

INFORMATION TO USERS

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

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

- 1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.**
- 2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.**
- 3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.**
- 4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.**
- 5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.**

Xerox University Microfilms

300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

73-20,159

SCHUBERT, Michael Laury, 1942-
A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF TWO MODELS OF
SENSITIVITY-TRAINING ON "LEVEL OF
EXPERIENCING".

The City University of New York, Ph.D., 1973
Psychology, general

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

© COPYRIGHT BY
MICHAEL LAURY SCHUBERT

1973

A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF TWO MODELS
OF SENSITIVITY-TRAINING ON
"LEVEL OF EXPERIENCING"

by

MICHAEL SCHUBERT

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

1973

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

4/13/73

date

Laurence J. Gould
Chairman of Examining Committee

4/26/73

date

Leonard S. Kogan
Executive Officer

Dr. Laurence Gould

Dr. Leonard Kogan

Dr. Irving Paul

Supervisory Committee

Abstract

A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTS OF TWO MODELS
OF SENSITIVITY-TRAINING ON
"LEVEL OF EXPERIENCING"

by

MICHAEL SCHUBERT

Adviser: Professor Laurence Gould

This research examines the effects of two models of sensitivity-training on Ss' "levels of experiencing," a dimension of psychological functioning that is closely related to awareness of inner experience.

The major hypotheses state that at an individual Interview one month following a weekend sensitivity-training workshop naive experimental Ss will manifest higher "levels of experiencing" than control Ss who do not receive such training, and that within the experimental group Ss trained under the Bethel model will manifest higher "levels of experiencing" than those trained under the Tavistock model.

Secondary hypotheses state that there will be concomitant differences among these groups along dimensions related to "level of experiencing."

Data on Ss' experiences of the workshops confirm expected differences between the models along a number of parameters and in the overall feeling tone of the workshop atmosphere. Differences between groups are reported also as a function of the individual trainer and are found to be consistent across models.

No support is found for the major hypotheses. The results indicate no differences in "level of experiencing" at the Interview between the combined experimental group and the control group nor between the Bethel and Tavistock groups despite the reports by the latter of marked differences in their experiences of the workshops.

Of the secondary hypotheses only one receives support: the combined experimental group reported a lower level of anxiety during the Interview than the control group.

Other findings are discussed that do not have direct bearing on the central issues of the study. These include marked differences between men and women in their evaluation of the Bethel and Tavistock models, in their experiences of the Interview, and in their reports of self-change as a function of the model under which they were trained. Differences between Bethel and Tavistock Ss in the patterns of their evaluations of sensitivity-training over time and in their self-reports of change are also reported.

The paucity of significant outcomes related to "level of experiencing" is discussed in terms of the (unavoidably) low level

in the groups of those conditions "necessary and sufficient" for personality change to occur, and in terms of the inadequacy of a single, isolated workshop experience for effecting personality changes of the depth and scope assessed by the instruments used in this study.

On the basis of consistent trends in the data, results from studies showing significant changes in process level during ongoing workshops, and research indicating a latency period of two to four months preceding the appearance of significant and observable outcomes of sensitivity-training, it is concluded that while sensitivity-training cannot immediately effect basic changes in personality it may be effective in initiating or furthering a process of personality change the end products of which will become visible, if at all, only after time and further nurturance from the environment.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In acknowledging the contributions of the many people who assisted me in this research I wish first to express my very special appreciation to Dr. Laurence Gould. Larry offered not only excellent technical supervision but also consistent encouragement, support, availability, empathy, and an attitude of respect that greatly eased the potential difficulties inherent in a supervisory relationship.

The specialness in working with Larry stemmed largely from his ability to supervise with sufficient detachment so that his own needs did not further complicate an already demanding task. The freedom from concern over his needs was for me an invaluable gift. In all it was a relationship from which I gained a lot and for which I am deeply grateful.

I wish also to extend my appreciation to the other members of my committee, to Dr. Irving Paul for his suggestions and encouragement, and to Dr. Leonard Kogan, most especially for his assistance with the statistical analysis.

It was my good fortune to have worked with a number of fellow graduate students whose cooperation in the execution of the research was both competent and conscientious. My appreciation

to Joe Marasco for his excellent interviewing, and to Steve Goldstein and Ron Taffel for their important contributions. Thanks also to Susan Tinkelman and Marilyn Lipson for their patient and careful work with the Experiencing Scale.

My gratitude to Dr. Bernard Seidenberg for his cooperation as an outside reader and for his assistance regarding use of the Brooklyn College facilities for recruitment and interviewing of subjects. My thanks, too, to Dr. David Singer for his cooperation as an outside reader and for his valuable criticism of the dissertation, much of which was incorporated into this final draft.

I wish to mention, too, the understanding and cooperation of those subjects who attended the workshop and Interview, both of which made unusual demands on the participants. Without their full cooperation this research would have been impossible.

My appreciation to the National Science Foundation for their generous grant, GS-30092, which greatly eased the financial burden of this research, and to Mrs. Virginia White for her assistance as Grants Officer of the Graduate Center.

Finally, my special thanks to Mrs. May Fine whose quiet support meant so much.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Outcomes	3
Orientation of This Research	3
Level of Experiencing	5
Hypothesis 1	8
Studies Using Dependent Variables Related to "Level of Experiencing"	10
Awareness of Feelings	15
Hypothesis 2	16
Hypothesis 3	16
Interpersonal Response	16
Hypothesis 4	19
Process	19
Two Training Group Models	19
Hypothesis 5	23
Hypothesis 6	23
Hypothesis 7	23
Hypothesis 8	23
Quality of Interpersonal Relationships	23
Feedback	27
Experience of the Workshop	32
Hypotheses	35
II. METHODOLOGY	36
Subjects	36
Recruitment Procedures	36
Recruitment of Applicants	36
Telephone Contact with Applicants	37
Mailing of Confirmations to Applicants	39
Experimental Workshops	40
Schedule of Experimental Workshops	40
Assignment of Experimental <u>Ss</u> to Groups	42
The Trainers	42
Execution of the Trainer Roles	42
Personal style	42

Chapter	Page
Interaction style	44
Content of interventions	44
Independent Ratings of Trainer Behavior	44
Procedures at the Experimental Workshops	45
Control Group	46
Assignment of Control Ss	46
The Control Group Workshop	46
The Interview Session	46
Scheduling	46
The Interviewer	47
The Interview	47
The Inquiry	48
Ratings of Level of Experiencing	49
Summary of Methodology	49
Experimental Subjects	49
Control Subjects	50
Brief Description of Instruments Used	50
Personal Information Form (PIF)	50
Person Description Instrument (PDI)	50
Workshop Questionnaire (WOQ)	51
Response to the Discussion (RED)	52
III. RESULTS SECTION	54
Statistical Analysis	54
3-Way Analysis of Variance	54
4-Way Analysis of Variance	55
t-tests	56
Pretreatment Comparison of Subjects	56
Scores on the Person Description Instrument (PDI)	57
Scores on the Personal Information Form (PIF), Questions #22 and #23	57
Summary	57
The Workshop	60
Parameters of the Two Models of Sensitivity- Training	60
Trainer style	60
Importance of topics in the training groups ..	64
Patterns of interaction in the group	67
Summary	69
Interpersonal Atmosphere in the Training Groups	70
Ss' experience of the training group atmosphere	70

Chapter	Page
<u>Ss'</u> experience of the training groups in terms of Rogerian constructs	73
Summary	76
Degree of Affective Involvement in the Group ...	76
Summary	79
Evaluation of the Workshop Experience and of Sensitivity-Training	79
Members assessment of their workshop experience	79
Members assessment of sensitivity-training ..	81
Summary	84
Summary	84
The Interview	86
Degree of Affective Involvement	86
Feeling State During the Interview	87
Impressions of the Interviewer	93
Evaluation of the Interview	94
Summary	100
Self-Reports of Change	102
Level of Experiencing	105
Summary	105
IV. DISCUSSION	113
Experience of the Workshop	113
Model Effects	113
Trainer Effects	115
Sex Effects	118
Outcomes	120
Comparisons Between the Control and Combined Experimental Groups	121
Comparisons Among Experimental Subjects ...	125
Model effects	125
Trainer effects	129
Sex effects	134
Comparisons of self-reports of change with other data	142
Overview	147
Level of "Necessary and Sufficient Conditions" in the Groups	148
Nature of the Dependent Variables	151
Conclusions	154
Role of sensitivity-training in fostering personality change	154

Chapter	Page
Comparison of the effects of Bethel and Tavistock training on level of experiencing	158
Implications for further research	159
Contributions to the literature	160
Summary	161
Experience of the Workshop	161
Model effects	161
Trainer effects	162
Sex effects	162
Outcomes	162
Original hypotheses	162
Comparisons between the control and experimental groups	163
Comparisons among experimental groups ..	163
Model effects	163
Trainer effects	164
Sex effects	164
Comparisons of self-reports of change with other data	165
Overview	166
Level of "necessary and sufficient conditions" in the groups	166
Nature of the dependent variable	166
Conclusions	166
Role of sensitivity-training in fostering personality change	166
Comparison of the effects of Bethel and Tavistock training on level of experiencing	167
Implications for further research	167
Contributions to the literature	167
REFERENCES	169
APPENDIX A. Application Form for Participation in a Sensitivity-Training Workshop	175
APPENDIX B. Confirmation of Assignment to a Workshop	177
APPENDIX C. Personal Information Form (PIF)	179
APPENDIX D. Person Description Instrument (PDI)	182

Chapter	Page
APPENDIX E. Schedules for Experimental Workshops ...	185
APPENDIX F. List of Neighborhood Restaurants	190
APPENDIX G. Workshop Questionnaire (WOQ)	192
APPENDIX H. Response to Discussion (RED)	205
APPENDIX I. Sample Computer Print-out for 2x2x2 Analysis of Variance	214
APPENDIX J. Sample Computer Print-out for 2x2x2x2 Analysis of Variance	216
APPENDIX K. Sample Computer Print-out for 2x2x2x3 Analysis of Variance	218

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Experimental <u>Ss'</u> Scores on (a) the PDI and (b) PIF Questions #22 and #23	58
2. Results of t-tests Comparing Experimental and Control Group Scores on (a) the PDI and (b) PIF Questions #22 and #23	59
3. Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of <u>Ss'</u> Ratings of Trainer Behavior During the Workshop.	61
4. Means of Judges' Ratings of Trainer Behavior.	63
5. Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of <u>Ss'</u> Ratings of the Importance of Topics in the Training Groups	66
6. Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of <u>Ss'</u> Ratings of the Frequency of Occurrence of Interaction Patterns in the Training Groups	68
7. Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of <u>Ss'</u> Ratings of the Workshop Atmosphere	71
8. Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of <u>Ss'</u> Ratings of the Group on the Relationship Inventory.	75
9. Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of <u>Ss'</u> Ratings of Their Degree of Affective Involvement in the Workshop	78
10. Results of 2x2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of <u>Ss'</u> Personal Assessment of Their Workshop Experience	80
11. Results of 2x2x2x3 Analyses of Variance of Responses to Questions #23 and #22 on the PIF	82

Table		Page
12.	Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Ratings of Degree of Affective Involvement in the Interview by Experimental <u>Ss</u>	88
13.	Results of t-tests Comparing the Degree of Affective Involvement in the Interview for the Experimental and Control Groups	89
14.	Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Experimental <u>Ss</u> ' Ratings of Their Feeling State During Interview	91
15.	Results of t-tests Comparing Feeling State During the Interview for the Experimental and Control Groups	92
16.	Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Experimental <u>Ss</u> ' Impressions of the Interviewer . . .	95
17.	Results of t-tests Comparing Impressions of the Interviewer by Control and Experimental <u>Ss</u> . .	96
18.	Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of <u>Ss</u> Evaluations of the Interview	98
19.	Results of t-tests Comparing Evaluations of the Interview by Control and Experimental <u>Ss</u> . . .	99
20.	Results of 2x2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of <u>Ss</u> ' Ratings of Self-Change as a Result of the Workshop, at Time 2 and Time 3	103
21.	Comparison of Judges' Ratings of <u>Ss</u> ' Levels of Experiencing During the Interview	106
22.	Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Modal and Peak Levels of Experiencing During the Interview for Experimental <u>Ss</u>	107
23.	Results of t-tests Comparing Modal and Peak Levels of Experiencing During the Interview for the Experimental and Control Groups	108

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Schedule of Training Groups for Experimental <u>Ss</u>	41
2. Composition of Training Groups for Experimental <u>Ss</u>	43

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The recent proliferation of "growth centers" and the greatly expanded interest in sensitivity-training are a profound expression of the nature of our times. The "group movement" is in large part an attempt by contemporary man to experience "meaningfulness /Tillich, 1952/" and a "sense of being /May, 1958/" and to soothe the pain of his alienation from himself and others.

The "training group" is not a panacea, but it is a "micro-cosm /Slater, 1966/" in which many of the important dynamics of living are played out and exposed to inspection. It is an environment which differs from the usual one mainly with respect to its mores, not its problems. It is a setting in which participants can experiment with new modes of being, relating and learning, and in which insight is sought into a wide variety of issues and problems faced by individuals and groups.

Within the last decade the training group has become a Mecca for business executives, an emotional oasis for feeling-famished-freshmen and a household term as common as Spiro Agnew. It has become a pet project of prominent humanistic psychologists and a

rival of psychotherapy for the following of dissatisfied thousands (see Frank, 1964, and Gottschalk and Pattison, 1969, for comparisons of "therapy" and "training"). It has received such diverse application as in the training of medical students (Cadden et al., 1969) and in the alleviation of interracial tensions (Leonard, 1968), and has been praised as "one cultural attempt to meet the isolation and alienation of contemporary life [Rogers, 1969]."

Following from the author's interest in exploring the application of training groups to the problems of alienation from self and others the goal of this research is to study the effects of two established models of training, Bethel and Tavistock, on "level of experiencing [Gendlin, 1962/," a dimension of psychological functioning that is closely related to awareness of inner experience.

While the stated goals of these models of training are largely in the realms of group and interpersonal dynamics the models also share, to different degrees, characteristics that provide a theoretical rationale for hypothesizing their influence on participants' "levels of experiencing."

By utilizing two radically different models of training and by studying in detail Ss' experiences of these models it is hoped to identify those process variables most relevant to the deepening of self-awareness through such training groups.

The foci of this research are:

1. The outcomes of Bethel and Tavistock training in terms of effects on "level of experiencing" and related variables;
2. The relationship between these outcomes and Ss' experiences of the group processes.

Outcomes

Orientation of This Research

The orientation of this research is "existential" in that it is concerned, primarily, with the effect of sensitivity-training on one's "experience" of his existence. The outcome focus is on changes in one's awareness of his feelings and in his experience of interpersonal situations. The training group workshop is viewed as an environment in which not only traditional learning can occur, but also the experiencing of a different way of being.

In focusing on changes in one's relationship to his inner life --his feelings and "felt meanings [Gendlin, 1964]"--we are examining an all-pervasive aspect of psychic functioning. We are looking at a "cognitive style," at a characteristic way of experiencing reality. We are not asking about a "piece" of learning but about the development of an approach to life. We are looking at the way in which an individual organizes his experiences, at the automatic screening process which selects certain aspects of reality as more

relevant to him, as more meaningful and more characteristically perceived. We are looking at a mode of functioning that applies in a variety of circumstances and which becomes a basic part of personality.

In some cases the difference between our conceptual approach to the outcomes of sensitivity-training and those of other studies is very clear. For instance, studies which use overall economic performance of an organization as a criterion of effective training show minimal interest in variables with an "existential" flavor (see Campbell & Dunnette, 1968, for a review of studies in managerial training).

Frequently, however, outcome studies use measures related to one's basic experience of himself and/or his environment though they are devoid of any reference to existential terminology. Studies of change in interpersonal perception (Burke & Bennis, 1961; Harrison, 1966; Myers, Myers, Goldberg, & Welch, 1969; etc.), in general values and interpersonal orientation (Baumgartel & Goldstein, 1967; Schutz & Allen, 1966; etc.), in self-perception (Burke & Bennis, 1961; French, Sherwood & Bradford, 1966; Gibb & Platts, 1950; Stock, 1958; etc.) and in analysis of situations and problems (Bass, 1962; Clark, Culbert & Bobele, 1969; Miles, 1960; etc.) all contain implicit reference to one's "mode of being" in the world. Changes in these areas affect one's experience of himself

and his life, and are not limited to isolated areas of functioning.

Thus, in labelling our orientation "existential" we are in part making explicit what others have left implicit. By emphasizing certain aspects of the data and extrapolating along certain lines we are restructuring the gestalt in a way that we find more meaningful than an alternative analysis.

On the innovative side we have specifically selected the kind of data that we will examine and the tools that we will use with an eye toward gaining a fuller understanding of the effects of sensitivity-training on Ss' "existential" mode of being.

Level of Experiencing

The main dependent variable we will use in this study is the S's "level of experiencing," operationally defined as a score on the 7-point Experiencing Scale (Klein, Mathieu, Gendlin, & Kiesler, 1969).

