeking affiliation will be frustrated not only by consultants but by their fellow group members as well.

The final part of the hypothesis states that there will be hostility from females consequent to this frustration and that it will be directed to peers rather than to authority figures. Tables 7, 9 and 10 show that the Semantic Differential ratings support this notion. Males and females did not differ in their ratings of consultants (Table 7), but females

were significantly less positive (or more hostile) toward peers than were males, particularly in the N-R consultant conditions (Tables 9 and 10). Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, Sears, Ford, Hovland & Sollenberger's (1939) work on the frustration-aggression hypothesis found that frustration often leads to hostility and/or aggression. Further, if the agent responsible for the frustration is inaccessible as an object of attack (as an authority figure might well be) due to conflicting response tendencies, then the hostility will be directed onto another more accessible object. It seems that this is the process that occurred with the Ss in this experiment, with the qualification that it happened more intensely to females than to males, and was due to females' more intense affiliation needs and consequent greater sense of frustration in an N-R consultant condition.

Data from male Ss also seemed to fall into several consistent patterns. As mentioned earlier, the ratings from the tape recordings showed that males were much more verbally active and peer-oriented, and positively so, when consultants were in an R mode than when in an N-R mode. This difference might be explained by the fact that Ss, both male and female, perceived N-R consultants as significantly "stronger" and significantly more "unpleasant" than R consultants according to the style-relevant items from the Semantic Differential (Table 5). Thus males in the N-R situation may fantasize that the "strong" and "unpleasant" N-R authority figures are

going to punish them if they're too active and positive toward their peers, among whom were females. This state of affairs may leave more room for females to be active in the N-R situation or the females may feel safer to speak out and approach peers, fantasizing that they have the "stronger" N-R consultant there to protect them from the male Ss. This process would act in conjunction with their affiliation needs. That is, not only would female Ss feel a greater need for affiliation in the N-R condition as discussed above, but also they would be more able to speak out as a result of relative male inactivity and the females' fantasies of consultant potency.

Correlations between various measures also highlighted some patterns of the male Ss. Relative to the female Ss, males produced a high number of negative and significant correlations between their ratings of the consultants on the Semantic Differential and their scores on the personality measures and a high number of positive and significant correlations between their ratings of their peers on the Semantic Differential and their scores on the personality measures. In both instances the significant correlations tended to occur on scales measuring similar needs (Tables 15 and 16). For instance, on the FIRO-B scale Expressed Inclusion, which measures the S's wish to include others in his activities, males produced a -.30 correlation between this need and their ratings of consultants on the Semantic Differential ($p < .05$).

The correlation between the same need and male Ss' ratings of their peers on the Semantic Differential was .46 ($p < .01$). It appears that when male Ss were high on need to be with others they rated the consultant negatively and their fellow group members positively. Female Ss did not produce similar or consistent patterns on any of these measures.

The Effect of Sex of Consultant

The variable of consultant sex also had a significant impact in this experiment. The peer ratings on the Semantic Differentials show that when consultants were N-R and female, both male and female Ss were much less positive toward peers than were Ss in the other groups for the most part, particularly in comparison to the N-R male consultant groups (Table 9). Also the analyses of correlations reveal that a higher incidence of negative correlations appeared for Ss in female consultant groups than for Ss in male consultant groups. Ss produced more negative correlations between their ratings of peers and their personality needs when consultants were female than when they were male (Table 16). The same pattern prevails when the correlations between FIRO-LIPHe scales and authority-oriented TAT interpersonal relationship scores are examined (Table 17).

The question arises as to why do female consultants evoke these patterns and not male consultants, and, as the Semantic Differential peer ratings show, why are Ss less positive toward each other when the consultant is N-R and female?

If the notion that male authority figures (e.g., fathers) in our culture are expected to be more impersonal and less nuturant than female authority figures (e.g., mothers) is accepted, then it stands to reason that Ss, male and female alike, would feel more deprived by exclusively task-oriented female authority figures like N-R female consultants than exclusively task oriented male authority figures like N-R male consultants, and, as a result of the deprivation or frustration, would act out their hostility. According to the Semantic Differential ratings it appears to have been displaced onto peers as reasoned earlier in this discussion.

It is also consistent with the earlier discussion on females' higher need for affiliation than men that females would experience this deprivation more intensely than men, as data in Table 9 show they do, if lower ratings of peers are accepted as an indicator of feelings of deprivation.

An alternative explanation is that the N-R style, regardless of consultant sex, produces these less positive peer ratings. The reason the effect was not obtained in the N-R male consultant condition would be that these consultants were not N-R enough. Support for this reasoning comes from two sources: First, the judges' ratings of consultants' styles wherein judges perceived N-R male consultants as a good deal more reciprocating than the N-R female consultants (Table 11). However, it is also possible that the male judges were also influenced by sex of consultants in the same fash-

ion that Ss might have been; i.e., an N-R woman is experienced by a male judge as much more N-R than a N-R man is because the woman violates cultural expectations while the latter does not. Second, the Semantic Differential ratings of one of the R male consultants indicates he was actually experienced as N-R by the Ss (Tables 5 and 7). The Ss in this consultant's group also rated peers a good deal less positively than most other groups (Table 9). Thus the effect of negative feelings toward peers may be due only to consultant style, i.e., a "true" N-R style rather than an interaction between consultant style and consultant sex.

Even if the latter reasoning is accepted however, there still is a good deal of data which support the notion that similar consultant behavior is experienced in a different fashion by Ss as the sex of the consultant varies. For instance, some of the style-relevant variables from the Semantic Differential sustain this notion (Table 5). R male consultants were perceived by the Ss as being far less "active" than the other consultants, while R female consultants were seen as a good deal more "active" than all other consultants. This indicates that when males in authority take on an R mode they are seen as more passive than R female authority figures, who are seen in a more sex-congruent and therefore more positive light (i.e., as active).

There were also significant main effects on the variable of sex of consultant for the items "active" and "strong,"

Female consultants were seen as significantly more "active" and significantly "stronger" than male consultants, which suggests that when a woman takes on the role of an authority figure she is endowed with more strength and activity than when a male occupies the same position. This "endowment" process may help explain why positions of authority are not as easily attained by women in our culture as they are by men. That is, women in authority may be seen as too strong and too active -- perhaps overwhelmingly so -- for the comfort of most people and thus authority is less apt to be delegated to a woman.

The variables "warm" and "friendly" produce interaction effects which lend further support at the .10 level of significance to the notion that similar consultant behavior is experienced in a different fashion by Ss as a function of consultant sex. N-R female consultants were seen as the least "warm" of all consultants while N-R male consultants were seen as the most "warm." N-R female consultants were perceived as the least "friendly" of all consultants while N-R male consultants were seen as moderately "friendly."

The analyses of the tape recordings produced congruent data. As Table 4 shows, overall, male authority figures were responded to in a significantly more positive fashion by all Ss, both male and female, than were female authority figures. In sum, there is a good deal of evidence to support the notion that male and female authority figures are often exper-

ienced according to their gender rather than their skill or competence in performing a particular task. Specifically, when men in authority take on an R style they are seen in a less positive light than women in authority behaving in the same manner. When women take positions of authority they appear to be perceived as more powerful than men in the same position, and furthermore, when in an authority position in an N-R style, women appear to be endowed with more negative, threatening characteristics than when male authority figures act in a similar fashion.

The Effects and the Effectiveness of the Manipulation of Consultants' Style

In research of this sort the matter of the effectiveness of the experimental manipulation of consultant style has to be examined. Were there two separate styles, and did they vary as prescribed in the guidelines set down in the experimental design? According to the analyses of variance of the judges' ratings of consultants on the 11 style-relevant items from the Semantic Differential, there were two different styles and the difference was highly significant ($p < .001$, Table 11). The mean ratings by judges indicate some disagreement between judges in their ratings of individual consultants (Table 12). Judge 1, for example, saw one of the two N-R male consultants as relatively N-R and the other N-R male consultant as fairly R, while Judge 2 rated the same two consultants in a reverse fashion. However, these differences in

ratings of consultants within style (the A X C interaction) were not statistically significant (Table 11). In sum, according to the judges who rated the consultants of this experiment, the style differences occurred for the most part in accordance with the guidelines set down in the design of the experiment.

On the other hand, the Ss' ratings of the consultants on the 11 style-relevant items from the Semantic Differential (Table 5) and their summed ratings of consultants on the full 26 items from the Semantic Differential (Table 7) do not support the position that there were indeed two distinct styles used by consultants. One of the R male consultants, for example, was experienced in a very "cold" and "non-giving" fashion, traits expected to be attributed to N-R consultants if style had been experienced as anticipated. On the full 26 item Semantic Differential scale there was little breakdown of Ss' ratings of consultants according to expectation. The majority of the consultants were rated in a negative fashion (Table 7). This might indicate then that the style variable did not 'take' as far as Ss were concerned. However, the various findings reported in the results section and discussed here indicate that style did indeed affect the Ss' responses.

First, the results from the tape recordings clearly show that style, in interaction with S sex, created significant differences in the verbal behavior of Ss (Table 3). Second,

style, again in interaction with a second variable -- consultant sex, effected to a significant degree Ss' ratings of peers on the Semantic Differential (Table 9). Significant differences between the two consultant styles also showed up on three of the style-relevant items from the Semantic Differential(Table 5). N-R consultants were seen as "stronger," less "pleasant" and more "giving" than R consultants. The latter finding, that N-R consultants were seen as significantly more "giving" than R consultants, is surprising and may well be used to argue that consultants did not differ as prescribed. However, there is reason to believe that the difference on this variable may have been an artifact of a possible contradiction in the guidelines forced by nature of the self-study goals. R consultants were instructed to take on a "giving" (i.e., reciprocating) attitude or style, but they were also instructed not to provide answers to the Ss, and if necessary to state this to the Ss. This may have created a situation where R consultants were experienced as pretending to give, i.e., they looked "giving" but refused, sometimes in a direct fashion, to give (e.g., information and advice) when asked to. N-R consultants, on the other hand, were instructed to neither look or be giving. Thus the R consultants may have been consciously experienced as non-giving while this never became, at least overtly, as great an issue with the N-R consultants.