Gendlin (1962) explains "experiencing" in this way:

I use the word "experiencing" to denote concrete experience, because the phenomenon I refer to is the raw, present, ongoing functioning (in us) of what is usually called experience. Let me describe it:

It is something so simple, so easily available to every person that at first its very simplicity makes it hard to point to. Another term for it is "felt meaning," or "feeling." However, "feeling" is a word usually used for specific contents--for this or that feeling, emotion, or tone, for feeling good, or bad, or blue or pretty fair. But regardless of the many changes in what we feel--that is to say, really, how we

feel--there always is the concretely present flow of feeling. At any moment we can individually and privately direct our attention inward, and when we do that, there it is. Of course, we have this or that specific idea, wish, emotion, perception, word, or thought, but we always have concrete feeling, an inward sensing whose nature is broader. It is a concrete mass in the sense that it is "there" for us. It is not at all vague in its being there. It may be vague only in that we may not know what it is. We can put only a few aspects of it into words. The mass itself is always something there, no matter what we say "it is." Our definitions, our knowing "what it is," are symbols that specify aspects of it, "parts" of it, as we say. Whether we name it, divide it, or not, there it is /p. 11/.

. . . All the thousands of different kinds of feeling and feeling tones, felt meanings, and so on are aspects of feeling, of "inner sense," a location, a referent of your inward attention. This inward referent (always this or that concrete aspect you attend to) is what I term "experiencing /p. 12/."

. . . Experiencing is a constant, ever present, underlying phenomenon of inwardly sentient living, and therefore there is an experiential side of anything, no matter how specifically detailed and finely specified, no matter whether it is a concept, an observed act, an inwardly felt behavior, or a sense of a situation /p. 15/.

The "process approach" to psychotherapy research was initially elaborated by Carl Rogers' theory of personality (1958, 1959). Rogers placed great emphasis on the role of inner experience in the therapeutic process and in the functioning of a healthy personality.

Further development of this approach led to the construction of the Process Scale (Rogers & Rablen, 1958) which was the first attempt to identify the specific observables of the therapeutic process. The Scale is composed of seven related "strands," each

of which is a 7-point scale on which clients can be rated according to their functioning along dimensions of the therapeutic process.

In essence each scale represents a continuum of psychological activity which commences at one end with a rigid, static, undifferentiated, and impersonal type of psychological functioning and which evolves through distinctive stages to a level of functioning characterized by changingness, fluidity, and rich and immediate experiencing of personal feelings which are felt as deeply owned and accepted [Rogers, 1967, p. 587].

The Experiencing Scale (Klein, Mathieu, Gendlin & Kiesler, 1969) used in this study is modelled on the original Process Scale. Raters trained on this scale use it as a guide for evaluating, from taped interviews, "the degree to which the client manifests inward reference in his verbalizations [Rogers, 1967, p. 589]."

At the lowest stage of experiencing the patient is not able to "own" his affective involvement in what he says, and may relate a straightforward narrative in which there is no personal reference or little or no expression of feeling. The middle stages of the scale are marked by the patient's progressive ownership of his feelings and involvement in events to the point where he can freely express his feelings and explore them in search of their personal meaning. The upper stages of the Experiencing Scale represent the patient's deepening awareness of his feelings, his successful understanding of them, and their integration into his experiential framework. . . . The focus is on the patient's ability to experience freely, to have insight into the significance of his experience and to move freely and appropriately among aspects of his experiential framework [Rogers, 1967, p. 141].

It is important to note that level of experiencing is viewed as both an indicator of psychological adjustment and as one aspect of the process of psychotherapy. The term "process scale" can be misleading if thought of only as a measure of the psychotherapeutic

process. A pervasive theme in Rogers' writing is the importance of "openness to experience," a theme present to varying degrees (and stated in a variety of ways) in most theories of psychotherapy and psychological adjustment. According to Rogers (1959):

Optimal psychological adjustment exists when the concept of the self is such that all experiences are or may be assimilated on a symbolic level into the gestalt of the self-structure. Optimal psychological adjustment is thus synonymous with complete openness to experience. On the practical level, improvement in psychological adjustment is equivalent to progress toward this end point /p. 206/.

The fact that we share Rogers' view on the nature of psychological adjustment was one factor in determining our choice of the Experiencing Scale as a dependent variable.

Our main outcome hypothesis is that training groups are effective in increasing one's awareness of his inner life and thus in raising the level of experiencing of which he is capable.

Hypothesis 1. The combined experimental group will manifest a higher level of experiencing during the Interview than the control group.

All training groups share some basic characteristics which provide a rationale for hypothesis 1:

1. Experience-based learning--Training groups make the assumption that experience plays a vital role in meaningful learning and thus members are encouraged to examine their own behavior, feelings and reactions in the group as valuable material from which

to learn. This focus on the "here and now" directs members' attention toward and increases their sensitivity to their ongoing experiencing. This emphasis on self-awareness is similar to the "focusing" process described by Gendlin (1964, 1969) and recommended by him as a means of improving an individual's ability to experience his inner self.

2. Freedom of exploration--Training groups are characterized by a lack of structure and an absolute minimum of rules delimiting member behavior. Participants have the opportunity of filling this structural vacuum with a wide range of behaviors which would be implicitly or explicitly prohibited in most other situations. This freedom of exploration potentially exposes members to an expanded range of situations and feelings concomittant with a group norm encouraging conceptualization and sharing of these feelings. Theoretically there are few behaviors and no thoughts or feelings that are inadmissable to the group process.

3. Unfamiliar environment--Training groups are usually composed of members who have had little or no previous contact with one another (an exception is the training of organizational groups). This "anonymity" potentially frees members from role expectations and concern about "back home" implications of their behavior in the group. The member is relatively free to explore new behaviors and express his feelings without the inhibitions of

past and future social considerations.

We believe that these three characteristics, shared by most training groups, provide the participant with a unique opportunity to become more aware of his inner experience. Other factors which vary among models of group training lead to discriminating hypotheses based on these differences and will be discussed in the section on Process.

Studies Using Dependent Variables Related to "Level of Experiencing"

Although no study of training groups has yet used the Experiencing Scale as an outcome measure several studies have used related dependent variables and found a positive relationship between sensitivity-training and process level. Meador (1971) studied a "weekend basic encounter group" composed of eight members who had met for a total of 16 hours over one weekend. From film recordings of the proceedings clinically naive judges rated each participant's process level on the original Process Scale (Rogers & Rablen, 1958). The results indicated a significant positive increase in process level over the sessions.

In terms of the description of the stages on the scale individuals moved from a distancing of feelings, rigidity, and past orientation of stages 2 and 3 to allow feelings to be expressed in the present, risking relating on a feeling basis, experiencing the inner self as a referent for behavior of stages 4 and 5. The group as a whole moved across what Rogers (1958) calls "an important threshold (in psychotherapeutic process (p. 26), " stage 4, beyond which they

began to relate to each other in terms of present feelings and experiencing /p. 74/.

Clark & Culbert (1965) studied a T-group that had met for 16 weeks with two 2-hour sessions per week. They hypothesized that there would be an increase in self-awareness in some members as a result of the T-group experience and that this increment would be a positive function of the number of "mutually therapeutic relationships" established in the group by the member. The "mutually therapeutic relationship" was operationally defined as mutual perception by two members of qualities in each other which are related to those hypothesized by Rogers to be relevant to personality growth (Rogers, 1957). Level of self-awareness was defined as a score on the Problem Expression Scale (van der Veen and Tomlinson, 1967), a measure based on one of the seven strands of the original Process Scale. This scale (PES) describes the way a person conceptualizes his problems. Movement from stage 1 to the last stage, 7, corresponds to an increasing awareness of one's own feelings about the problem and of their contribution to the situation. Thus, in the earliest stages the client either avoids any mention of problems or simply refers to them as if he were not personally involved. At the highest stages he talks about his understanding of his feelings and experiences and "an actual resolution of the problem situation in terms of changes in his feelings,

experiences, or attitudes /p. 601/. "

The authors found support for both hypotheses, but found no overall change on the PES for the group as a whole.

In a follow-up study Clark, Culbert, & Bobele (1969) found that 5 of the 20 members of two 14-week T-groups showed positive movement on the PES, and that although increase in PES score was not significantly related to the number of "mutually perceived therapeutic relationships" formed, the trend was in the predicted direction.

Another study in this series (Culbert, 1968) investigated the effect of personal self-disclosure of trainers on the development of "mutually perceived therapeutic relationships" and on self-awareness as measured by the PES. The author found a significantly positive change in PES score over the 14 weeks of training for the group as a whole.

Although taken as a whole these four studies provide strong evidence that sensitivity-training can affect the level of experiencing of which an individual is capable, the findings are somewhat equivocal because of a number of weaknesses in design. First, because these authors were studying group process and not outcomes the process scores were based on Ss' recorded speech segments taken from early and late sessions of the workshops. This

procedure fails to eliminate the probable influence of "demand characteristics" of the workshop on the S's behavior in the group situation. It obscures the quality of the change in behavior: does this change reflect real growth or merely the acquisition of a new vocabulary (or at best an introspective style), the use of which is encouraged and supported by the T-group atmosphere and insufficiently internalized to remain functioning in a different setting? In order to separate the influence of internalized learning from that of demand characteristics the subject must be rated in a neutral setting, and preferably on material that is different from the content of the T-group interaction.

Secondly, taking process ratings from the early and late group interactions artificially increases the probability of a significant difference. The early sessions are spent in an alien and uncomfortable atmosphere, one in which participants are likely to be unusually inhibited and defensive. By the end of the group life we would expect them to function on a deeper level if only because they are so much more comfortable in these surroundings than they were at the time of the first rating.

The present study is designed to eliminate these weaknesses.

A recent study by Harrison and Oshry (1970) examined the effect of sensitivity-training on participants' "emotional expressiveness." Our interest in this study derives from the possible

relationship between one's level of experiencing (which subsumes awareness of feelings) and his expressiveness of these feelings.

Harrison and Oshry hypothesized that "participants in a laboratory in human relations will be seen by themselves and others [co-workers] as increasing the overt expression of their own feelings [p. 3]." These authors used a population of managers from various business enterprises trained in one- or two-week residential laboratories at the NTL. They collected pre- and post-training assessments of behavior from the participant, his supervisor and two subordinates (these assessments were made at intervals ranging from about two to six months).

The "Emotional Expressiveness Scale" included such items as "He tends to be emotional" and "His feelings are transparent." Although changes on this scale were in the predicted direction, they were small in absolute size and did not reach significance.

One explanation for this negative finding is inferred from:

1. The very low inter-describer correlations on ratings of emotional expressiveness indicating that this variable is a function of the role (supervisor or subordinate) and/or personality of the individual with whom the participant is interacting, and from;
2. The possible lack of receptivity to such changes in the organizational environments from which these subjects were drawn.

Thus, the authors suggest:

If overt behavior is strongly role- and other-determined, and if organizational norms tend to suppress the expression of concerns and emotionality, then participants in training may change their values without being able to act upon the changes /p. 20/.

This explanation is supported by the results of another study by Harrison (1966, see below).

Our use of the Experiencing Scale is designed to mitigate the counter-effect of the above factors by:

1. Providing an atmosphere in which the subject can feel relatively free to express his feelings, and by;
2. Using an instrument on which ratings are determined more by the inferred, underlying process than by the content of the S's verbalizations.

Awareness of Feelings

As we have stated earlier, we conceptualize "level of experiencing" as an "all pervasive aspect of psychic functioning." We expect that a change in one's level of experiencing will have an effect on a variety of observable behaviors and/or modes of being in the individual. By discovering areas of functioning that change concomitantly with experiencing we can better understand the nature of the latter. Thus, throughout this study we will examine phenomena that may be related to experiencing, and we will

attempt to demonstrate a relationship between this and other, hypothetically related variables.

If, as hypothesized, experiencing deepens as a result of sensitivity-training, then awareness of feelings can also be expected to increase. Specifically, we expect that Ss who have had experience in sensitivity-training will report an affectively richer experience of the Interview than Ss who have never attended a workshop. (See the Methodology section for a description of the Interview.)

Hypothesis 2. The combined experimental group will report a greater degree of affective involvement in the Interview than the control group.

Hypothesis 3. There will be differences between the combined experimental group and the control group in their reported feeling state during the Interview.

Interpersonal Response

One's openness to his inner feelings (his level of experiencing) has important implications for his interpersonal relationships. Some interesting studies by Harrison (1962, 1966) demonstrate changes in perception of others as a result of sensitivity-training.

Harrison (1966), recognizing that one goal of sensitivity-training is "increased awareness of one's own feelings and attitudes in interpersonal situations [p. 517]," hypothesized that participants in training groups would become more oriented toward

the inter- and intra-personal process in their perception of others. Employing a modification of Kelly's Role Reportory Test on which subjects are asked to discriminate one member of a triad of his close associates from the other two by selecting differentiating personal characteristics, Harrison predicted that after sensitivity-training participants would use more concepts dealing with feelings, attitudes and emotions than before training.

The subjects in this study, all of whom had participated in a two-week training program at the NTL, were asked to complete the Kelly Test three times: once before training, again about three weeks after training and a last time about three months later. The results show that Ss' usage of the "inferential-expressive" concept increased for the group over all administrations, but significantly only between the three-week and three-month followups. The "inferential-expressive" concept included such characteristics as confidence, competitiveness, sociability, interpersonal style (formal vs. personal), personal warmth, etc. Harrison's second, and contrasting category of characteristics, the "concrete-instrumental," included such items as religion, sex, physical stature, job competence, etc.

Harrison concluded that "interpersonal concept systems are amenable to change through group experiences in which participants are asked to focus on the causes and complexities of their own

and others' behavior [p. 520]."

Harrison interpreted these results largely in terms of the participants' acquisition of a new value system or orientation toward others as a result of sensitivity-training. "That is, a person's values determine in large part the events of which he can be aware [1962, p. 261]."

While we agree with this statement as a generality we do not accept that change in values is the only, or even major factor instrumental in increased awareness resulting from sensitivity-training. In the last analysis expanded awareness of events, be they internal or external, implies increased sensitivity to one's inner life--the seat of all our responses. We would interpret increased interpersonal sensitivity as one facet of a generally deeper level of experiencing, an outcome of training which is only in small part attributable to a change in values. In other sections of this paper we discuss other factors that we believe are instrumental in deepening participants' level of experiencing.

A frequent occurrence in training groups is for members to initially deny having any feelings about other members because they "don't know them well enough." After some discussion members occasionally discover that, in fact, they had had feelings toward unknown members of the group but had not admitted these feelings to awareness for a variety of reasons. When this discovery occurs early in the group life it seems attributable to an

increased awareness of inner feelings independent of a change in values.

A specific arena in which deepened awareness of feelings can express itself in interpersonal relations is in impression formation. As implied above, social mores ("don't judge a book by its cover") further suppress our already flattened affective responses to new people. If experiencing is newly awakened through training we may expect a rejuvenation of emotional responses to a stranger. In the same way that Harrison expected a change in interpersonal perception (for different reasons) we expect a change in the process of impression formation after Ss have undergone sensitivity-training.

Hypothesis 4. There will be differences between the combined experimental group and the control group in the strength and quality of their impressions of the interviewer.

Process

Two Training Group Models

In this study we are using the terms "training group" and "sensitivity-training" generically to refer to a variety of approaches whose common goal is the learning about group and individual dynamics through direct participation and the study of members' behavior in the here-and-now. We will compare two different training group models--the "study group" and the "T-group"--in

their ability to promote change along the dimensions of personality and behavior measured by our dependent variables.

The "study group" (or Tavistock group) utilizes a role-playing consultant who behaves in a formal and detached manner designed to stimulate feelings of dependency, frustration and anger in the group members. The feelings and fantasies about authority and their effect on group life provide the basic raw data for study. In this approach the primary focus for both consultant and members is on the group as a whole--on group dynamics. Relatively little emphasis is placed on individual dynamics.

In the "T-group" (or Bethel group) the trainer is a model of "good" member behavior, demonstrating and encouraging in others low defensiveness, increased openness and trust, and genuine, spontaneous feedback of his feelings toward others. The goal of the "T-group" is to create an atmosphere of trust and openness in which members can feel free to share their personal feelings with one another thus enhancing shared emotional growth. "Whereas in the study group members learn primarily about group dynamics, in the T-group participants learn about self and techniques of interpersonal competency through trust, owning up to feelings, feedback and 'here and now' data [Klein & Astrachan, 1971, p. 667]."

The significant differences between the study group and the T-group can be summarized along the following dimensions:

1. Trainer style--The role of the study group trainer is remote and impersonal and designed to elicit feelings and phantasies about authority figures in the group members. In contrast, the T-group trainer is a model of the "good member," and an active participant in the group process. Unlike the study group consultant he models openness, trust, acceptance, understanding, etc.

2. Central issues--In the study group the focus is on authority relations and related group dynamics. The T-group attends mostly to individual dynamics and interpersonal relations, including trust, openness and affection.

3. Patterns of interaction--In the study group the most important relationships are those between the members and the consultant, whereas in the T-group peer relations assume greatest significance. The T-group places great emphasis on the importance of personal feedback among members.

(For a detailed comparison of the study group and the T-group see Klein & Astrachan, 1971.)