The effect of consultant style was also reflected in the correlations obtained between the various measures used in this experiment. For example, a number of significant correlations between the various TAT measures appeared for the N-R style but not for the R mode (Tables 13 and 14). Part of this is due to the fact that certain TAT scores are not indepedent of each other. For example, an authority oriented Interpersonal Relationship score, which is a measure of the quality of the interaction between the people of the story, would stand a good chance of correlating with one of the two Outcome measures, Authority Favorable or Authority Unfavorable. However, in spite of this lack of independence, this did not happen in the R mode to the same intensity as in the N-R mode. Furthermore, there is no obvious reason why authority oriented Interpersonal Relationship scores should correlate significantly with peer oriented Interpersonal Relationship scores or peer Outcome scores (Table 13) or why peer oriented Interpersonal Relationship scores should correlate significantly with authority Outcome scores (Table 14), and yet they did in the N-R condition. Thus it appears that the N-R style had an impact on the Ss' fantasy life in such a way as to create very definite patterns in their fantasy productions, while the R condition does not induce such clear delineations.

The N-R style also affected the relationship between authority-oriented interpersonal relationship scores and

FIRO-LIPHE scales in a different fashion than the R style did (Table 17). In the N-R style, ratings were more often negative, and again, several reached significant levels, whereas the same did not happen in the R mode. Apparently the N-R style has an impact on Ss' needs measured by these scales that the R style does not have, and furthermore, this impact is intense enough that it shows up in the fantasy life of the S as reflected in his or her TAT productions.

The style variable induced relatively strong relationships between various personality scales and Ss' ratings of consultants and peers on the Semantic Differential as Tables 15 and 16 show. The relationship between Ss' ratings of N-R consultants and the personality measures were almost entirely negative and several were significant at high levels (Table 15) while the R style had somewhat the opposite impact on the relationships between personality measures and ratings of peers on the Semantic Differential; they were mainly positive and two were significant at the .05 level and a third at the .10 level (Table 16.)

In sum, there is a good deal of evidence which shows that a variation in style actually occurred, that it followed the prescriptions laid down in the experimental design, and that style variations had definite impacts on the dependent variables. There is also evidence that Ss did not consciously or directly experience the style differences in as clear-cut a fashion as had been anticipated. Yet the more indirect

measures of Ss' responses to consultants' style, such as the ratings from the tape recordings, Ss' ratings of peers on the Semantic Differentials, and correlations between the various measures indicate that differential styles were in effect in this experiment.

Future research must be aimed at clarifying the basis of this descrepancy between direct and indirect measures of the style variable. For example, how N-R does a consultant have to be in order to be directly experienced as such? Evidence from this experiment seems to indicate that males have to be more vigorously N-R than females to be even indirectly reacted to as N-R. How much more N-R and what are the traits that males need to assume to clearly establish the effect?

Further Considerations

Mills' (1963) theory and findings on the dynamics that obtain between group leaders and group members were not confirmed. In fact, this experiment produced evidence contrary to his. On the Semantic Differential ratings of peers, female Ss in the N-R female consultant condition with a mean score of -10.38 were significantly less positive toward their peers than female Ss in the R female consultant condition with a mean rating of peers of 29.50 (Table 10), opposite to the prediction of hypothesis IIa of this experiment which states, "in subject-subject situations, responses of Ss in the N-R condition who are the same sex as the consultant will be more positive than responses of Ss in the R condition who are the

same sex as the consultant."

There are, however, crucial differences between this experiment and Mills' experiment that may help account for the differing results. First, the Ss in Mills' experimental groups were always of the same sex while only sex of the authority figure varied. In this experiment, groups were sexually mixed, i.e., both males and females comprised group membership. Second, Mills had two Ss to a group whereas the average number of Ss in the groups of this experiment was 10. Third, length of group experience varied. Mills' groups met for 32 hours over a six-week period, whereas the Ss in this experiment met formally as a study group for six hours out of the 10½ hour period that the experiment covered. The remainder of the time they were together as a group responding to research instruments or having coffee together.

This variable of length of group experience, in theory at least, ought to have profound effects on the results achieved in research of this sort. For instance, Mills' "ideal sequence" makes it clear that Ss will change in their attitudes and feelings toward each other and toward the consultant as a function of the stage of interaction they are in. Mills does not indicate, however, at what time point in the life of the group Ss will be experiencing which specific feelings. Furthermore, Yalom (1970) indicates that such specificity is impossible and cites support of his position

(e.g., Bennis, Burke, Cutter, Harrington and Hoffman, 1957). According to Yalom, phases of a group emerge, become dominant, and then recede, only to have the group return later to deal with the same issues with greater thoroughness. Bennis and Shephard (1956) also indicate that there are a variety of factors that may impede or stop group development completely; e.g., an absence of strong, independent group members capable of bringing about the events that precipitate movement.

The Ss in this experiment may not have arrived at or passed through -- and might return to at a later point in time -- the stage of development Mills' Ss were at when his research measures were obtained. These processes may well account for some of the differences between the groups in this experiment, i.e., groups were developing at different paces and arriving at similar stages at different times. The independent variables may not have been the only determining variables in this experiment, but rather a fourth variable, stage of group development may be designated. This latter variable may have been interacting with the identified experimental variables to produce the results. For example, consultant style and consultant sex may interact with stage of development in very specific ways. Here is an issue for future research.