As these descriptions indicate the primary goals of these two models do not include the induction of intra-personal changes in the participants. Rather the goals specified by these models stress, primarily, learning on a group process level in Bethel (Singer, Astrachan, Gould, & Klein, 1972). The hypothesis that such training will eventuate in deepened levels of experience for the

participants (an intra-personal change) is based on a consideration of a number of characteristics shared by these approaches and discussed above. These are: experience-based learning, freedom of exploration and unfamiliar environments. It should be emphasized that such intra-personal changes are not the primary goals of either Bethel or Tavistock training and that the assessment of these hypothesized changes in the present study is in no way intended as an attempt to evaluate the success of these models of training in achieving their stated goals. It is our goal, instead, to investigate the possible occurrence of changes in level of experience as either a by-product of such training or as a mediating variable in the promotion of other related changes. And, on another level, we are interested in discovering the actual extent of such changes in experiencing because of the widely shared belief--mistaken or accurate--that sensitivity-training induces profound alterations in participants' "inner lives" (Lieberman, Yalom, & Miles, 1972, offer relevant comments on misunderstanding of the goals of sensitivity-training).

Two differences, especially, between the study group and the T-group processes--the quality of interpersonal relationships and the emphasis on feedback among members--lead us to the hypothesis that the T-group process will result in a greater deepening of experiencing capacity than will the study group process.

Hypothesis 5. The T-groups will manifest a higher level of experiencing during the Interview than the study groups.

Hypothesis 6. The T-groups will report a greater degree of affective involvement in the Interview than the studygroups.

Hypothesis 7. There will be differences between the T-groups and the study groups in their reported feeling states during the Interview.

Hypothesis 8. There will be differences between the T-groups and the study groups in the reported strength and quality of their impressions of the interviewer.

Quality of Interpersonal Relationships

One basis for these hypotheses is the quality of interpersonal relationships fostered in the T-group (as compared with the study group) and the products of this kind of relationship as predicted by Rogers in his theory of personality change.

Rogers (1957) hypothesized that in a relationship where two people are in psychological contact and one of them (the client) is in a state of "incongruence" (suffers marked discrepancy between his self-image and his actual experiencing) the client's perception of three qualities in the therapist are "necessary and sufficient" conditions for constructive personality change to occur. These three conditions are that the therapist be perceived as congruent, or genuine in the relationship, as holding an attitude of "unconditional positive regard" toward the client, and as experiencing an

accurate, empathic understanding of the client's awareness of his own experience--of his own private world.

Elsewhere Rogers has stated that "the therapeutic relationship is only one instance of interpersonal relations, and that the same lawfulness governs all such relationships [Rogers, 1961, p. 37]." He believes, as we do, that the elements that are effective growth-producers in therapy are also effective in other interactions. "It appears possible to me that we are seeing the emergence of a new field of human relationships, in which we may specify that if certain attitudinal conditions exist, then certain definable changes will occur [p. 37]."

The conditions specified by Rogers are found to a much greater extent in a T-group than in a study group. The group's goals of honesty and openness are equivalent to Rogers' term "genuineness" (or congruence), the values of trust and acceptance in the T-group reflect the development of "unconditional positive regard," and the great emphasis on feedback serves, in part, to increase "empathic understanding" among members.

To the extent that a T-group is more successful in achieving these goals than a study group we would expect change in the participants to a greater extent than occurs in the study group. And one of the major dimensions along which change is predicted, under these conditions, is the client's "manner of experiencing."

This dimension is described in various ways, some of which relate directly to our hypotheses:

The client is increasingly free in expressing his feelings, through verbal and/or motor channels.

. . . He experiences fully, in awareness, feelings which have in the past been denied to awareness, or distorted in awareness /Rogers, 1959, p. 216/.

The process involves a change in the manner of experiencing. The continuum begins with a fixity in which the individual is very remote from his experiencing and unable to draw upon or symbolize its implicit meaning. . . . From this remoteness in relation to his experiencing, the individual moves toward the recognition of experiencing as a troubling process going on within him. Experiencing gradually becomes a more accepted inner referent to which he can turn for increasingly accurate meaning. Finally he becomes able to live freely and acceptantly in a fluid process of experiencing, using it comfortably as a major reference for his behavior /Rogers, 1961, pp. 156-157/.

(See Clark, 1963, for a discussion of how Rogers' theory can be applied to the training group process.)

The series of studies by the Clark group, described above, have implications for this hypothesis. In two of these studies (Clark & Culbert, 1965; Culbert, 1968) the authors found a significant relationship between the number of "mutually perceived therapeutic relationships" (MPTR) and movement on the PES, and in a third study (Clark et al., 1969) they found a non-significant trend in the predicted direction. These results yield two interpretations:

1. They lend support to Rogers' (1957) hypothesis of the necessary and sufficient conditions for personality change. The MPTR's were defined as mutually high rankings of each other by

two members of the T-groups on the Relationship Inventory (RI), a scale which focused on four dimensions of interpersonal communication: level of regard, empathic understanding, congruence and unconditionality of regard. These dimensions are modelled on those suggested by Rogers (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

2. They suggest that the T-group can foster the development of relationships high in these "therapeutic" qualities.

Unfortunately the status of this last interpretation must remain tentative because of the absence of a control group which would allow a comparison of the number of MPTR's formed and/or the amount of change in self-awareness over time independent of a T-group experience. Thus, the fact of change in the group is relatively clear; what remains ambiguous is the role of the group context in promoting this change. A difference in design between the 1969 and 1965 studies suggests that the group context is important. In the earlier study the two weekly sessions were held with the entire group and there was a significant relationship between the number of MTR's and change in the PES. In the later study, in which there was no significant relationship between these variables, one of the two weekly sessions was spent in dyads, only. The authors concluded that "the fewer number of hours spent in the large sensitivity-training group (half that of the original study) probably reduced the likelihood of members'

exhibiting significant PES increases over time /Clark et al., 1969, p. 69/. If this is so it underlines the importance of the group context for promoting personality change.

Overall, these results suggest that "untrained laymen, given the proper context, can and do act therapeutically toward one another /Clark & Culbert, 1965, p. 192/."

Feedback

The second basis for our hypotheses 6 and 7 is the fact of the greater emphasis on feedback in the T-group relative to the study group. Writing about the T-group Dunnette & Campbell (1968) explain:

Given the unstructured group as the vehicle and the behavior emitted in the group as the principal topic of conversation, the success of the venture depends on the crucial process of feedback. Thus, the participants must be able to inform each other how their behavior is being seen and interpreted and to describe the kinds of feelings generated. This is the primary process by which the delegates "learn /p. 76/."

Gendlin, in his theory of personality change (1964) places great importance on the role of interpersonal responsivity in promoting growth:

For, if there is a response, there will be an ongoing interaction process. Certain aspects of the personality will be in process. However, without the response, there will not (in these respects) be a process at all /pp. 129-130/.

Personality change is the difference made by your responses in carrying forward my concrete experiencing. To be myself

I need your responses, to the extent to which my own responses fail to carry my feelings forward /p. 136/.

Studies of feedback in sensitivity-training fall into two categories: those that control the amount of standardized feedback given and/or received by randomly selected participants (in addition to feedback from the group interaction), and those that look for correlations between outcomes and amount of uncontrolled feedback given and/or received during the workshop.

Reviewing a study in which Gibb and his associates used the controlled feedback technique, Stock (1964) summarized that "groups which received feedback differed from those which did not in that members felt more favorable toward the group, displayed a higher level of aspiration for their group, and expressed more negative feelings /p. 430/." She also reported that "feeling-oriented feedback" was more effective than "task-oriented feedback" in achieving these ends.

Lippitt (1959) studied the effects of controlled feedback on changes in individual behavior. Using non-participant observers as raters Lippitt found that participants who were informed of fellow members' perceptions of and desires for change in their behavior showed greater change than matched control participants who were not provided with any feedback.

French, Sherwood, & Bradford (1966) had T-group participants rate themselves on several dimensions of their self-identities,

and then select four dimensions which were especially salient in their lives. The authors provided various amounts of feedback along one of these dimensions and studied the effect of this procedure on changes in self-identity. They found that all groups receiving feedback changed in their self-identities more than the group receiving no feedback, but that there was no difference among groups receiving different levels of feedback.

Two studies examined the effect of feedback on sensitivity to interpersonal phenomena, specifically, one's awareness of others' perception of himself. Gibb & Platts (1950) concluded that self-insight (defined as awareness of the perceptions that others have of the self) is increased by the reception of feedback.

In the experimental condition of another study (Myers, Myers, Goldberg, & Welch, 1969) group members filled out and received feedback from a sociometric questionnaire at the end of each of eight group sessions during a three-day workshop. Control group #1 also filled out the questionnaire eight times but did not receive any feedback. Control group #2 filled out the questionnaire after the first and last sessions, only. They also received no feedback. The authors used the discrepancy between a member's anticipated and received ratings as an indicator of his sensitivity to interpersonal phenomena.

A significant difference between discrepancy scores of the experimental group and control group #2 supported the hypothesis that members who regularly provide and receive sociometric feedback will show a greater increase in sensitivity than T-group members who do not systematically provide or receive such data. However, the discrepancy scores for the experimental group were not significantly different from those of control group #1 who provided but did not receive sociometric data. This result might suggest the value for a group member in clearly conceptualizing his feelings along interpersonal dimensions.

Myers, et al., suggest some explanations of their results as alternatives to one that emphasizes increased interpersonal sensitivity. For instance, they raise the possibility that members begin to conform to the ratings they have received thereby reducing discrepancies between theirs' and others' perception of their behavior, but not necessarily increasing their own sensitivity. We wonder, too, to what extent members simply adopt others' perception of their behavior as their own just for the duration of the group--almost like Asch's conformity data. In a word, how "real" are these reported increases in self-insight?

Two studies, one by Harrison (1966), and one by Harrison & Oshry (1970) adopt the second approach to examining the role of feedback in promoting personal change. In both studies group

members rated one another toward the end of the workshop on their participation in the group process. Some dimensions assessed in the Harrison study are: insight gained from reactions of others, amount of feedback received, energy spent in trying to lead groups away from personal discussion, etc. In the study by Harrison & Oshry the items included: overall effectiveness as group member, warmth toward group members, flexibility in going along with group decisions, etc. In the Harrison study there were significant correlations between three of the five participation ratings and later change (use of the inferential-expressive category on the Kelley Test--see above). The author concluded that "the changes appear to be associated with the extent to which the individual participates in the active, open exchange of personal reactions which is a central process in such learning /p. 520/"

In the Harrison & Oshry study correlations were in the predicted direction for two of the four outcomes rated, and significant for one dimension ("consideration"). Overall, the correlations between activity and change on the outcome measures was not impressive in this study. We believe that the lack of significant change on any of the dependent variables, themselves, is a partial explanation for this lack of relationship between activity and outcome.

These studies, which do not control the amount of member feedback and/or activity, but only measure it post facto, cannot

definitively answer the question of the causal role of feedback in the process of change. They can only, like the present study, suggest a relationship which warrants further and more carefully controlled study.

In our study a significant difference in effectiveness between the two training models will remain ambiguous because the models differ in several respects, not just in emphasis on feedback. But, at this point in our knowledge such a demonstration of differential outcome from two major models would be of tremendous exploratory value.

Experience of the Workshop

While a number of authors have studied outcomes of training as a function of individual differences in personality and attitudes (Baumgartel & Goldstein, 1967; Miles, 1960; Schutz & Allen, 1966; Steele, 1968) there has been little research into Ss' experiences of training and their influence on outcomes.

In a study of group composition Harrison & Lubin (1965) touch on this area by making inferences about Ss' experiences of sensitivity-training and offering an explanation of their findings based on these inferred experiences. In that study Ss were classified "task-oriented" or "person-oriented" according to their scores on the Person Description Instrument, an instrument designed to

measure modes of interpersonal perception. The authors then set up and studied training groups that were heterogeneous and homogeneous with respect to this dimension of personality.

As expected, person-oriented Ss were found to be warmer and more emotionally expressive in the groups than the task-oriented Ss. It was inferred that the person-oriented Ss felt more comfortable in the groups because of the apparent harmony between their natural interpersonal style and the orientation of sensitivity-training. The authors expected this greater comfort and harmony to enhance the learning for person-oriented Ss, but to their surprise they found a non-significant trend for task-oriented Ss to be perceived by their co-members as learning more from the workshop than the person-oriented Ss.

An analysis of these and results from other studies of groups with varying compositions led the authors to an interpretation based on the degree of discord between a group member and the group environment. Basically, the theory advanced is that learning in a training group involves the simultaneous confrontation with opposites and support for one's current personal style. Members whose personal styles are already congruent with the values of the workshop, itself, and/or with the values of the other group members, will feel too relaxed, too uncontested in their "psychic home" to enjoy optimal learning. In contrast, members with an

orientation that finds opposition ("culture shock") would be more likely to grow from the experience. In the words of the authors:

It may be that the unresolved issues, the confrontations with differing outlooks and views, the feelings of outrage and dismay, puzzlement and challenge, last longer and are more of a force for learning than the warmth and comradeship and the feeling of completion and closure of a more "successful" T-group experience /p. 300/.

Support for this interpretation is found in a study by Clark, Culbert & Bobele (1969). In a re-analysis of two earlier studies these authors found a marked but non-significant relationship between the number of positive and negative "mutually perceived therapeutic relationships," combined, and change on the Problem Expression Scale. They interpreted this as evidence for the "importance of a combination of mutual positive and mutual negative relationships in determining the development of self-awareness in the T-group /p. 71/."

In these studies, unlike the Harrison & Lubin study, Ss reported their experiences of the group directly on an instrument designed to assess the quality of their felt relatedness to other members.

These studies not only offer an interesting hypothesis for consideration--the need for conflict, confrontation, or discord for maximal personal growth in training groups--but they underline the importance of inquiring into Ss' subjective experiences of the workshop. In the present study considerable attention will be paid

to such reports by Ss in hopes of acquiring a fuller understanding of the relationship between the process and outcomes of sensitivity-training.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. The combined experimental group will manifest a higher level of experiencing during the Interview than the control group.

Hypothesis 2. The combined experimental group will report a greater degree of affective involvement in the Interview than the control group.

Hypothesis 3. There will be differences between the combined experimental group and the control group in their reported feeling state during the Interview.

Hypothesis 4. There will be differences between the combined experimental group and the control group in the strength and quality of their impressions of the interviewer.

Hypothesis 5. The T-groups will manifest a higher level of experiencing during the Interview than the study groups.

Hypothesis 6. The T-groups will report a greater degree of affective involvement in the Interview than the study groups.

Hypothesis 7. There will be differences between the T-groups and the study groups in their reported feeling states during the Interview.

Hypothesis 8. There will be differences between the T-groups and the study groups in the reported strength and quality of their impressions of the interviewer.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The 46 Ss in this research were undergraduate students at Brooklyn College and the City College of New York, all between the ages of 17 and 23 and all without previous sensitivity-training experience. Although no attempt was made to control the ethnic composition of the subject population it turned out that none of the 46 Ss were black and only two or three belonged to other minority groups, the balance being white.

Recruitment Procedures

Recruitment of Applicants

The first attempt at recruitment was an advertisement in the CCNY newspaper, resulting in a mere handful of responses. All further recruitment was achieved through the author's personal visits to undergraduate classes at Brooklyn and City Colleges (largely classes in psychology). During these visits the author:

1. Offered students without previous sensitivity-training experience an opportunity to attend a weekend workshop (two days)

at greatly reduced cost (\$9);

2. Provided a rough description of the goals, techniques and atmosphere of a sensitivity-training workshop;

3. Explained that the reduced cost was made possible by the prospective Ss' willingness to cooperate in dissertation research on these groups;

4. Guaranteed that the research would not manipulate or interfere with the training experience;

5. Offered a rough idea of the Ss' obligations to the research, details of which were to be supplied during a subsequent telephone conversation (see below);

6. Distributed application forms (see Appendix) to all interested students, the completion of which was not binding to the applicant nor to the author, but which merely indicated the applicant's interest in the study. Applications were either handed back to the author or mailed to him later.

Telephone Contact with Applicants

Sometime after receiving an application the author personally telephoned the applicant to arrange for his attendance at one of the workshops. The time between the receipt of the application and the telephone call varied from one day to about two months depending on a variety of factors. Recruitment and telephoning went

on continuously during the period of preparation for the workshops as applicants would continually drop out before the workshop took place.

After the applicant reconfirmed his interest in attending a workshop the author would answer his questions about sensitivity-training and the research. All questions about training were answered in very general (though honest) terms, and questions about the research were answered only if they concerned the applicant's own obligations or the effect of the research on the training. Questions about the design or content of the research were dealt with by explaining that because of the nature of the research Ss' questions would be answered only after all data were collected.

The bulk of the telephone conversation consisted in the author informing the applicant of the details of the contract:

1. The workshop would cost \$9;
2. It would take place at CCNY over a two-day weekend (Saturday and Sunday) from about 9 AM to 7:30 PM each day;
3. The S would spend about one hour of each day completing questionnaires, and would have about 1-1/2 hours of his workshop tape recorded on the second day only;
4. The S would take an individual, tape recorded Interview followed by questionnaires, involving a total time of about two hours. If the applicant was being assigned to an experimental group

he was told that the Interview would take place a few weeks after the workshop, and if he was being assigned to the control group he was told that the Interview would take place before the workshop. Applicants for the control group, only, were also told that there would be a shorter, unrecorded, follow-up Interview a few weeks after the workshop, a fabricated condition used to further insure the comparability of their commitment to that of the experimental applicants;

5. The S would necessarily remain ignorant of the purpose of the research until after his involvement was completed;

6. The material from each S would be treated as confidential and would be destroyed after its use in the research.

None of the applicants objected to any of these terms.

After their agreement to the "contract" the applicants were assigned to one of the three weekends (there were two experimental weekends with two workshops at each, and one control weekend) according to the availability of space and the applicant's personal schedule. Though these assignments were not strictly random there was no obvious bias in the procedure.

Mailing of Confirmations to Applicants

Following verbal agreement of the applicants' participation in the study announcements confirming their assignments to a weekend

workshop and informing them of the time, place, method of transportation and procedures for payment were mailed to them (see Appendix). These announcements were the last scheduled contact with the applicants prior to their expected attendance at the workshops.

Experimental Workshops

Schedule of Experimental Workshops

Four experimental workshops were conducted, two workshops on each of two consecutive weekends, March 20-21, 1970 and March 27-28, 1970, all at CCNY's Psychological Center in Manhattan. On each weekend there was one Bethel and one Tavistock workshop scheduled as follows in Figure 1.

Assignment of Experimental Ss to Groups

At the time of the original mailing of confirmations (based on telephone conversations with applicants) there were 24 Ss assigned to the first weekend and 27 assigned to the second. The Ss for each weekend were randomly assigned to the Bethel and Tavistock groups scheduled for that weekend, with two constraints:

1. Subjects sharing a close personal relationship were not assigned to the same group;
2. The composition of each group was intended to be half

	Date of Workshop	
	March 20-21	March 27-28
Trainer 1	Group A (Bethel)	Group D (Tavistock)
Trainer 2	Group B (Tavistock)	Group C (Bethel)

Fig. 1

Schedule of Training Groups for Experimental Ss

male and half female.

There were originally 12 Ss assigned to group A, 12 to group B, 14 to group C, and 13 to group D. The final analysis, however, was based on data from only 36 experimental Ss as shown in Figure 2.

The reduced totals reflect losses from: Ss who never showed, Ss who did not return for the second day of a workshop, one S who never took the Interview and one S whose data was lost.

The Trainers

The two trainers were males in their middle twenties, both doctoral students in clinical psychology and both with extensive experience training Bethel and Tavistock groups. The two were also close friends and roommates who resembled each other in appearance and style.

Execution of the Trainer Roles

Discussions between the trainers and the author established uniform guidelines for trainer roles in the Bethel and Tavistock groups. The major differences in these trainer roles can be summarized as follows (see also the Introduction):

Personal style. The Tavistock consultant behaved in a formal, role-playing manner and wore a tie and jacket throughout the workshop. The Bethel trainer dressed and behaved informally.

	Bethel		Tavistock		
	Trainer 1 (gp A)	Trainer 2 (gp C)	Trainer 1 (gp D)	Trainer 2 (gp B)	Totals
Females	4	5	4	3	16
Males	5	6	4	5	20
Sub-totals	9	11	8	8	
Totals	20		16		36

Fig. 2

Composition of Training Groups for Experimental Ss

Interaction style. The Tavistock consultant never entered into individual conversation with group members. He did not answer questions during the workshop but offered his observations when he felt they would be most useful. The Bethel trainer was more of a participant-observer than a detached, unresponsive commentator. He shared his own feelings when it seemed appropriate, answered questions at will and was generally "himself" rather than playing a role.

Content of interventions. The Tavistock consultant addressed himself to group dynamics exclusively, paying special attention to issues of authority, leadership and competition. The Bethel trainer addressed himself to both group and individual dynamics, focusing especially on personal feedback, and issues of trust, affection, openness and other issues of strong emotional import.¹

Independent Ratings of Trainer Behavior

In addition to ratings of trainer behavior by group members (WOQ 5) two judges used the same checklist on which to rate trainer behavior along a number of dimensions from hour-long tapes of the seventh session of each sensitivity-training group. (See Results section.)

¹A fuller comparison of these models can be found in Klein & Astrachan, 1971.

Procedures at the Experimental Workshops

Upon arriving at the workshop the first morning Ss paid their fee and picked up printed material consisting of group and room assignments, workshop schedule and a listing of neighborhood restaurants (see Appendix).

Before breaking up into their training groups the Ss were assembled in one room in which the author gave them a brief orientation and distributed the Personal Information Form (PIF) and the Person Description Instrument (PDI), with specific instructions for the latter (see Appendix).

The balance of the workshop was run according to the printed schedule with coffee breaks staggered so that participants from the different groups had virtually no contact with each other over that weekend.

Session 7, on the second day, was tape recorded in all workshops.

The Workshop Questionnaire (WOQ) was distributed by the author and completed by the Ss immediately before the final session of the workshop (see Appendix).

Room assignments were alternated between the two models so that the Bethel group on the first weekend occupied the same room as the Tavistock group on the second weekend, etc.

Control Group

Assignment of Control Ss

The control group, assigned further in advance than the experimental groups, underwent even greater changes in composition from the time of the original assignments until the time of their workshop. As Ss changed their minds about their agreements during this period they were replaced by new applicants, each applicant always agreeing to the same "contract" as detailed above.

Of 15 control Ss who finally took the Interview 3 did not show up for the workshop and 2 did not return for the second day. Therefore only data from the 10 control Ss who completed the entire weekend workshop (6 women and 4 men) were used in the final analysis of results.

The Control Group Workshop

A workshop was conducted for the control Ss on May 1-2, 1970, following the Interviews for these Ss. This workshop was held only to fulfill the contract to control Ss and contributed no data to the research. It was co-trained by the author and another graduate student in psychology, using the Bethel model.

The Interview Session

Scheduling

Attempts were made to schedule Interview Sessions on a

fairly random basis but Ss' availability necessarily took precedence. These Sessions were conducted at Brooklyn and City Colleges from April 14 through May 25. Experimental Ss had already attended their workshop and control Ss were interviewed before their May 1st workshop.

For experimental Ss the time between their workshop and the Interview Session varied from 17 to 51 days (with the exception of one S who was given an Interview 65 days after his workshop). The median time between the workshop and the Interview Session, for experimental Ss, was 33-1/2 days.

The Interviewer

One interviewer performed all the Interviews. He was a white male in his late twenties and a graduate student in psychology with several years experience as an individual psychotherapist. He was instructed in the style of interview he was to conduct but was told absolutely nothing about the design or purpose of the research.

The Interview

The Interview was 45 minutes long and tape recorded in its entirety. It is best described as an unstructured period in which the S was invited to talk about himself and his life in any manner that he preferred. The interviewer was instructed to respond in a basically "client-centered" style--accepting, nondirective,

reflective. The interviewer was also instructed to become more structured, i. e., to ask specific questions, if a S was seen to be experiencing difficulty functioning in the non-directive format.

In short, the interviewer attempted to create an atmosphere in which the S could express himself as freely and fully as he desired.

The interviewer introduced himself to the S and explained his role in roughly these terms:

My name is Joe. Let me tell you why I'm here. I'm not part of the research and in fact I don't even know what it's all about. I'd like to spend 45 minutes talking to you about yourself, your life, and whatever else is important to you and you feel like discussing. There's nothing specific to cover so it's all pretty much up to you.

Because the interviewer knew nothing about the research he was free to be as spontaneous and open as he felt. He had nothing to hide and only a very vague role to play. The Interview was thus a very real interaction between the S and the interviewer. (This Interview was modelled on Rogers' (1967) "sampling interview.")

The Inquiry

Immediately following the Interview the S was ushered into another room where an assistant was waiting with questionnaires to be filled out by the S.

All Ss filled out the Response to the Discussion (RED), #1-5. In addition, the experimental Ss filled out RED 6 and RED 7, and

the control Ss filled out (after completing the RED forms) the PIF and the PDI that the other Ss had completed at their workshops.

The assistant was instructed not to enter into conversation with the S about any research-related material beyond the instructions for completion of the forms.

Ratings of Level of Experiencing

Two judges were trained on the use of the Experiencing Scale for rating level of experiencing from taped interviews, following procedures outlined in the Research and Training Manual (Klein, Mathieu, Gendlin & Kiesler, 1969). After reaching an adequate level of inter-judge agreement in their ratings of practice tapes supplied with the Manual judges used the Experiencing Scale to rate Ss' level of experiencing during the Interview described above. Ratings were made from taped 3-minute segments from the middle of the 45-minute Interview.

The 3-minute segments for the 46 Ss were randomized and rated in opposite sequence by the two judges.

Summary of Methodology

Experimental Subjects

1. Attended sensitivity-training workshop
 - (a) completed PIF, PDI and WOQ at workshop

2. Attended Interview Session from 17 to 51 days after the workshop;

(a) took the interview

(b) completed REF #1-7.

Control Subjects

1. Attended Interview Session before the sensitivity-training workshop;

(a) took the Interview

(b) completed RED #1-5

(c) then completed PIF and PDI.

2. Later attended a sensitivity-training workshop that had no implications for the research.

Brief Description of Instruments Used

Personal Information Form (PIF)

The PIF contains items on demographic variables, two multiple choice questions on the Ss' general attitude toward sensitivity-training, and one question on their political orientation.

Person Description Instrument (PDI)

The PDI, an instrument modelled on Kelly's Role Reportory Test, was designed by Roger Harrison and used by him to determine interpersonal values in a study of sensitivity-training (Harrison &

Lubin, 1965).

The PDI consists of 27 bipolar rating scales on which the S describes three persons: himself, his closest friend of the same sex and his closest friend of the opposite sex. After completing the semantic differential on each person the S is asked to go back over the scales and choose one-third of them as the "best description."

On the basis of his choices of "best description" scales the S is assigned a score on the dimensions "person-oriented" and "task-oriented." These dimensions were arrived at through factor analysis.

Workshop Questionnaire (WOQ)

The WOQ is designed to provide a rough picture of each S's experience of the workshop along several dimensions of interest to this research. The independent parts of the WOQ are:

1. WOQ 1--a series of 11 bipolar scales on which the S rates the atmosphere in his group.
2. WOQ 2--a series of 18 scales on which the S checks the "most extreme degree" to which he experienced each of those feelings during the workshop.
3. WOQ 3-4--a series of nine questions on which S indicates his overall evaluation of his workshop and of sensitivity-training, in general.

4. WOQ 5--a series of 16 bipolar scales on which S rates the behavior of the group trainer.

5. WOQ 6--a series of six scales on which S indicates the frequency with which his group engaged in a number of patterns of interaction.

6. WOQ 7--an instrument on which S indicates the importance in his group of each of 15 issues.

7. WOQ 8-11--an adaptation for groups of Barrett-Lennard's Relationship Inventory (1962), an instrument which assesses an individual's experience of the degree of Regard, Empathy, Congruence and Unconditionality of Regard in the attitudes toward him held by others. The instrument follows Rogers' theory of personality.

8. WOQ 12--a series of 12 dimensions along which S indicates the direction and felt degree of change in himself since the beginning of the workshop.

Response to the Discussion (RED)

The RED is designed to provide a rough picture of each S's experience of the Interview. The parts are:

1. RED 1--a series of 18 scales on which S indicates the "most extreme degree" to which he experienced these feelings during the Interview.

2. RED 2--a series of 14 bipolar scales on which S

indicates his overall feeling state during the Interview.

3. RED 3--a series of bipolar scales on which the S indicates his impressions of the interviewer.

4. RED 4--a series of 16 bipolar scales on which S evaluates the Interview.

5. RED 5--a scale on which S indicates the degree to which he felt himself to be open and "himself" during the Interview.

6. RED 6--a duplicate of WOQ 12.

7. RED 7--a duplicate of WOQ 3-4.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS SECTION

Statistical Analysis

The following are brief descriptions of the statistical procedures used in this research.

3-Way Analysis of Variance

Most of the data from the two experimental groups (N=36) was analyzed by a 2x2x2 fixed effects analysis of variance originally designed for six replications per cell. Unequal N's were handled by an unweighted means analysis with the assumption that the design originally called for equal N's and became unbalanced due to random processes.

The three factors in this design are:

1. Model of training ("model")
 - (a) Bethel (B), N=20
 - (b) Tavistock (T), N=16
2. Trainer ("trainer")
 - (a) trainer 1 (T1), N=17
 - (b) trainer 2 (T2), N=19
3. Sex of participant ("sex")

(a) female (F), N=16

(b) male (M), N=20

Main effect and interaction sums of squares had $df=1$, and the error sum of squares had $df=28$. (See the Appendix for a sample summary table of this analysis.)

4-Way Analysis of Variance

A number of instruments were completed by the experimental groups at two or three points in time. These data were analyzed by a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ or a $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 3$ analysis of variance, respectively, with repeated measures on the last factor. Unequal N's in the cells were handled by the method of least squares. This analysis, then, is similar to the $2 \times 2 \times 2$ analysis described above with the addition of a fourth factor, "time."

The three points in time used in the various analyses are as follows:

1. Time 1 (TM1)--immediately before the beginning of the workshop.
2. Time 2 (TM2)--during the second half of the workshop (toward the end of the second day).
3. Time 3 (TM3)--immediately following the Interview.

In the $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 2$ analyses all main effect and interaction sums of squares had $df=1$, and the between and within error sums of squares each had $df=28$.

In the 2x2x2x3 analyses the model, trainer and sex sums of squares each had df=1 and the time sum of squares had df=2. Between Ss interaction sums of squares had df=1 and within Ss interaction sums had df=2. The between Ss error sum of squares had df=28 and the within Ss error sum of squares had df=56. (See the Appendix for sample summary tables of these analyses.)

t-Tests

Comparisons between the control group (N=10) and the combined experimental groups (N=36) were made by a t-test for uncorrelated samples. Population variances could not be assumed equal so separate standard errors were computed from each sample and pooled estimates were not made. Because sample sizes were different a corrected number of degrees of freedom was calculated from a formula suggested by Hayes (1963, p. 322):

$$df = \frac{(\text{est } \sigma_{M_1}^2) + \text{est } \sigma_{M_2}^2}{\frac{(\text{est } \sigma_{M_1}^2)^2 / (N_1 + 1) + (\text{est } \sigma_{M_2}^2)^2 / (N_2 + 1)}{2}} - 2$$

Pretreatment Comparison of Subjects

A number of instruments included in this study for other purposes were also used to confirm the random assignment of Ss to groups. These results follow.

Scores on the Person Description Instrument (PDI)

Each S received two scores based on his responses to the PDI:

1. Interpersonal warmth and acceptance;
2. Power and effectiveness.

Tables 1a and 2a summarize the results of the statistical analyses of these scores. (Summary tables for all statistical tests can be found in the Appendix.)

The data indicate no significant differences between the control and combined experimental groups, and only one significant effect among the experimental Ss: a significant three-way interaction in "power and effectiveness" scores.

Scores on the Personal Information Form (PIF), Questions #22 and #23

The data summarized in Tables 1b and 2b indicate that there are no significant differences between the experimental and control groups nor among the experimental Ss, themselves, in their pretreatment attitudes toward sensitivity-training or in their expectations about the type of experience they will have at the workshop.

Summary

The above comparisons of pretreatment scores on the PDI and PIF (#22 and #23) confirm the initial comparability of the

TABLE 1

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Experimental
Ss' Scores on (a) the PDI and (b)
 PIF Questions #22 and #23

Scale	Model		p	Trainer		p	Sex		p	Interaction Effects
	B	T		T1	T2		F	M		
a) <u>PD1</u>										
Interpersonal warmth and acceptance	9.4	10.2	n. s.	10.0	9.5	n. s.	9.8	9.7	n. s.	n. s.
Power and effectiveness	6.9	6.2	n. s.	6.9	6.4	n. s.	5.9	7.2	n. s.	model x trainer x sex; p < .05
b) <u>PIF</u>										
#22 evaluation of sensitivity training	1.8	2.0	n. s.	1.9	1.9	n. s.	1.9	1.9	n. s.	n. s.
#23 expected depth of work- shop experience	2.0	2.0	n. s.	2.0	2.0	n. s.	2.0	2.0	n. s.	n. s.

TABLE 2

Results of t-tests Comparing Experimental and Control
Group Scores on (a) the PDI and (b)
PIF Questions #22 and #23

Scale	Experimental	Control	p
a) <u>PDI</u>			
Interpersonal warmth and acceptance	9.8	9.3	n. s.
Power and effectiveness	6.6	7.7	n. s.
b) <u>PIF</u>			
#22--evaluation of sensitivity training	1.9	2.0	n. s.
#23--expected depth of workshop experience	2.0	2.1	n. s.

experimental and control Ss on the dimensions assessed.

The Workshop

Parameters of the Two Models of Sensitivity-Training

Trainer style.

1. Ratings by Ss--Table 3 summarizes the analysis of Ss' ratings of trainer behavior during the workshop. Ratings were made on a series of sixteen 8-point bipolar scales (WOQ 5), with a rating of "1" corresponding to the most extreme value of the left end of the scale and a rating of "8" corresponding to the most extreme value of the right end of the scale. (See the Appendix for copies of WOQ 5 and all other instruments.)