Furthermore, the N-R style of this experiment may have particularly different effects at different points in the life of a group because of its non-traditional characteris-

tics with respect to relating to people. Toward the start of a group experience it may induce certain reactions. As Ss become more experienced or "used to" the style and work through their feelings about it, they might find it more conducive to productive work than other styles would be and more generative of positive feelings in group members. Mills "ideal sequence" suggests, in fact, that the N-R style will, "ultimately," induce more solidarity amongst group members (contingent upon sex composition) than any other style. The meaning of "ultimately," will have to be explored in more depth by considerable research effort.

The issue of naive versus experienced Ss must also be dealt with. Most of the Ss in this experiment were relatively naive with regard to group experience, and particularly naive about the Tavistock approach (with the exception of two Ss, most of whose data has not been included in the analyses). Experienced Ss might have reacted quite differently. Quality of prior experience might also be an important variable. That is, Ss who have been intensely involved in personal growth inducing encounter groups or action oriented groups might react differently than Ss who have had experience in Tavistock type groups. In sum, the limited length of this group experience and the naivete' of the Ss involved limits the generalizability of the findings of this experiment.

The Relevance of this Research

This research has shown that the variables of sex and style of consultant or leader are indeed important variables operating in small groups. Up to now these variables have not been emphasized in experimental work. Bills (1964), for example, indicates that group members feelings toward each other can be significantly influenced by the sex of the group authority figure. However, he worked with two member groups thus severely limiting the generalizability of these findings to the more typical larger group situations now so much a part of applied psychology. The present research indicates that the sex of the authority figure frequently in interaction with other variables like his or her style has an important impact on group experiences. Sex of group members has also been shown to be an important determining variable, and one that also interacts in complex ways with other variables like sex and style of the group consultant.

In light of the often recognized complexity and irrationality that characterize group functioning (e.g., Bion, 1962) the clear indication through experimental methods of the above-mentioned variables as powerful influencers of group processes ought to be helpful to group practitioners and researchers of all persuasions.

References

Bennis, W., Burke, R., Cutter, H., Harrington, H. & Hoffman, J. A note on some problems of measurement and prediction in a training group. Group Psychotherapy, 1957, 10, 328-341.

Bennis, W. G. & Shephard, H. A. A theory of group development. Human Relations, 1956, 9, 415-437.

Bion, W. R. Learning from Experience. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Blake, R. R. Studying group action. In Bradford, L. P., Gibb, J. R., & Benne, K. D. (Eds.), T Group Theory and Laboratory Method, New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Bolman, L. Some effects of trainers on their T-Groups. The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. 1971,7,309-325.

Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S., & Vogel, S. R. Sex-role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1970, 34, 1-7.

Dollard, J., Doob, L. W., Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H., Sears, R. R., Ford, C. S., Hovland, C. I. & Sollenberger, R. T. Frustration and Aggression, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1939.

Eron, L. D. A normative study of the Thematic Apperception Test. Psychological Monograph, 1950, 65 (Whole No. 315).

Fine, R. A scoring scheme for the TAT and other verbal projective techniques. Journal of Projective Techniques, 1955, 19, 306-316.

Harrow, M., Astrachan, B. M., Tucker, G. J., Klein, E. B., & Miller, J. C. The T-group and study group laboratory experiences. Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 85, 225--233.

Hartley, R., Sex role pressures and socialization of the male child. Psychological Reports, 1959, 5, 457-467.

Horwitz, L. Transference in training groups and therapy groups. The International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1964, 2, 202-213.

Kagen, J. Acquisition and significance of sex typing and sex role identity. In Hoffman, M.L. & Hoffman, L.W.(Eds.) Review of Child Development Research, Vol.2, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1964.

Katz, E. A content-analytic method for studying themes of inter-personal behavior. Psychological Bulletin, 1965, 66, 419-422.

Klapman, J. W. Group Psychotherapy: Theory and Practice. New York: Grune & Stratton, 1946.

Klein, E. B. & Astrachan, B. M. Learning in groups. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, (in press).

Lewin, K. Field Theory in Social Science, New York: Harper, 1951

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R. & White, R. K. Patterns of Aggressive behavior in experimentally created 'social climates.' Journal of Social Psychology. 1939, 10, 271-299.

Lieberman, M. A., Yalom, I. D. & Miles, M. B. Encounter Groups: First Facts, New York: Basic Books, Inc. (in press).

Lynn, D. B. Sex differences in masculine and feminine identification. Psychological Review, 1959, 66, 126-135.

Mills, T. M. Authority and group emotion. In Bennis, W. G. et. al., Interpersonal Dynamics, Homewood, Ill.:Dorsey, 1964, 94-108.

Murstein, B. Theory and research in projective techniques. New York: J. Wiley and Sons, 1963.

Sansolo, J. Trainer style and group reaction: an analysis of trainer comments in T-groups and its relation to the learning and satisfaction of group members. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1969.