Several clear patterns emerge from Table 3. The main effect, model, is significant in 14 of the 16 comparisons, indicating that trainer behavior is seen as significantly and consistently different across the two models. The Bethel trainer is experienced as warmer (more "friendly," "likable," "soft," "warm"), more genuine ("open," "emotional," "spontaneous," "authentic"), more supportive ("accepting," "reassuring," "supportive," "tranquilizing") and more accessible to the members ("informal," "flexible").

Significant model x trainer interactions on four scales reveal that while the differences between Bethel and Tavistock styles are

TABLE 3

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Ss' Ratings of Trainer
Behavior During the Workshop

Scale	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model			Trainer			Sex			
	B	T	p	T1	T2	p	F	M	p	
Friendly-unfriendly	1.9	6.1	**	4.2	3.4	n. s.	3.9	3.7	n. s.	model x trainer; p < .05
Likable-unlikable	1.4	3.7	**	2.5	2.4	n. s.	2.5	2.4	n. s.	n. s.
Intelligent-unintelligent	1.7	1.7	n. s.	1.6	1.8	n. s.	1.6	1.8	n. s.	n. s.
Strong-weak	2.6	2.0	n. s.	1.8	2.8	*	2.2	2.4	n. s.	n. s.
Informal-formal	2.9	5.7	**	3.8	4.5	n. s.	4.4	3.9	n. s.	n. s.
Flexible-rigid	2.6	6.1	**	3.8	4.5	n. s.	4.4	4.0	n. s.	trainer x sex; p < .05
Accepting-critical	2.7	5.2	**	4.9	2.9	**	3.5	4.1	n. s.	model x trainer; p < .01
										model x sex; p < .05
										trainer x sex; p < .01
Open-closed	1.7	4.9	**	3.2	3.1	n. s.	3.0	3.2	n. s.	trainer x sex; p < .05
Emotional-intellectual	4.3	7.0	**	5.1	5.9	n. s.	5.6	5.4	n. s.	model x trainer; p < .01
Authentic-role-playing	1.8	5.9	**	3.9	3.4	n. s.	3.7	3.5	n. s.	n. s.
Warm-cold	1.4	5.7	**	3.5	3.2	n. s.	3.4	3.2	n. s.	n. s.
Soft-hard	2.0	5.4	**	3.5	3.6	n. s.	3.6	3.5	n. s.	n. s.
Reassuring-intimidating	2.5	4.6	**	3.8	3.2	n. s.	3.1	3.7	n. s.	model x trainer; p < .01
										model x sex; p < .05
Supportive-unsupportive	2.7	4.6	**	3.4	3.7	n. s.	2.9	4.0	*	trainer x sex; p < .05
Spontaneous-calculated	2.8	5.6	**	3.8	4.4	n. s.	3.9	4.2	n. s.	trainer x sex; p < .01
Tranquilizing-provocative	4.4	6.7	**	5.5	5.3	n. s.	5.1	5.6	n. s.	n. s.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

in the same direction for both trainers, they are of a greater magnitude for T1, along these dimensions.

The individual trainers were experienced as different in style on only two scales, "strong-weak" and "accepting-critical," with T2 being rated less "strong" and more "accepting" than T1. Significant interactions with model and sex on the latter scale reflect differences only in the degree to which T2 is experienced as more "accepting" than T1.

Significant trainer x sex interactions indicate that women responded more positively to T2 than to T1 (rating him more "flexible," "open," "supportive," and "spontaneous") while men responded more positively to T1 than to T2 along these same dimensions. Ratings on the dimension "friendly-unfriendly" follow this same trend ($p=.08$).

2. Ratings by judges. Two judges listened to a one-hour recorded segment from each of the four training groups and then rated trainer behavior on the same 16 scales used by the Ss (WOQ 5). Means of the judges' ratings are presented in Table 4 and comprise the data for the following non-statistical analysis.

Judges' ratings of trainer behavior in the two models follow the same pattern found in ratings by Ss: the Bethel trainer is experienced as warmer, more genuine, more supportive and more accessible

TABLE 4

Means of Judges' Ratings of Trainer Behavior

Scale	Trainers		Models	
	T1	T2	B	T
Friendly-unfriendly	3.3	3.5	2.0	4.8
Likable-unlikable	3.3	3.5	2.3	4.5
Intelligent-unintelligent	2.3	2.8	2.8	2.3
Strong-weak	2.5	2.8	2.8	2.5
Informal-formal	4.8	4.3	2.5	6.5
Flexible-rigid	4.5	3.8	2.0	6.3
Accepting-critical	4.3	3.3	1.8	5.8
Open-closed	4.8	2.8	2.5	5.0
Emotional-intellectual	5.0	4.0	2.8	6.3
Authentic-role-playing	4.5	4.3	2.0	6.8
Warm-cold	4.8	4.3	2.0	7.0
Soft-hard	5.0	4.0	2.3	6.8
Reassuring-intimidating	4.5	3.5	2.3	5.8
Supportive-unsupportive	3.3	2.8	2.0	4.0
Spontaneous-calculated	4.5	4.8	2.8	6.5
Tranquilizing-provocative	6.0	6.0	5.0	7.0

than the Tavistock consultant. In all but two of these comparisons the differences are qualitative as well as quantitative, ratings for Bethel falling on the left side of the scale and those for Tavistock falling on the right.

Ratings of the individual trainers across models indicate substantially less difference between them than between the models. This finding, too, is congruent with the ratings of the Ss. The few differences that reach appreciable magnitude point toward a trend for T2 to be perceived as "warmer," more "open" and more "accepting" than T1.

3. Summary. These data on trainer style indicate marked differences in ratings of trainer behavior in the Bethel and Tavistock models by both group members and by independent judges working from tapes. Ratings of the individual trainers, averaged across models, indicate substantially fewer and smaller differences between them than between models. On a number of dimensions T1 was experienced by Ss as more different in his two roles than was T2, though differences were always in the same direction. Women responded more positively to T2 and men to T1.

Importance of topics in the training groups. Subjects used the following 5-point scale to rate each of 15 topics on its "importance" in the training group (WOQ 7);

- 1 = never discussed
- 2 = one of the least important topics discussed
- 3 = one of many topics of only minor importance
- 4 = one of the more important topics discussed
- 5 = one of the most important topics discussed

The analysis of the mean ratings is summarized in Table 5.

Two issues, "affection" and "role of feedback" were rated more important in the Bethel groups, and several issues related to authority ("relationships with trainer," "relationships with authority figures" and "need for structure") were rated more important in the Tavistock groups.

T2 groups rated several issues higher in importance than T1 groups: "trust," "expression of feeling," "anger," "need for structure," and "honesty." The model x trainer interaction on "relationship with authority" indicates that greater importance is assigned this topic by T2 groups only in Bethel. Only one issue was rated more important by T1 groups ("competition") and the model x trainer effect indicates that this difference exists only in Bethel while in Tavistock the same issue was rated more important by T2 groups.

All sex differences are in the same direction, with women rating 7 of the 15 topics higher in importance than men: "expressions of feeling," "anger," "need for structure," "honesty," "sex differences," "competition," and "relationships with trainer." Significant

TABLE 5

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Ss' Ratings of the Importance
of Topics in the Training Groups

Topic	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model			Trainer			Sex			
	B	T	p	T1	T2	p	F	M	p	
Sexual attraction										
and feelings	3.4	3.9	n. s.	4.0	3.3	n. s.	3.9	3.3	n. s.	model x trainer; $p < .05$
competition	3.1	3.7	n. s.	3.9	2.9	**	3.8	3.0	*	model x trainer; $p < .05$ model x sex; $p < .05$
Emotion	4.2	3.3	*	3.6	4.0	n. s.	3.7	3.9	n. s.	n. s.
trust	3.4	4.0	n. s.	3.0	4.2	**	3.9	3.5	n. s.	n. s.
Need for approval	4.2	4.3	n. s.	4.3	4.3	n. s.	4.6	4.0	n. s.	n. s.
anger	3.8	3.7	n. s.	3.3	4.1	*	4.3	3.3	**	n. s.
Need for structure	2.0	3.1	**	2.3	2.7	*	3.2	2.0	**	model x sex; $p < .05$
honesty (openness)	4.5	4.4	n. s.	4.1	4.8	**	4.8	4.2	*	n. s.
relationships with										model x sex; $p < .05$
your trainer	3.6	4.9	**	4.3	4.2	n. s.	4.6	3.9	**	
relationships with										
authority figures	2.9	4.9	**	3.4	4.2	*	4.0	3.7	n. s.	model x trainer; $p < .05$
expression of feelings	4.5	4.4	n. s.	4.2	4.7	*	4.7	4.3	*	n. s.
role of feedback in										
the group	4.2	2.9	**	3.9	3.5	n. s.	4.0	3.4	n. s.	n. s.
depending on others	3.8	3.9	n. s.	3.6	4.1	n. s.	4.2	3.6	n. s.	model x sex; $p < .05$ model x trainer x sex; $p < .05$
Non-verbal communi-										
cation	2.9	2.4	n. s.	2.9	2.5	n. s.	2.9	2.6	n. s.	n. s.
sex differences	3.4	3.3	n. s.	3.6	3.1	n. s.	3.9	2.9	**	n. s.

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

model x sex interactions reveal a greater sex difference in Bethel on these last two topics and a greater difference in Tavistock on "need for structure."

Thus, ratings of topic importance were a function of all three factors: model, trainer and sex. Each training model stressed topics related to its own theoretical emphasis. T2 groups and women reported generally greater importance of topics than T1 groups and men, respectively.

Patterns of interaction in the group. Using the following 4-point scale Ss rated the frequency with which a number of different interaction patterns occurred in their group (WOQ 6):

1 = very frequently

2 = sometimes

3 = rarely

4 = not at all

Table 6 summarizes the analysis of mean frequency ratings.

The models were different in a number of ways: Tavistock groups report spending more time sharing historical facts and Bethel groups report a trend (at $p=.09$) toward greater sharing of here and now feelings. Bethel groups report interacting with their trainer more frequently and dealing more often with a single member in depth.

TABLE 6

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of $\bar{S}_s'$ ratings of the
Frequency of Occurrence of Interaction Patterns
in the Training Groups

Interaction Pattern	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model			Trainer			Sex			
	B	T	p	T1	T2	p	F	M	p	
Giving feedback	1.5	1.7	n. s.	1.8	1.5	n. s.	1.4	1.7	n. s.	model x trainer; p < .05
Interacting with the trainer	1.6	2.6	**	1.9	2.2	n. s.	1.9	2.2	n. s.	trainer x sex; p < .01
Interacting with another member	1.3	1.4	n. s.	1.2	1.5	n. s.	1.4	1.3	n. s.	n. s.
Sharing "here-and- now" feelings	1.6	1.9	.09	2.1	1.5	**	1.6	1.9	.07	n. s.
Sharing historical facts	1.7	1.1	**	1.5	1.5	n. s.	1.5	1.4	n. s.	n. s.
Dealing in depth with one member at a time	1.2	1.7	*	1.5	1.3	n. s.	1.4	1.4	n. s.	model x trainer x sex; p < .05

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Groups trained by T2 report more frequent sharing of here and now feeling, and women report a trend toward greater sharing of here and now feelings than men ($p=.07$).

There was no consistent difference between the models in amount of feedback given.

In summary, the most striking contrast in reported interaction patterns appeared between the models: Bethel groups interacted more consistently and deeply in the here and now with both other members and with their trainer. Tavistock groups more frequently revealed facts about themselves in a less interactive style.

Summary. The data from this section confirm that the differences between the Bethel and Tavistock groups in the areas of trainer style, importance of topics, and patterns of interaction were generally congruent with the description of the models presented in the Introduction above.

The Bethel groups were characterized by a warmer, more genuine and more supportive trainer, a greater emphasis on issues of affection and individual feedback, and a more frequent interaction in the here and now with both trainer and other members. The Tavistock groups were characterized by a colder, more formal and distant consultant, a greater emphasis on issues of authority relations, a more historically-oriented pattern of interaction and less

frequent interaction with the consultant.

Model x trainer interactions indicate that while both trainers were experienced as significantly different in their two roles this difference was greater in the case of T1. T2 was seen as less "strong" and more "accepting" than T1 and T2 groups rated a number of issues higher in importance than T1 groups.

Two clear sex differences were found: women responded more favorably to T2's style than to T1's, the reverse being true for the men, and women rated a number of group issues higher in importance than the men.

The presence of numerous interactions indicates that generalizations about models, trainers and sexes must often be qualified by reference to other variables.

Overall, then, the results of this section confirm that the Bethel and Tavistock models of training are significantly different along the parameters of trainer style, topic importance and patterns of interaction, and that these differences are congruent with the description of the models outlined in the Introduction, above. The trainer, sex and interaction effects add to the complexity of the picture but do not nullify these basic differences between the models.

Interpersonal Atmosphere in the Training Groups

Ss' experience of the training group atmosphere. Table 7

TABLE 7

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of $\bar{S}_s$ ¹
 Ratings of the Workshop Atmosphere

Scale	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model			Trainer			Sex			
	B	T	p	T1	T2	p	F	M	p	
Open-closed	2.3	4.3	**	4.4	2.2	**	3.4	3.1	n. s.	n. s.
Warm-cold	2.1	4.3	**	3.8	2.5	**	3.1	3.1	n. s.	n. s.
Accepting-rejecting	4.0	3.7	n. s.	4.5	3.4	*	3.5	4.2	n. s.	n. s.
Close-distant	2.5	4.4	**	4.5	2.3	**	3.5	3.2	n. s.	model x trainer; p < .05 model x trainer x sex; p < .05
Emotional-intellectual	4.4	5.2	n. s.	5.1	4.5	n. s.	4.9	4.6	n. s.	n. s.
Sexual-asexual	3.8	3.9	n. s.	3.9	3.8	n. s.	3.2	4.4	n. s.	n. s.
Unstructured-structured	4.4	3.4	n. s.	3.5	4.4	n. s.	4.5	3.6	n. s.	n. s.
Empathic-unempathic	2.1	3.6	**	3.6	2.0	**	2.5	3.0	n. s.	n. s.
Cooperative-competitive	4.8	4.7	n. s.	6.0	3.7	**	5.1	4.5	n. s.	n. s.
Experiential-didactic	2.3	3.9	**	3.6	2.5	*	2.8	3.2	n. s.	n. s.
Personal-impersonal	2.1	3.5	**	3.3	2.2	*	2.8	2.6	n. s.	n. s.

*p < .05

**p < .01

summarizes the analysis of S_s' ratings of the group atmosphere in terms of their experience of the second half of the workshop. Ratings were made on a series of eleven 8-point bipolar scales (WOQ 1) with a rating of "1" corresponding to the most extreme value of the left end of the scale and a rating of "8" corresponding to the most extreme value of the right end of the scale.

Table 7 reveals that there are marked and consistent differences in the reported "atmospheres" of the groups as a function of both model and trainer. The fact that there is only one significant interaction term indicates that these differences are essentially non-interactive.

Bethel groups are experienced as more personally open and revealing ("open," "personal"), more friendly ("warm," "close," "empathic"), and more "experiential" in comparison with the Tavistock groups. In a word they felt more emotionally intimate.

A similar pattern of differences emerges when the data is divided according to the trainer variable. T2 groups were experienced as more revealing, friendly and experiential, as were the Bethel groups, and also as more "accepting" and "cooperative" than T1 groups.

Thus, the two treatment levels, Bethel and T2, separately and additively fostered a group atmosphere that was experienced by participants as more personal, friendly and experiential than that

fostered by the Tavistock model and T1, respectively.

Ss' experience of the training groups in terms of Rogerian constructs. The Relationship Inventory (RI) assesses the degree to which an individual experiences another person as empathic, congruent, having positive regard for him and having unconditionality of regard for him. The RI as adapted for this study measures the extent to which the S experiences his group as having the above attitudes toward himself. The S rates each of 69 statements on a 6-point scale as follows (WOQ 8 - WOQ 11):

- +1: I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue
- +2: I feel that it is true
- +3: I strongly feel that it is true
- 1: I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true
- 2: I feel that it is not true
- 3: I strongly feel that it is not true

Items are then grouped according to the scale to which they belong (between 16 and 19 items per scale) and four separate sums are calculated:

- level of regard (R)
- empathic understanding (E)
- congruence (C), and
- unconditionality of regard (U)

These scores reflect qualities of the group as experienced by the rater.

Table 8 summarizes the analysis of Ss' ratings of the group on the RI.¹ It shows a consistent pattern of differences between the models of training and between the individual trainers on three of the four scales of the RI: level of regard, empathic understanding, and congruence. On these scales Bethel groups are experienced as more "Rogerian"² than Tavistock groups, and T2 groups are experienced as more "Rogerian" than T1 groups. There are no significant effects on the "unconditionality" scale, and there are no sex main effects or interactions on any of the scales.

¹The actual raw data for the statistical analysis consisted of four sums for each S, one for each of the above scales, with a constant, plus four, added to each individual rating in order to remove negative numbers. However, in order to facilitate comprehension the results are reported here in terms of the original scale ratings. Thus, a reported mean score for a group on a given scale will be the mean rating, averaged over all members of that group, to a single item on that scale, a number between -3 and +3.