Schein, E. H. & Bennis, W. G. Personal and Organizational Change Through Group Methods: The Laboratory Approach. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1965.

Schutz, W. The Interpersonal Underworld. Palo Alto, Calif.: Science and Behavior Books, 1966.

Slavson, S. R. An Introduction to Group Psychotherapy. New York: Commonwealth Fund, 1943.

Singer, J., & Goldman, A. Experimentally contrasted social atmospheres in group psychotherapy with chronic schizophrenics. Journal of Social Psychology, 1954, 40, 23-37.

Waxenberg, S. E., Strachstein, H., Leff, J., Laufer, G. L. & Bamberger, H. Leadership style: interaction and group climate. Psychotherapy, Theory Research & Practice. 1965, 2, 164-168.

Whitman, R. M. Psychodynamic principles underlying T-group processes. In Bradford, L. P., Gibb, J. R., & Benne, K. D. (Eds.), T-Group Theory and Laboratory Method. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1964.

Winer, B. J. Statistical Principles in Experimental Design. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company. 1962.

Witkin, H. A., Lewis, H. B., Hertzman, M., Mackover, K., Meissner, P. B. & Wapner, S. Personality through Perception. New York: Harper, 1954.

Yalom, I. D. The Theory and Practice of Group Psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1970.

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

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Subject Recruitment Flyer

FREE

INTENSIVE ONE DAY STUDY GROUP WORKSHOPS

(lunch money provided)

Weekends (Saturdays and Sundays) from the middle of March to the end of April and during the Spring recess, April 3rd to April 9th, at the Psychological Center, The City College of New York.

A group of students and faculty at the City University of New York under the direction of Dr. Laurence Gould, are currently conducting an extensive research program on the assessment and evaluation of various group exercises. This announcement will discuss one type of workshop to be offered in connection with this program, a series of intensive one day Study Group workshops.

We are offering these workshops at no charge since the evaluation and assessment of the experience will require some additional time (approximately two and a half hours) from the participants. That is, we are offering participants a free one day group experience (e.g. 9 a.m. to 7:30 p.m.) in return for which they will be expected to give us two and a half hours of their time for evaluation purposes, one hour prior to the group experience and one hour and a half after the group experience. We are also able to give participants $1 for lunch expenses on the day of the workshop.

It is important to note that these workshops are NOT experimental. They will be conducted in exactly the same manner as comparable workshops offered on a regular basis for a fee. In view of this, we would like to stress the following: THE EVALUATION PROCEDURES IN WHICH YOU WILL BE ASKED TO PARTICIPATE WILL NOT INTERFERE WITH THE WORKSHOP EXPERIENCE. EVERY PARTICIPANT IS GUARANTEED A COMPLETE, ANANYMOUS AND UNOBSERVED WORKSHOP. However, some sessions will be tape-recorded for later evaluation purposes. Anonymity will still be maintained in that only two judges will listen to and rate the tapes in an anonymous fashion. The tapes will then be erased.

THE PRIMARY TASK: The primary task of these workshops will be to provide members with opportunities for learning and

increased awareness of group processes or social systems. In families, classrooms, work meetings and social situations, group processes are always operating. These workshops will focus in particular on understanding covert processes which operate in groups and often hinder effective decision-making and competent functioning by individuals and the group as a whole.

FOCUS: The focus of the study is upon groups rather than upon individual personalities. The workshops emphasize this perspective in order to facilitate an understanding of groups like families, institutions, organizations and communities. Thus the workshops are conceived of as opportunities for intensive learning; they are not geared towards providing a therapeutic experience. This emphasis is one of the principle differences between the approach of these workshops and those of T-Groups and Encounter Groups. Anybody having experienced the latter type groups is eligible for these workshops. Anybody having experienced Study Groups before (described in more detail below) is not eligible.

Throughout the workshop special attention will be paid to the covert processes which operate in and among groups, such as unspoken attitudes and unnoticed behavior patterns. Since such processes may hinder the work of groups, greater understanding and heightened awareness of them may lead to more effective action.

The workshops are open-ended in the sense that there is no attempt to prescribe what anyone shall learn, however, the intent is that, as a result of learning at the workshop and later reflection upon it, the members will be capable of more responsible leadership and followership. Thus they will be able to form and participate more effectively in groups.

EVENTS: The major vehicle for learning in these workshops will be the Study Group. There will also be one Application and Review Session.

1. The Study Group consists of about ten to fourteen members. The task of the group is to study its own behavior in the "here and now." Each member has the opportunity to examine group processes as they unfold, to study the effects of his behavior upon others, and to study the effects of their behavior upon himself. The Study Group also provides opportunities for members to try out different ways of establishing relationships and different interpersonal problem solving techniques. Each group has the services of a consultant whose task it is to help the group to examine its own behavior. He will intervene only when he believes he can facilitate the learning of the group.
2. The task of the Application and Review Session is to con-

sider the relevance of the workshop learning to the participants' own life and work settings.

If you are interested in attending a one-day workshop please fill out this form and return it either to the person who gave it to you or mail it to:

Dr. Laurence Gould
Psychological Center
3332 Broadway
New York, New York 10031

Name_____ Address_____
Telephone_____Sex____Age____School_____Year___

I understand that I will be required to give a few hours of my time for research purposes. I know that I will NOT be available to attend a workshop on the following Saturdays and Sundays from the middle of March to the end of April____. I know now that I will NOT be available to attend a workshop on these days of the week of April 4th to Arpil 9th_____.

Appendix B

Demographic Questionnaire

CODE_____

In order to be able to identify the participants in this study and, at the same time, to insure anonymity, we would appreciate it if you would put a code in the above space. This code should consist of an "M" or "F" for your sex, followed by the number of the month of your birth, followed by the initial of your mother's first name and finally followed by the initial of your father's first name. Please use this code on all following evaluation forms whenever "code" or "name" is asked for.

1. GENERAL INFORMATION:

Major_____Year in school_____Age____

Number of brothers_____Ages of brothers_____ _____ _____

Number of sisters_____Ages of sisters _____ _____ _____

Do you live at home? Yes__ No __

If no, do you live with: roommates__
spouse__ alone__

Do you work? Yes__ No __

If yes, what type of job do you have?

_____

How many hours a week do you work, on the average?_____

Briefly list your previous experience in Sensitivity Training or Human Relations Groups, if any:

1. None__ 2. H.P.A., beginner__, advanced__, student assist__
3. Ricorso__ 4. Psych.Sc__, Consultant(s) name_____
5. Group Therapy__ 6. Other_____

CODE_____

II. Please rank the following in order of priority of importance to you with respect to your expectations of the workshop. Put the number 1 next to the item you most want to achieve from this experience, and continue numbering in order of diminishing importance.

____learn more about the functioning of groups

____become more effective in groups

____develop greater self-awareness

____develop leadership skills

____be able to form more meaningful relationships with people as a result of the experience

____to meet more people, or a group of people, whom I feel I might be able to share more with

____help me deal with some specific personal problems

____other; explain_____

Short Form of the Sex-Role Questionnaire

We would like to know something about what people expect other people to be like. Imagine that you are going to meet someone for the first time, and the only thing that you know in advance is that he is an adult male. What sort of things would you expect? For example, what would you expect about his liking or disliking of the color red? On each scale, please put a slash (/) and the letter "M" above the slash according to what you think an adult male is like.

For example:

Strong dislike for the color red	1....2....3....4....5.../.6....7 (M above slash)	Strong liking for the color red

On the following pages are a number of scales like the one above. Please place a slash and the letter "M" above the slash according to what you expect an adult male to be like. You may put your slash anywhere on the scale, not just at the numbers. PLEASE BE SURE TO MARK EVERY ITEM. Start with the example below.

Very interested in athletics	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Not at all interested in athletics

1.	Not at all aggressive	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very aggressive
2.	Not at all independent	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very independent
3.	Not at all consistent	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very consistent
4.	Very emotional	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Not at all emotional
5.	Very realistic	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Not at all realistic
6.	Does not hide emotions at all	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Almost always hides emotions
7.	Very subjective	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very objective
8.	Always thinks before acting	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Never thinks before acting
9.	Not at all easily influenced	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very easily influenced
10.	Not at all talkative	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very talkative

11. Very dominant	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very submissive
12. Dislikes math and science very much	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Likes math and science very much
13. Not at all reckless	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very reckless
14. Not at all excitable in a major crisis	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very excitable in a major crisis
15. Not at all excitable in a minor crisis	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very excitable in a minor crisis
16. Very active	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very passive
17. Not at all able to devote self completely to others	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Able to devote self completely to others
18. Very blunt	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very tactful

19. Very gentle	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Very rough
20. Very helpful to others	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Not at all helpful to others
21. Not at all competive	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Very competive
22. Very logical	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Very illogical
23. Very worldly	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Very home oriented
24. Not at all skilled in business	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Very skilled in business
25. Very direct	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Very sneaky
26. Knows the way of the world	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Does not know the way of the world
27. Feelings not easily hurt	1....2....3....4....5....6....7	Feelings easily hurt

28. Not at all adventurous	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very adventurous
29. Very aware of the feelings of others	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Not at all aware of the feelings of others
30. Not at all religious	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very religious
31. Not at all interested in own appearance	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very interested in own appearance
32. Can make decisions easily	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Has difficulty making decisions
33. Gives up very easily	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Never gives up easily
34. Never cries	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Cries very easily
35. Almost never acts as a leader	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Almost always acts as a leader
36. Never worried	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Always worried

37. Very neat in habits	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very sloppy in habits
38. Very quiet	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very loud
39. Not at all self-confident	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very self-confident
40. Feels very superior	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Feels very inferior
41. Not at all uncomfortable about being aggressive	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very uncomfortable about being aggressive
42. Very little need for security	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very strong need for security
43. Not at all ambitious	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very ambitious
44. Able to separate feelings from ideas	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Unable to separate feelings from ideas
45. Not at all dependent	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very dependent
46. Does not enjoy art and literature at all	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Enjoys art and literature very much

47. Seeks out new experience	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Avoids new experience
48. Not at all restless	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Very restless
49. Easily expresses tender feelings	1.....2.....3.....4... .5.....6.....7	Does not express tender feelings easily
50. Very conceited about appearance	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Never conceited about appearance
51. Retiring	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Forward
52. Thinks men are superior to women	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Does not think men are superior to women
53. Very assertive	1.....2.....3.....4.....5.....6.....7	Not at all assertive

Now we would like you to go through these same scales for a second time. Again imagine that you are meeting a person for the first time, and the only information you have is that she is an adult female. This time, please put a slash on each scale according to what you would expect an adult female to be like. Put the letter "f" above your second slash on each scale.