²Throughout this paper the term "Rogerian" will be used to refer to the presence of a relatively high degree of "empathy," "congruence," "positive regard" and "unconditionality of regard." The term will not be limited to those instances in which the presence of these interpersonal qualities have been directly assessed, but will also be used to indicate situations in which such qualities can be reasonably inferred to exist, as for instance when Ss have reported a high level of "acceptance" to exist in their group.

TABLE 8

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Ss' Ratings of the Group
on the Relationship Inventory

Scale	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model		p	Trainer		p	Sex		p	
	B	T		T1	T2		F	M		
Level of regard	+1.8	+0.9	**	+1.0	+1.8	*	+1.4	+1.4	n. s.	n. s.
Empathic understanding	+0.5	-0.1	*	-0.2	+0.6	**	+0.2	+0.2	n. s.	n. s.
Congruence	+0.7	-0.3	**	-0.4	+0.9	**	+0.1	+0.4	n. s.	n. s.
Unconditionality of regard	-0.6	-0.4	n. s.	-0.6	-0.5	n. s.	-0.4	-0.7	n. s.	n. s.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

Summary. The results of this section confirm that the differences between the Bethel and Tavistock models with respect to the members' experience of the group atmosphere is congruent with the description of the models outlined in the Introduction.

Two measures of members' experience of the group (WOQ 1 and the RI) led to related conclusions: the Bethel groups were experienced as more personal, friendly, experiential and Rogerian than the Tavistock groups. This difference was constant across trainers and sex.

It was also found that the groups trained by T2 were experienced as more personal, friendly, experiential and Rogerian in comparison with groups trained by T1, and that this difference between trainers was constant across model and sex.

Thus, the expected effect of the model in fostering different types of group atmospheres was found to coexist with a non-interactive trainer effect along the same dimensions

Degree of Affective Involvement in the Group

Ss used the following 5-point scale to rate the "most extreme degree" to which they felt "involved" in the workshop and the most extreme degree to which they experienced each of 17 specified feelings during the workshop (WOQ 2):

0 - not at all

- 1 - slightly
- 2 - moderately
- 3 - very
- 4 - extremely

These 17 scales were divided into two categories:

- 1. positive affect (6 scales)
happy, relaxed, affectionate, excited, trusting, sexual
- 2. negative affect (11 scales)
sad, hurt, angry, anxious, jealous, competitive,
distrustful, defensive, embarrassed, insulted, nervous

Three comparisons were made among groups:

- 1. mean degree of involvement
- 2. mean degree of positive affect
- 3. mean degree of negative affect

Table 9 shows that the main differences in degree of affective involvement in the workshop were between the models, Bethel groups reporting a greater involvement in and a higher degree of positive feeling during the workshops than the Tavistock groups. Differences between the models in degree of negative affect reported are negligible.

Though the differences between trainers are not statistically significant there is a marked pattern in the data indicating that T2 groups report greater positive involvement in the workshop than T1 groups.

TABLE 9

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Ss' Ratings of Their Degree
of Affective Involvement in the Workshop

Scale	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model		p	Trainer		p	Sex		p	
	B	T		T1	T2		F	M		
Degree of involvement	3.4	2.7	*	2.9	3.3	n. s.	2.9	3.2	n. s.	n. s.
Degree of positive affect	2.7	2.1	*	2.2	2.7	.06	2.4	2.5	n. s.	n. s.
Degree of negative affect	1.9	1.7	n. s.	2.0	1.6	.07	1.8	1.8	n. s.	n. s.

* $p < .05$

There are no sex effects or interactions in this data.

Summary. Bethel groups report greater involvement in and a higher degree of positive affect during the workshop than the Tavistock groups. There is also a non-significant trend for T2 groups to feel more positively involved with a lesser degree of negative affect in the workshop than T1 groups.

Evaluation of the Workshop Experience
and of Sensitivity-Training

Members assessment of their workshop experience. A series of four questions relating to members' assessment of the workshop were asked at two points in time: once during the second half of the workshop (Time 2) and again at the Interview (Time 3). The questions and rating scales follow (WOQ 3, #4-7 and RED 7, #4-7):

To what extent has the workshop been a valuable growth experience for you?

To what extent has the workshop been a painful experience for you?

To what extent has the workshop been an enjoyable experience for you?

(1) not at all (2) slight (3) moderate (4) very great

How do you feel about the prospect of attending another workshop with a format similar to this one?

(1) would not want to at all (2) slight interest
(3) substantial interest (4) eager to attend

The results, analyzed by a 4-way analysis of variance, are presented in Table 10. They show that there was a small but significant drop

TABLE 10

Results of 2x2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Ss' Personal
Assessment of Their Workshop Experience

Question	Main Effects												Interaction Effects
	Model			Trainer			Sex			Time			
	B	T	p	T1	T2	p	F	M	p	TM2	TM3	p	
To what extent was workshop a valuable experience?	3.1	2.9	n. s.	2.8	3.2	n. s.	3.1	2.9	n. s.	3.1	2.9	*	model x sex; p < .05
To what extent was workshop a painful experience?	2.4	2.3	n. s.	2.4	2.3	n. s.	2.5	2.2	n. s.	2.4	2.2	n. s.	model x trainer x time; p < .05
To what extent was workshop an enjoyable experience?	3.3	3.0	n. s.	2.9	3.4	*	3.2	3.1	n. s.	3.2	3.0	*	n. s.
Would you like to attend an-other workshop?	3.2	2.9	n. s.	2.9	3.2	n. s.	3.0	3.1	n. s.	3.1	3.0	n. s.	n. s.

* p < .05

from Time 2 to Time 3 (TM2 to TM3) in Ss' reports of the extent to which their workshop was a "valuable" and "enjoyable" experience. This effect was constant across all other factors.

Groups trained by T2 report greater enjoyment of the workshop than T1 groups, at both TM2 and TM3.

Also stable across time is the fact that women value Bethel more than Tavistock while men value Tavistock more than Bethel.

Ss were also asked to evaluate their workshop experience in another question posed at three points in time: immediately before the workshop (TM1) (anticipated experience, PIF #23), during the workshop (TM2) (WOQ 3, #9), and at the Interview (TM3) (RED 7, #9). The question read:

Which of the following best describes the kind of experience that this workshop has been for you?

(1) A profound experience. I underwent great change and experienced deeply meaningful insight about myself and my relationships with others.

(2) A meaningful experience. Some aspects of this workshop have improved my understanding of myself and others and I have changed, somewhat, as a result of this experience.

(3) An enjoyable experience. I had a good time at the workshop, as I would at a party.

(4) A boring experience. The workshop was a tedious and boring exercise in meaningless psychological jargon and phony interpersonal relationships. The only effect it had on me was to turn me off.

A 4-way analysis of variance on the responses to this question (summarized in Table 11) shows no significant differences.

Members' assessment of sensitivity-training. One question

TABLE 11

Results of 2x2x2x3 Analyses of Variance of Responses
to Questions #23 and #22 on the PIF

Question	Main Effects													Interaction Effects
	Model			Trainer			Sex			Time				
	B	T	p	T1	T2	p	F	M	p	TM1	TM2	TM3	p	
PIF #23 Evaluation of workshop experience	1.9	2.0	n. s.	2.0	1.9	n. s.	1.9	2.0	n. s.	2.0	1.9	1.9	n. s.	n. s.
PIF #22 Evaluation of efficacy of sensivity- training	1.8	1.9	n. s.	1.9	1.8	n. s.	1.8	1.9	n. s.	1.9	1.7	1.9	*	model x time; p < .05

*p < .05

asked Ss to indicate their evaluation of the efficacy of sensitivity-training in promoting personal growth. This question was also asked at three points in time. It read (PIF #22, WOQ 3 #8, RED 7 #8):

Please indicate which statement is closest to your own view:

(1) Sensitivity-training is an important and effective method of helping individuals grow into psychologically healthier and happier human beings.

(2) Sensitivity-training is an experimental technique which may be effective in helping individuals grow into psychologically healthier and happier human beings.

(3) Sensitivity-training is a current fad, something like discotheque dancing, which provides individuals with a harmless and entertaining experience that is unlikely to have any deep influence on their lives.

(4) Sensitivity-training is a technique which is more likely to have harmful than a beneficial effect on the participants.

The responses were analyzed by a 4-way analysis of variance summarized in Table 11. The data shows that Bethel and Tavistock groups followed different courses in their evaluations of sensitivity-training over time. Starting with approximately the same initial evaluation (TM1), Bethel groups reported a markedly more favorable evaluation at TM2 and reverted to their initial position by TM3 while the Tavistock groups reported a gradually more favorable evaluation over time.

Thus, it seems that while the workshop experience had an initially positive effect on the evaluations of sensitivity-training held by all groups this effect was greater but more temporary for the Bethel groups.

Summary. The data on Ss' evaluation of the workshop reveals that there were no differences between the models of training and relatively few and small differences as a function of trainer, sex and time. These latter effects show that there was a drop in the favorableness of Ss' evaluation of the workshop over time, with T2 groups being rated more "enjoyable" than T1 groups, and women rating Bethel more "valuable" than Tavistock while men rated Tavistock more "valuable" than Bethel.

Evaluations of sensitivity-training as an effective technique followed a different pattern: Bethel groups showed a marked increment in favorableness of ratings during the workshop followed by a reversion to their initial level while Tavistock groups gave a gradually more favorable evaluation over time.

Summary

The above results indicate a marked difference between participants' experiences of the two models of training used in this study. Though model effects occasionally interacted with sex and trainer effects a clear pattern of differences emerged that can be generalized across trainers and sex and is consistent with the orientations of Bethel and Tavistock as outlined in the Introduction to this paper.

Participants rated Bethel differently from Tavistock on all three parameters: In Bethel the trainer seemed more genuine and

supportive, the focus centered more on warmth and personal feedback, and the interaction remained more here and now with both members and trainer. The interpersonal atmosphere in the Bethel groups was experienced as more personal, experiential and Rogerian, and members reported deeper and more positive involvement in the workshop. The evaluation of sensitivity-training reported by Bethel members during their workshop reflected a marked rise in esteem for the technique relative to pre-workshop ratings, while a final evaluation at the time of the Interview was similar to the more modest initial rating. This see-saw motion was in stark contrast to the gradually more favorable evaluation of sensitivity-training over time by members of the Tavistock groups.

Striking differences between Ss' experiences of the two trainers were reported and found to be largely independent of the difference between models. T2 was seen as less "strong" and more "accepting" than T1 and was experienced as less different in his Bethel and Tavistock roles than was T1. T2 groups rated a number of topics higher in importance than T1 groups did, and they reported a more personal, experiential and Rogerian atmosphere in their groups than T1 groups did in theirs. Finally, T2 groups rated their workshops more "enjoyable" than did T1 groups, and reported a trend toward deeper and more positive involvement in their groups than did T1 groups.

Women rated a number of topics higher in importance than men did and they responded more positively to T2, while men favored T1. Women rated Bethel more "valuable" than Tavistock, while men offered the opposite rating.

There was a significant drop over time in the degree to which Ss reported the workshop to have been "valuable" and "enjoyable."

The Interview

Degree of Affective Involvement

Ss used the following 5-point scale to rate the "most extreme degree" to which they felt "involved" in the Interview and the "most extreme degree" to which they experienced each of 17 specified feelings during the Interview (RED 1);

- 0 - not at all
- 1 - slightly
- 2 - moderately
- 3 - very
- 4 - extremely

These 17 scales were divided into two categories:

1. positive affect (6 scales)

happy, relaxed, affectionate, excited, trusting, sexual

2. negative affect (11 scales)

sad, hurt, angry, anxious, intimidated, distrustful,
competitive, nervous, defensive, embarrassed, insulted

Three comparisons were made among groups:

1. mean degree of involvement
2. mean degree of positive affect
3. mean degree of negative affect

Tables 12 and 13 show that there were no differences among the experimental groups nor between the experimental groups as a whole and the control group on the degree of affective involvement in the Interview. Thus hypotheses 2 and 6 receive no support from the data.

Feeling State During the Interview

Ss rated their overall feeling state during the second half of the Interview on a series of fourteen 8-point bipolar scales (RED 2), with a rating of "1" corresponding to the most extreme value of the left end of the scale and a rating of "8" corresponding to the most extreme value of the right end of the scale.

In this section we will examine analyses of the ratings on 7 of the 14 scales plus two additional scores calculated by combining four related scales, each from the original 14. These two additional scores are:

1. anxiety

sum of ratings on "self-conscious - unself-conscious," "nervous - relaxed," "loose - tight," and "comfortable - uncomfortable"

TABLE 12

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Ratings of Degree of Affective
Involvement in the Interview by Experimental Ss

Scale	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model		p	Trainer		p	Sex		p	
	B	T		T1	T2		F	M		
Degree of involvement	2.8	2.7	n. s.	2.6	2.9	n. s.	2.6	2.9	n. s.	n. s.
Degree of positive affect	1.9	1.8	n. s.	1.7	2.0	n. s.	1.9	1.9	n. s.	n. s.
Degree of negative affect	2.1	1.9	n. s.	2.4	1.7	n. s.	2.4	1.8	n. s.	n. s.

TABLE 13

Results of t-tests Comparing the Degree of Affective
Involvement in the Interview for the
Experimental and Control Groups

Scale	Groups		p
	Experimental	Control	
Degree of involvement	2.8	2.7	n. s.
Degree of positive affect	1.9	1.4	n. s.
Degree of negative affect	2.0	2.2	n. s.

2. openness

sum of ratings on "open - closed," "honest - dishonest," "spontaneous - cautious," "real - false"

A high score on the "anxiety" scale indicates higher levels of reported anxiety. A low score on the "openness" scale indicates higher levels of reported openness.

From Table 14 it can be seen that, contrary to hypothesis 7, there was no difference between Bethel and Tavistock Ss in their reported feeling state during the Interview. In contrast, Ss trained by T2 reported less anxiety and a trend toward greater spontaneity ($p=.051$) during the Interview than Ss from T1's groups. Men reported less anxiety than women.

The significant model x trainer interaction on the "involvement" dimension indicates that the Ss trained by T1 showed greater involvement if they had been in the Tavistock group while Ss trained by T2 showed greater involvement if they had been in the Bethel group.

The significant trainer x sex interaction on the "emotionality" dimension indicates that women trained by T1 felt more emotional during the Interview than those trained by T2 while men trained by T2 reported greater emotionality than men trained by T1.

Table 15 shows that there was only one significant difference between the control group and the experimental group in their reported feeling state during the Interview: the control group reported feeling more anxious than the experimental group, a finding that

TABLE 14

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Experimental Ss'
Ratings of Their Feeling State During Interview

Dimension	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model			Trainer			Sex			
	B	T	p	T1	T2	p	F	M	p	
Anxiety (combined score)	15.4	16.1	n. s.	18.8	13.0	*	18.1	13.8	*	n. s.
Openness (combined score)	9.1	10.6	n. s.	10.9	8.7	n. s.	10.1	9.5	n. s.	n. s.
Unselfconscious-self-conscious	4.5	4.8	n. s.	5.5	3.9	*	5.4	4.1	.08	n. s.
Relaxed-nervous	4.1	4.4	n. s.	4.9	3.7	n. s.	5.1	3.5	*	n. s.
Involved-uninvolved	2.3	2.7	n. s.	2.6	2.4	n. s.	2.5	2.5	n. s.	model x trainer p < .05
Open-closed	2.1	2.5	n. s.	2.5	2.0	n. s.	2.5	2.1	n. s.	n. s.
Spontaneous-unspontaneous	3.3	3.7	n. s.	4.2	2.9	.05	3.9	3.2	n. s.	n. s.
Emotional-intellectual	4.9	4.3	n. s.	4.5	4.8	n. s.	3.9	5.2	*	trainer x sex; p < .05
Comfortable-uncomfortable	3.4	3.2	n. s.	4.0	2.7	.07	3.7	3.0	n. s.	n. s.

*p < .05

**p < .01

TABLE 15
Results of t-tests Comparing Feeling
State During the Interview for the
Experimental and Control Groups

Scale	Groups		p
	Experimental	Control	
Anxiety (combined score)	15.7	20.5	*
Openness (combined score)	9.8	9.3	n. s.
Unselfconscious-self-conscious	4.7	5.7	n. s.
Relaxed-nervous	4.2	5.4	.09
Involved-uninvolved	2.5	3.3	n. s.
Open-closed	2.3	3.0	n. s.
Spontaneous-unspontaneous	3.5	3.0	n. s.
Emotional-intellectual	4.7	4.7	n. s.
Comfortable-uncomfortable	3.3	4.5	n. s.

* $p < .05$

provides partial confirmation of hypothesis 3.

Questionnaire RED 5 supplements RED 2, above, by asking the S to choose one of four alternative descriptions of the extent to which he was relaxed and able to be "his 'real' self" during the Interview. There were no statistically significant differences among the responses to this question, though the differences between the experimental and control groups were in the expected direction, the control group reporting greater uneasiness.