PLEASE BE SURE TO MARK EVERY ITEM

Appendix D

FIRO-B

Please Note:

Pages 120-121, Appendix D: "FIRO-B," Copyright 1957 by William C. Schutz and pages 122-125, Appendix E: "LIPHE-FIRO Scale," copyright 1962 by William C. Schutz, not microfilmed at request of author. Available for consultation at The City University of New York Library.

University Microfilms.

Appendix F

Contract and Schedule

Group Relations Workshop
City College Psychological Center

Your Consultant for this workshop is _____ _____.

The primary task of this workshop is to study the dynamics of group life as they occur. The workshop is therefore designed to provide opportunities for you, the members, to experience and examine what forces are brought to bear on you when you take various roles and confront various dilemmas in group situations.

You will have the opportunity, for example, to learn what it feels like to be, and how to behave as both leaders and followers, and to experience the conflicts that may arise in yourself and others in these roles. In short, the basic workshop method is to construct a situation in which conventional defenses against recognizing or acting upon various interpersonal feelings and group processes are reduced. This permits an examination of the covert processes at work. That is, the workshop is set up to provide the time and opportunity to study group processes and your participation in them as they occur. This study is facilitated by spending the better part of the day together, relatively free from outside distractions or other pressures, by the fact that what happens here is confidential, and finally, by not having any agenda other than that of self-study and no prescribed roles. (There is a research agenda added to this workshop. Therefore the above applies to the workshop proper, excluding the research aspects.)

The design and method is aimed at lowering the barriers to the expression of feelings both friendly and unfriendly; of providing opportunities for a continuous check on one's own feelings, and for comparing them with those of others for given situations. Or, to put it another way, it is to check fantasy against reality. What this means in practice is that the anxiety of learning is enhanced and that the ways in which anxiety is generated and controlled become part of the learning opportunity. The workshop from this perspective is conceived of than as providing an intensive opportunity for learning - it is not geared toward providing a therapeutic experience, and the consultants will not address themselves to analyses or interpretations of individual behavior.

The role of the consultants is to facilitate the work of the various self-study events in the "here and now." Consultants

will do this by commenting on what is occurring if they feel that it will help the group in its work. They will, as best they can, address themselves to this task and to no other. That is, the consultant will stay in role and maintain the boundaries of events by entering and leaving on time. The role of the consultant then, is not to teach or lead in the conventional sense, but rather to provide learning opportunities and to facilitate your work. Your roles, as members, are to avail yourselves of these opportunities as you see fit and to learn in your own way and at your own pace. Your behavior is in no way prescribed, and you have the responsibility for your own learning.

To briefly summarize - how this workshop is designed, how it is managed, and how competently the staff carry out their roles are all parts of the situation in which learning can take place. Everything that happens in this workshop, therefore, whether by design or accident, is material for study.

SCHEDULE

Time	Activity
9:00-10:00	Introduction and administration of research questionnaires
10:00-11:30	Study Group 1
11:30-11:45	Coffee break
11:45-1:15	Study Group 2
1:15-2:15	Lunch break
2:15-3:45	Study Group 3
3:45-4:00	Coffee break
4:00-5:30	Study Group 4
5:30-6:30	Administration of research questionnaires
6:30-7:00	" " "
7:00-7:30	Application and review session

Appendix G

TAT Instructions and Test Blanks

CODE_____

GROUP RESEARCH PROJECT

INSTRUCTIONS: You will be shown ten pictures. For each of the ten pictures we would like you to write a story including the following:

1. What has led up to the situation shown?
2. What is happening at the moment?
3. Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?
4. What are the participants feeling and thinking?
5. What will happen subsequently?

This is not a test in any sense---there are no correct answers. Please try to work spontaneously and quickly. Five minutes will be given for each story.

PICTURE #1

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

PICTURE #2

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

PICTURE #3

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

PICTURE #4

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

PICTURE #5

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

PICTURE #6

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

PICTURE #7

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

PICTURE #8

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

PICTURE #9

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

PICTURE #10

What has led up to the situation shown?

What is happening at the moment?

Who are the participants and what are their relationships to each other?

What are the participants feeling and thinking?

What will happen subsequently?

Appendix H

Semantic Differential for Rating Consultants and Other Group Members

CODE_____

The purpose of this questionnaire is to elicit information concerning the ways in which you perceived 1) the consultant, and 2) the group members (other than yourself) during the workshop.

INSTRUCTIONS

You are to first rate the consultant, and second, the other group members, against a series of descriptive scales.

Here are some examples of how you are to use the scales:

Suppose you are using a scale which runs from POWERFUL to WEAK, like this:

powerful __:__:__:__:__:__:__: weak

If you feel that the consultant (in the first rating), or the other group members (in the second rating) are very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your "X" as follows:

powerful __:__:__:__:__:__:X_: weak

If you feel that the consultant (or the group) is quite closely related to one or another end of the scale (but not extremely) you should place your "X" as follows: (say in this case the scale runs from VALUABLE to WORTHLESS)

valuable __:X_:__:__:__:__:__: worthless

or

valuable __:__:__:__:__:X_:__: worthless

If the consultant (or the group) seems somewhat related to one side as opposed to another (but not too closely), you

CODE_____

you should make your "X" as follows: (Suppose this time the scale goes from ACTIVE to PASSIVE.)

active __:__:__:X_:__:__.__. passive

or

active __;X_:__:__:__:__:__: passive

The direction which you check depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seems most characteristic of what you are judging. If you consider the proper rating to be neutral on the scale -- that is, both sides of the scale are equally associated with what you are rating, then put your "X" in the middle space, like this:

clear __:__:__:X_:__:__:__: hazy

THERE ARE NO RIGHT OR WRONG ANSWERS.

WORK RAPIDLY: Don't puzzle over individual scales, or worry about being consistent in your judgments. Often a vague general impression will be all you have on which to base your ratings. In some cases you may doubt that a certain scale is applicable, but you should be able to make the decision quite easily if you work quickly and rely on your first impression.

Please be sure to place one, and only one, mark (X) on each scale. Do not omit any.

IMPORTANT: Place your mark in the spaces, not on the boundaries.

DO THIS

__:__:X_:__:__:__:__:

NOT THIS

__:__:__:__:__:__X__:

CODE_____

Concept to be Rated:

THE CONSULTANT

emotional	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unemotional
flexible	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	rigid
suspicious of others	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	trusts others
superficial understanding	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	deep understanding
expresses feelings	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	feelings guarded
not aware of what's happening "tuned out"	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	aware of undercurrents "tuned in"
influential in determining group members' behavior	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	not influential in determining group members' behavior
understanding, sensitive to others' feelings	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	lacks understanding insensitive to others' feelings
strong	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	weak
frustrating	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	satisfying
close	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	distant
not powerful	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	powerful
beats around bush	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	frank
non-inhibiting	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	inhibiting
worthless	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	valuable
not particularly concerned with others' comments and behavior	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	sensitive to others' comments and behavior
pleasant	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unpleasant

knowledgeable __:__:__:__:__:__:__: not knowledgeable

friendly __:__:__:__:__:__:__: not friendly

authoritarian __:__:__:__:__:__:__: non-authoritarian

respected __:__:__:__:__:__:__: not respected

warm __:__:__:__:__:__:__: cold

depriving __:__:__:__:__:__:__: giving

active __:__:__:__:__:__:__: passive

frightening __:__:__:__:__:__:__: comforting

mystical __:__:__:__:__:__:__: mundane

CODE_____

Concept to be Rated

Group Members
(other than yourself)

emotional	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unemotional
flexible	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	rigid
suspicious of others	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	trusts others
superficial understanding	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	deep understanding
expresses feelings	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	feelings guarded
not aware of what's happening "tuned out"	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	aware of undercurrents "tuned in"
influential in determining group members' behavior	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	not influential in determining group members' behavior
understanding, sensitive to others'feelings	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	lacks understanding insensitive to others' feelings
strong	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	weak
frustrating	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	satisfying
close	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	distant
not powerful	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	powerful
beats around bush	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	frank
non-inhibiting	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	inhibiting
worthless	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	valuable
not particularly concerned with others" comments and behavior	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	sensitive to others' comments and behavior
pleasant	__:__:__:__:__:__:__:	unpleasant

Rating of Group Members (continued)

knowledgeable __:__:__:__:__:__:__: not knowledgeable

friendly __:__:__:__:__:__:__: not friendly

authoritarian __:__:__:__:__:__:__: non-authoritarian

respected __:__:__:__:__:__:__: not respected

warm __:__:__:__:__:__:__: cold

depriving __:__:__:__:__:__:__: giving

active __:__:__:__:__:__:__: passive

frightening __:__:__:__:__:__:__: comforting

mystical __:__:__:__:__:__:__:mundane

Appendix I

FINAL NOTE FROM THE EXPERIMENTER TO THE SUBJECTS

People experience these group workshops in a variety of ways. Some find them to be marvelous experiences; others feel the opposite way about them. Many leave with neutral or ambivalent feelings only to find the ideas and principles experienced and learned coming to mind and helping them to cope more effectively in later group situations - whether of a family, social or institutional nature. Regardless of where you fall on this continum we ask you to maintain the strictest confidence about this experience until after May 1st, 1971.

Please do not discuss the goodness or badness of it, or what happened, or what you did, or what the consultants were like, or anything about it with anyone - particularly your fellow students who may be future participants.

This is requested in order to minimize unnecessary biases and distorted expectations from contaminating future participants' experience of the workshops. As you know the data compiled will eventually be used in a research publication, and we wish to produce the most reliable information possible.

Thank you for your cooperation,

Fred Wright