In summary, the differences among experimental Ss in their reported feeling state during the Interview included trainer and sex effects--men and Ss trained by T2 reporting less anxiety than women and Ss trained by T1, respectively--but no differences between models. All appreciable differences between experimental and control Ss indicated generally greater comfort, openness, and involvement on the part of the experimental Ss, but only one difference reached significance, with control Ss reporting greater anxiety during the Interview.

Impressions of the Interviewer

Immediately following the Interview Ss reported their "impressions" of the interviewer on a series of thirty 9-point bipolar scales with a midpoint labeled "no impression" (RED 3). Three scores were calculated for each S:

1. number of "no impressions"

2. degree of impression formation

This was arrived at by scoring each 9-point scale as follows: 4 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 4, where the higher numbers refer to more extreme ratings at either end of the scale, and "0" indicates "no impression."

3. quality of impression formation

In this instance the 30 scales were scored 1-9, with "1" corresponding to the highest rating at the more positive end of the scale, and "5" corresponding to "no impression," and "9" corresponding to the highest rating at the more negative end of the scale.

Table 16 summarizes the analysis of these scores for the experimental group, and Table 17 summarizes the analysis for the control group vs. the experimental groups combined. In both tables means are reported as a mean score on the original 9-point scale rather than as a sum of all 30 scores.

The results indicate no differences among the experimental Ss or between the control and experimental groups on these measures of impressions of the interviewer, and thus provide no support for hypotheses 4 and 8. There is a trend, however, for women in the experimental groups to report more "no impressions" than men in those groups (Table 16, $p=.08$).

Evaluation of the Interview

Ss recorded their evaluations of the Interview on a series of sixteen, 8-point bipolar scales (RED 4), of which eight scales are analyzed with summaries in Table 18 and Table 19. A rating of "1"

TABLE 16

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Experimental
Ss' Impressions of the Interviewer

Scale	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model		p	Trainer		p	Sex		p	
	B	T		T1	T2		F	M		
Number of "no impressions"	5.3	4.5	n. s.	5.0	4.9	n. s.	6.2	3.9	.08	n. s.
Degree of impression formation	2.0	2.2	n. s.	2.0	2.1	n. s.	2.2	2.0	n. s.	n. s.
Quality of impression formation	3.2	3.0	n. s.	3.3	3.0	n. s.	3.1	3.2	n. s.	n. s.

TABLE 17

Results of t-tests Comparing Impressions of the
Interviewer by Control and Experimental

Ss

Scale	Groups		p
	Experimental	Control	
Number of "no impressions"	5.0	6.0	n. s.
Degree of impression formation	2.1	1.9	n. s.
Quality of impression formation	3.1	3.5	n. s.

corresponds to the most extreme value of the left end of the scale and a rating of "8" corresponds to the most extreme value of the right end of the scale.

The data from Tables 18 and 19 show that there are very few differences among groups in their evaluations of the Interview.

Within the experimental groups Tavistock "graduates" rated the Interview as more "personal" and more "valuable" than Bethel "graduates." Women from Bethel found the Interview more "enjoyable" than women from Tavistock, but men from Bethel found it less "enjoyable" than men from Tavistock.

While there was no difference between women from T1 and T2 groups in their ratings of the Interview on the "personal-impersonal" scale, men from T2 groups found the Interview more "personal" than men from T1 groups. Finally, there is a trend ($p=.08$) for T2 groups to evaluate the Interview as "deeper" than T1 groups.

There are no differences between the control group and the combined experimental group in terms of their evaluations of the Interview on these scales.

In summary, the only "pure" main effect shows Tavistock Ss reporting the Interview to be more "personal" and "valuable" than Bethel Ss. Other differences interacted with sex: women from Bethel found the Interview more enjoyable than women from Tavistock, but men from Bethel found it less enjoyable than men from

TABLE 18

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Ss'
Evaluations of the Interview

Scale	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model			Trainer			Sex			
	B	T	p	T1	T2	p	F	M	p	
Appropriate-inappropriate	3.2	3.0	n. s.	3.5	2.7	n. s.	3.2	3.0	n. s.	n. s.
Personal-impersonal	2.3	1.7	*	2.4	1.7	*	1.6	2.3	**	trainer x sex; p < .05
Valuable-worthless	3.4	2.5	*	3.1	3.0	n. s.	3.0	3.0	n. s.	n. s.
Stimulating-boring	3.0	2.5	n. s.	2.9	2.6	n. s.	2.7	2.8	n. s.	n. s.
Enjoyable-unpleasant	3.3	2.9	n. s.	3.2	3.0	n. s.	3.1	3.1	n. s.	model x sex; p < .05
Unusual-ordinary	4.4	3.5	n. s.	4.1	3.9	n. s.	3.7	4.2	n. s.	n. s.
Undirected-directed	3.9	3.5	n. s.	3.5	3.9	n. s.	3.4	3.9	n. s.	n. s.
Deep-superficial	2.9	2.8	n. s.	3.2	2.6	.08	2.7	3.0	n. s.	n. s.

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

TABLE 19

Results of t-tests Comparing Evaluations of the Interview
by Control and Experimental Ss

Scale	Groups		p
	Experimental	Control	
Appropriate-inappropriate	3.1	3.3	n. s.
Personal-impersonal	2.0	3.1	n. s.
Valuable-worthless	3.0	3.7	n. s.
Stimulating-boring	2.8	3.4	n. s.
Enjoyable-unpleasant	3.1	4.0	n. s.
Unusual-ordinary	4.0	4.1	n. s.
Undirected-directed	3.7	3.1	n. s.
Deep-superficial	2.9	3.2	n. s.

Tavistock. Men from T2 groups rated the Interview more "personal" than men from T1 groups, though there was no difference along this dimension between women from T1 and T2 groups. There are no significant differences between the control and combined experimental groups.

Summary

Overall, there are relatively few significant differences among Ss with respect to their reported experiences of the Interview. The differences that do appear are limited to two of the four areas explored: "feeling state during the Interview" and "evaluation of the Interview." There were no differences among Ss in their "affective involvement in the Interview" or in their "impressions of the Interviewer."

Differences between Bethel and Tavistock Ss occurred only in their evaluations of the Interview, Tavistock graduates rating it as more "personal" and more "valuable" than Bethel graduates. An interaction revealed that while women from Bethel found the Interview more "enjoyable" than women from Tavistock, men from Bethel found it less "enjoyable" than men from Tavistock.

Ss from T2 groups reported less anxiety and a trend toward greater spontaneity ($p=.051$) during the Interview than Ss from T1 groups. Ss trained by T1 reported greater "involvement" in the Interview if they had been in the Tavistock group while Ss trained

by T2 reported greater involvement if they had been in the Bethel group.

The only sex main effect revealed that men felt more relaxed and less anxious during the Interview than women. Men from T2 groups rated the Interview more "personal" and "emotional" than men from T1 groups, and women from T1 groups rated it more "emotional" than those from T2 groups.

The only difference between the control and combined experimental groups is that the former reported feeling more anxious during the Interview than the latter. All other comparisons between these two groups were non-significant.

Thus, the most striking differences to emerge from this data are that Tavistock groups found the Interview to be more meaningful than Bethel groups (the men from Tavistock also finding the Interview more enjoyable than men from Bethel), and that men, Ss trained by T2, and the experimental group as a whole all reported themselves less anxious during the Interview than their counterparts (women, Ss trained by T1, and the control group, respectively).

There is support in the data for only one of the six hypotheses set forth in the Introduction: there were no differences at all in Ss' degree of affective involvement in the Interview (hypotheses 2 and 6) or in their impressions of the interviewer (hypotheses 4 and 8), and there was no difference between Bethel and Tavistock Ss in their

reported feeling state during the Interview (hypothesis 7). The difference between the combined experimental group and the control group in their reported level of anxiety during the Interview lends partial support to the hypothesized difference in feeling state between these two groups (hypothesis 3).

Self-Reports of Change

Experimental Ss evaluated the extent of their own personality change as a result of their sensitivity-training experience at two points in time: during the second half of the workshop (TM2) and again immediately following the Interview (TM3).

Three items on the extent of Ss' change in understanding of self and others and in social attitudes and values were rated on a 4-point scale from "not at all" (1) to "very great" (4) (WOQ 3 and RED 7, #1-3). Eleven items assessing the degree of change in specified areas of interpersonal relations were rated on a 9-point scale from "extreme negative change" (-4) through "no change" (0) to "extreme positive change" (+4) (WOQ 12 and RED 6).

Table 20 summarizes the results of 4-way analyses of variance of these ratings of self-change as a result of the workshop by experimental Ss at two points in time. A significant difference between Bethel and Tavistock Ss in reported self change in "emotionality" at TM2 disappeared by TM3 as ratings by Bethel Ss declined and those by Tavistock Ss increased. Similarly, a trend at TM2

TABLE 20

Results of 2x2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Ss' Ratings of Self-Change as a Result
of the Workshop, at Time 2 and Time 3

Dimension of Change	Main Effects												Interaction Effects
	Model			Trainer			Sex			Time			
	B	T	p	T1	T2	p	F	M	p	TM2	TM3	p	
Better understanding of self	2.5	2.5	n. s.	2.3	2.7	n. s.	2.7	2.4	n. s.	2.6	2.5	n. s.	model x sex; p < .05
Better understanding of people	3.0	2.6	.06	2.5	3.1	*	2.9	2.7	n. s.	2.9	2.7	.06	n. s.
Change in attitude and values about people	2.6	2.5	n. s.	2.4	2.7	n. s.	2.9	2.3	*	2.5	2.6	n. s.	n. s.
Openness	2.0	1.7	n. s.	1.9	1.9	n. s.	2.1	1.7	n. s.	2.2	1.6	*	n. s.
Warmth	2.1	1.5	n. s.	1.7	1.9	n. s.	2.1	1.6	n. s.	2.0	1.6	n. s.	model x sex; p < .05
Acceptance	1.6	1.6	n. s.	1.6	1.6	n. s.	2.2	1.2	**	2.0	1.2	**	model x sex; p < .05
													trainer x sex x time; p < .05
Emotionality	1.9	1.1	*	1.5	1.6	n. s.	1.9	1.2	n. s.	1.7	1.4	n. s.	model x times; p < .05
Sexuality	0.7	1.1	n. s.	0.8	1.0	n. s.	0.8	0.9	n. s.	0.9	0.9	n. s.	n. s.
Trust	1.6	0.9	n. s.	1.1	1.5	n. s.	1.6	1.0	n. s.	1.5	1.0	*	sex x time; p < .05
Attractiveness	1.5	1.1	n. s.	1.2	1.4	n. s.	1.5	1.2	n. s.	1.7	0.9	**	model x sex x time; p < .05
Adventurousness	1.4	0.9	n. s.	1.1	1.3	n. s.	1.2	1.2	n. s.	1.2	1.2	n. s.	n. s.
Activity	1.1	0.8	n. s.	1.0	1.0	n. s.	1.3	0.8	n. s.	1.2	0.8	n. s.	n. s.
Awareness of own feelings	2.0	1.8	n. s.	1.7	2.0	n. s.	2.0	1.8	n. s.	1.7	2.1	n. s.	n. s.
Awareness of others' feelings	1.8	1.6	n. s.	1.6	1.9	n. s.	1.9	1.6	n. s.	1.8	1.7	n. s.	n. s.

*p < .05

**p < .01

toward greater gains in "understanding of other people" by Bethel Ss ($p=.06$) was no longer visible at TM3, its disappearance attributable to a decrement in estimates by Bethel Ss.

T2 Ss report larger gains in "understanding of people" than T1 Ss and women report a greater increase in their "acceptance" of others and a greater change in their "interpersonal attitudes and values" than men do.

A strikingly consistent interaction between model and sex reveals that women from Bethel report greater self-change than women from Tavistock while men from Bethel report less self-change than men from Tavistock. This model x sex interaction holds for the dimensions "understanding of self," "warmth," "acceptance," and "attractiveness," though only at TM3 for the last dimension.

Finally, on five of the 14 dimensions rated reports of self-change became smaller than TM2 to TM3, and in some cases significant effects at TM2 disappeared by TM3 (as in the model x time interaction for "emotionality" and the sex x time interaction for "trust").

In summary, on a number of dimensions T2 Ss and women report greater change as a result of training than do T1 Ss and men, respectively. Reports of greater self-change by Bethel Ss at TM2 decreased to levels equal to those of Tavistock Ss by TM3. A model x sex effect indicates that women frequently report greater change

from Bethel and men from Tavistock, and a Time effect shows that several reports of self-change decreased from TM2 to TM3.

Level of Experiencing

Two trained judges, working from tapes of three-minute segments taken from near the middle of each S's 45-minute Interview, rated the Ss' modal and peak "level of experiencing." The final rating for each S is the mean of the ratings assigned him by the two judges.

Because of the very narrow range of rated levels of experiencing across Ss (almost 2/3 of the 46 Ss were rated between 2 and 3 on the Scale) inter-judge reliability was assessed in terms of percent agreement between the judges. The data in Table 21 show that the judges agreed on more than half of the 46 ratings of modal and peak levels of experiencing.

Table 22 summarizes an analysis of ratings of level of experiencing for the experimental Ss, and Table 23 summarizes a comparison of level of experiencing for the combined experimental group with that of the control group. Examination of these tables reveals that there are no significant differences among experimental groups or between the control and combined experimental group in modal or peak level of experiencing during the Interview.

Summary

The above results show that the three randomly selected

TABLE 21

Comparison of Judges' Ratings of Ss' Levels of
Experiencing During the Interview

Rating	Agreements	Difference of 1 stage	Difference of 2 or more stages	Totals
Modes	24	19	3	46
Peaks	24	19	3	46

TABLE 22

Results of 2x2x2 Analyses of Variance of Modal and
Peak Levels of Experiencing During the
Interview for Experimental Ss

Rating	Main Effects									Interaction Effects
	Model		p	Trainer		p	Sex		p	
	B	T		T1	T2		F	M		
Modal level of experiencing	2.5	2.6	n. s.	2.4	2.6	n. s.	2.5	2.5	n. s.	n. s.
Peak level of experiencing	2.9	3.0	n. s.	2.8	3.1	n. s.	2.9	3.0	n. s.	n. s.

TABLE 23

Results of t-tests Comparing Modal and Peak Levels of
Experiencing During the Interview for the
Experimental and Control Groups

Rating	Groups		p
	Experimental	Control	
Modal level of experiencing	2.5	2.3	n. s.
Peak level of experiencing	3.0	2.8	n. s.

groups of Ss, the Bethel group, the Tavistock group and the Control group, did not initially differ from one another with respect to scores on the PDI, their attitudes toward sensitivity-training or their expectations about the workshop experience.

The differences between Ss' experiences of Bethel and Tavistock form a pattern that is consistent with the descriptions of the two models outlined in the Introduction. The Bethel groups were characterized by a warmer, more genuine and more supportive trainer, a greater emphasis on issues of affection and individual feedback, and a more frequent interaction in the "here-and-now" with both trainer and other members. The Tavistock groups were characterized by a colder, more formal and distant consultant, a greater emphasis on issues of authority relations, a more historically-oriented pattern of interaction and less frequent interaction with the consultant. The interpersonal atmosphere created in the Bethel groups was experienced as more personal, experiential and Rogerian than in the Tavistock groups, and members of these groups reported deeper and more positive involvement in the workshop than their Tavistock counterparts.

Ratings of trainer behavior by independent judges confirmed the differences between the Bethel and Tavistock roles as reported by group members.

Ratings of the extent to which the workshop was a "valuable"

and "enjoyable" experience declined over time for all Ss, but ratings of the efficacy of sensitivity-training as a technique followed different courses for the Bethel and Tavistock groups: ratings from Tavistock becoming more favorable over time while those from Bethel showed a marked rise in esteem immediately after the workshop followed by a reversion to the initial level by the time of the Interview.

Striking differences between Ss' experiences of the two trainers were reported and found to be largely independent of the differences between models. T2 was seen as generally more positive and effective than T1: his groups reported greater importance for a number of topics, described the group atmosphere as more personal, experiential and Rogerian, found the workshop more "enjoyable" and exhibited a tendency toward deeper and more positive involvement in the training than did T1 groups.

Preferences for both model and trainer differed between the sexes: women responded more positively to Bethel than to Tavistock, and to T2 than to T1, while men reported the opposite preferences.

Ss' reported experiences and evaluations of the Interview indicated few differences among groups, and support for only one of the six relevant hypotheses: there were no differences at all in Ss' degree of affective involvement in the Interview (hypotheses 2 and 6) or in their impressions of the interviewer (hypotheses 4 and 8), and there was no difference between Bethel and Tavistock Ss in their

reported feeling state during the Interview (hypothesis 7). The one significant difference between the combined experimental and control groups in feeling state during the Interview is the higher level of anxiety reported by the control group.

Within the experimental groups the only model main effect is that Tavistock "graduates" rated the Interview as more "personal" and "valuable" than Bethel "graduates." An interaction showed that women from Bethel found the Interview more "enjoyable" than women from Tavistock while men from Bethel found it less "enjoyable" than men from Tavistock.

T2 groups, and men, reported less anxiety during the Interview than T1 groups and women, respectively.

There were no differences among Ss in their levels of experiencing during the Interview, contrary to hypotheses 1 and 5.

There are, however, some differences among Ss in their self-reports of change: Bethel Ss report a greater increase in "emotional-ity" than do Tavistock Ss, and T2 Ss report a more substantial improvement in their "understanding of people" than do T1 Ss. Women report a greater increase in "acceptance" of others and a greater change in interpersonal "attitudes and values" than do men. A series of model x sex interactions reveals that women from Bethel report generally greater self-change than women from Tavistock while men from Bethel report less self-change than men from Tavistock.

There is a general trend for the reported magnitude of self-change to diminish from TM 2 to TM3.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The major issues to which this section addresses itself are: the nature of the differences among Ss' experiences of the workshop, the relationship between these differences and the outcomes assessed in this study, and an interpretation of the overall pattern of results to emerge from the data.

Experience of the Workshop

Model Effects

The results indicate that the most important influence in determining Ss' experience of the workshop was the model of training. In general it was found that the trainer roles prescribed by the Bethel and Tavistock approaches were effective in fostering group experiences that were characteristically different and largely independent of the personality of the trainer and the sex of the participant.

Differences in Ss' descriptions of the models' parameters (trainer style, importance of topics, and patterns of interaction) followed closely the models' orientations and goals as prescribed. The Bethel groups were characterized by a warmer, more genuine

and more supportive trainer, a greater emphasis on issues of affection and individual feedback, and a more frequent interaction in the "here and now" with both trainer and other members. The Tavistock groups were characterized by a colder, more formal and distant consultant, a greater emphasis on issues of authority relations, a more historically-oriented pattern of interaction and less frequent interaction with the consultant.

Ss' experiences of the group atmosphere and their own affective involvement in the workshop also differed markedly between the models. Members of Bethel groups experienced the workshop as more personal, friendly, experiential and Rogerian than Tavistock members, and they reported deeper and more positive affective involvement in the workshop than their Tavistock counterparts.

Taken as a whole these results strongly confirm that Bethel and Tavistock are, in fact, two distinct models of training whose prescriptions for trainer style are sufficiently disparate and well-defined to allow for their execution with effects that are comparable across the trainers used in this study. The fact, however, that these two trainers were carefully selected for their similar background, skill and personal style prevents generalization of this conclusion to the population of all qualified trainers and invites further research into this issue.

Trainer Effects

While model, alone, was the single most important factor in determining Ss' experiences of the workshop, the results also indicate significant contributions by trainer, sex and the interactions among all of these factors.

The individual style and personality of the trainer had a marked effect on the kind of experience reported by Ss. Overall, T2 groups experienced the workshop as more personal, intense and enjoyable than T1 groups. Specifically, in T2 groups numerous topics were rated more "important," a greater amount of "here and now" interaction occurred, the group atmosphere was experienced as significantly more intimate, supportive and Rogerian, members reported greater enjoyment of their experience, and there was a trend for Ss to feel deeper and more positive affective involvement in the workshop.

And even more striking close inspection of this data reveals that on a number of these dimensions differences between Ss' experiences of T1's and T2's groups were not just a matter of degree, but were qualitatively opposite. Thus, ratings of the workshop in terms of Rogerian constructs (Table 8) show not only that T2 groups were perceived as more rewarding, empathic, and congruent in atmosphere, but that on the latter two dimensions T1 groups received negative ratings, indicating perception of the group atmosphere as

slightly unempathic and incongruent. Similarly, ratings of the atmosphere on the bipolar scale, "accepting-rejecting" (Table 7), reveal that T2 groups were perceived as "moderately accepting" while T1 groups were perceived as exactly on the border between "accepting" and "rejecting."

Ratings of trainer behavior provide the first clue into those differences between the personalities and styles of the trainers that were instrumental in producing the radical differences in Ss' experiences of their groups. The trainers were perceived as different in style on only two of the 16 dimensions rated (Table 3), one of them being "accepting-critical" on which T2 was rated "moderately accepting" and T1 was rated "slightly critical." The fact that this dimension of "acceptance-criticality" is of major theoretical importance in this investigation, that it is one of only two significant differences in trainer style, and that the ratings of the trainers on this dimension differ in direction as well as in degree, argues for its special importance as an influence on the group atmosphere.

Another difference between trainers is suggested by the data in Table 6 showing that T2 groups differed from T1 groups with respect to only one rated activity, "sharing 'here and now' feelings," a pattern that lends a strong experiential mode to the group experience. Considering the influence of the trainer on group process it can be inferred that T2 in some manner encouraged greater here

and now interaction in his groups than did T1 in his groups.

A final difference between the two trainers is suggested by the finding that T2 was seen as less different in his two training roles than was T1. A rather speculative inference is that T2 was more natural, more "himself" in each of his roles than was T1, which would account for his relative constancy across models. In Rogers' terminology he was more "congruent."

Thus, these results suggest that T2's perceived "acceptance," his ability to foster a more consistent "here-and-now" pattern of interaction in his groups, and his greater congruence in his trainer roles, were the major factors in the evolution of his groups into more personal, intense, Rogerian, and enjoyable experiences than those trained by T1. It is significant that these dimensions along which the personalities and styles of the two trainers are reported to differ are exactly those that are hypothesized by Rogers (1957; 1959) and Gendlin (1964) to be of critical importance in any interpersonal relationship which aims at encouraging personality change. (See below for further discussion of this point.)

A recent study by Culbert (1968) relates to this one in that it explores the effect of trainer "self-disclosure" on the group process. Though the overall finding was that the amount of self-disclosure was not a factor in members' learning, Culbert found that in groups with more self-disclosing trainers members more

frequently viewed their relationships with other "non-critical" members as "therapeutic." This finding bears strong resemblance to the present study which found greater openness, intimacy, involvement, etc. among members of T2 groups.

This effect of increased openness and involvement among members of groups led by relatively open and accessible trainers (in this study as well as in Culbert's) is probably encouraged only in part by the function of the "open" trainer as a model for such behavior. An additional factor may be that a distant and "mysterious" trainer (like a "silent member") exerts strong (if inadvertent) pull on group members to expend substantial time and energy in attempting to dethrone the distant figure, to pierce his armor and make him a part of the group in the same capacity as the others. It is as if the group cannot relate to one another so long as this elusive figure remains a riddle. Thus, in Culbert's study members reported a greater number of "therapeutic relationships" with less disclosing trainers than with more disclosing ones, a finding that on the surface seems paradoxical.

Sex Effects

The numerous differences between men and women in their experiences of the workshop can be understood in terms of the degree to which various aspects of the training conform to the traditional ideas of "masculinity" and "femininity." Women's higher valuation of

Bethel reflects their traditionally "feminine" concern with warmth, emotionality, affection, etc., while men's higher valuation of Tavistock reflects their traditionally "masculine" involvement with issues of authority, leadership and competition.

Viewing the trainers and their groups along the same dimensions it can be seen that T1, rated "stronger" and more "critical" than T2 was in these respects perceived as more "masculine," and T2 groups, rated more intimate, accepting and supportive were experienced as more "feminine" than those of T1. Thus, the fact that the women responded more positively to T2 and the men to T1 may reflect a greater comfort experienced by each sex in those workshops where trainer and atmosphere were most congruent with their psychological orientations as men and women.

This line of thought suggests that sensitivity-training, itself, with its special emphasis on feelings in the "here-and-now," may be more "feminine" than "masculine" in orientation and thus more comfortable for women than for men. This hypothesis is supported, indirectly, by the finding that in spite of no differences between the sexes in their reported involvement in or evaluation of the workshop, women assigned greater importance than men to seven of the 15 topics rated, and showed a trend (at $p=.07$) toward reporting more frequent "here-and-now" interaction in the groups.

Harrison and Lubin (1965) found analagous results using

homogeneously "person-oriented" groups. As expected, the "person-oriented" groups, composed of Ss for whom sensitivity-training was assumed to be more harmonious with their own values and interpersonal styles, evidenced greater comfort and developed stronger interpersonal ties in their homogeneous groups than did the "work-oriented" Ss. Their finding is supported by the data from the present study suggesting greater involvement in the workshops for women. Together these results indicate that Ss whose own interpersonal orientation is congruent with that encouraged by sensitivity-training become more easily and deeply involved in the group process.

In summary, the data on experience of the workshop as a function of sex indicate that differences between men and women in their experiences of model and trainer, and in their degree of involvement in the workshops, can be understood as expressions of their respective "masculine" and "feminine" orientations.

Outcomes

The most striking finding to emerge from this study is the relatively small number of differences between the control and combined experimental groups and between the Bethel and Tavistock groups on the wide variety of dependent variables used to evaluate personal change as a result of training.

The major hypotheses predicting a higher level of experiencing

in the combined experimental group than in the control group (hypothesis 1) and in the Bethel groups than in the Tavistock groups (hypothesis 5) were not confirmed. The hypothesized differences between the combined experimental and control groups and between the Bethel and Tavistock groups in their degree of affective involvement in the Interview (hypotheses 2 and 6) and in their impressions of the interviewer (hypotheses 4 and 8) found no support in the data. And the hypothesized difference between the Bethel and Tavistock groups in their feeling state during the Interview (hypothesis 7) was similarly unconfirmed while a difference between the combined experimental and control groups in reported level of anxiety during the Interview lent only partial support to the hypothesized difference in feeling state with respect to these groups (hypothesis 3).

But before turning to the myriad questions raised by these negative findings which taken together are the central issue of this study, it is useful to examine those differences that did emerge and attempt to understand their relationship to the Ss' experiences of the workshop.

Comparisons Between the Control and Combined Experimental Groups

The relatively few significant outcome differences between the two models of training make it unnecessary to compare the control group with each model separately. The numerous comparisons of

the control group with the combined experimental group revealed only one area in which there was a significant difference in outcome: the control group reported feeling more anxious during the Interview than the combined experimental group (Table 15).

The important question regarding this finding is the extent to which the lowered anxiety during the Interview in the experimental group reflects relatively deep personality change rather than just "desensitization" to personal encounter, or the acquisition of new defense mechanisms which effectively reduce this type of anxiety.

The "desensitization" hypothesis would argue that the repeated exposure to anxiety-producing encounters in the supportive atmosphere of the sensitivity-training workshop effected a partial extinction of such responses in the experimental Ss. As a result these Ss experienced and reported less anxiety one month later during their Interview.

The "defense mechanism theory" would suggest that experimental Ss, bombarded by the high level of anxiety characteristic of sensitivity-training workshops, acquired additional and/or better mechanisms of defense with which to cope with such conditions. The lowered anxiety level during their Interview would be understood as having resulted from the automatic triggering of these new defense mechanisms whose acquisition at the workshop involved no accompanying changes in experiencing or personality.

The third approach, emphasizing relatively deep personality change, explains the lowered anxiety level as a product of newly acquired attitudes toward openness, affect, communication, self-awareness, etc. This view holds that sensitivity-training encourages a different way of experiencing inner feelings and interpersonal encounters, a way that alleviates anxiety and increases involvement and fulfillment in such situations. In this view the lowered level of anxiety reported by the experimental Ss results from a different "mode of being" during the Interview, not from the desensitization to threat or the acquisition of new defense mechanisms.

The strongest evidence against the two conditioning theories described above is the fact that T2 Ss reported significantly less anxiety in the Interview than T1 Ss. If the difference in reported anxiety level at the Interview were in fact a consequence of desensitization or acquisition of defenses during training it would follow that there must have been greater opportunity for such conditioning during T2's groups than during those trained by T1. This interpretation, however, is less plausible than one which views the lower anxiety level in T2 Ss as an expression of relatively pervasive personality changes resulting from the qualitative differences described above in the training styles and group atmospheres in T1 and T2 groups, differences that provide an ample theoretical basis for expecting such changes in personality. (This point is treated more extensively

below.)

There would be an even stronger argument for the "personality change" approach if the data indicated concomitant changes in other aspects of the experimental Ss' reported experience of the Interview. However, for a number of reasons discussed below these differences did not reach significance. Only the consistent direction of the trends between control and experimental Ss testifies to the possibility of change in overall experiencing of the Interview by the experimental groups. These Ss reported trends toward greater and more positive affective involvement in the Interview (Table 13), greater "openness" in the Interview (Table 15), impressions of the interviewer that were larger in number, wider in range and more positive in quality than those of the controls (Table 17), and consistently more positive evaluations of the Interview (Table 19).

Thus, though the expected difference in level of experiencing between the experimental and control groups did not reach a level of statistical reliability the significantly lower anxiety level reported by the experimental Ss, supported by a cluster of interrelated trends in the direction of a richer experience of the Interview, favors the hypothesis that the sensitivity-training experience initiated (or accelerated) a process of personality change in the participants which had not, by the time of the Interview, found expression in a manner that could be observed with statistical reliability. The striking

consistency of the trends in the data and the significant trainer effects in this same area argue strongly against the idea that the difference in anxiety level between the control and experimental groups can be fully accounted for by conditioning theories.

Comparisons Among Experimental Subjects

Model effects. There were no differences between the models in level of experiencing, in Ss' self-reports of their degree of affective involvement or feeling state during the Interview, or in their impressions of the interviewer.

The only significant differences to appear revealed that Tavistock groups evaluated the Interview as more "personal" and more "valuable" than Bethel, and that Bethel groups reported greater positive change in two areas: an increase in "emotionality" and a trend (at $p=.06$) toward more greatly improved "understanding of people" than the Tavistock groups.

These findings indicate that the differences between the models occur in those measures tapping relatively superficial layers of personality compared to the dimensions along which no differences were found. Ss' evaluation of the Interview and their ratings of self-change, while based to some extent on internal experiencing (as virtually all functioning is), are more "intellectual" in nature and less reflective of deep-rooted change than reports of feelings,

impressions, and ratings of level of experiencing.

It can be concluded, then, that there is no support in these data for hypothesis 5 which states that Bethel training leads to greater increments in Ss' level of experiencing than Tavistock training.

But even in the absence of the hypothesized effects of training, examination of the nature and roots of those changes that did occur can provide additional understanding of the differences between the models. One striking aspect of these results is the fact that while Bethel Ss reported greater self-change than Tavistock Ss it is the latter group that actually manifested greater change at the Interview.

This discrepancy can be viewed as a result of a greater tendency for Bethel Ss to "dramatize" their experience of the workshop and the magnitude of the resultant changes in comparison with reports of Tavistock Ss. This interpretation finds support from the data on Bethel Ss' evaluation of sensitivity-training over time (Table 11). These evaluations followed an inverted U pattern, rising steeply at TM2 (during the workshop) and reverting to their original, lower level by the time of the Interview. In contrast, Tavistock Ss showed more gradual but linear increments in their evaluations over time. Similarly, while Bethel Ss initially reported greater change than Tavistock Ss in "emotionality," by the time of the Interview there was negligible difference between these groups: estimates by

Bethel Ss had declined in magnitude and those of Tavistock Ss had risen. This same pattern was evident as a trend with respect to reported self-changes in "understanding of other people."

The apparent lability and exaggeration in these ratings by Bethel Ss reflects, to some degree, the greater emotionality of the Bethel experience, itself. Taken literally the data on Ss' experiences of the Bethel workshop conveys an almost caricaturish picture in which these groups of near-perfect strangers are described as "very open," "very warm," "very empathic," and "very personal." In atmospheres of such intense (and undoubtedly precarious) "togetherness" there often develops strong group pressures to preserve the "positive" emotional climate and to "justify" the euphoria by the belief in the productivity of the group; in this case by reports of personal growth. (See Schubert, 1971, for related comments.) In Tavistock, where there is a greater emphasis placed on cognitive learning, perception of the workshop is less distorted by intense affect and by the needs for "justification" and, at a later date, internal consistency.

The question of what factor in the Tavistock experience would lead Ss to evaluate the Interview as more "personal" and "valuable" than Bethel Ss points to the area of authority relations. Theoretically, and empirically (Table 5), Tavistock, much more than Bethel, is oriented toward the clarification and resolution of

the dynamics prominent in relationships with authority, and to the extent that this goal is achieved participants would be expected to deal more successfully, less transferentially and more realistically with authority figures. Following this line of reasoning it is likely that the Tavistock Ss, having worked through more of their authority "hang-ups" than the Bethel Ss, were more able to experience the interviewer as "personal," rather than perceiving him as distant and threatening. Similarly, they could experience the Interview, itself, as "valuable" rather than as evaluative or otherwise hierarchical.

Another dynamic that may have influenced the Tavistock Ss' evaluation of the Interview is the sense of welcome relief with which participants in Tavistock workshops are frequently seen to respond when they find that an authority figure relates to them without the distant formality that characterizes the Tavistock consultant and which stimulates feelings of abandonment and anger in the participants. It is possible that the highly accepting and responsive style of the interviewer whose manner was in much greater contrast to that of the Tavistock consultant than to that of the Bethel trainer, may have been experienced by the Tavistock Ss as a welcome "goody" after the relative deprivation of their workshops, and thus contributed to their more favorable evaluation of the Interview.¹

¹This interpretation was suggested in a personal communication from David Singer.

In summary, the comparisons of outcome measures as a function of model indicate no differences at "deeper" levels of personality (like "experiencing"), but do reveal some differences in evaluation of the Interview and in ratings of self-change. The latter difference is seen as evidence that Bethel Ss tend to "dramatize" the effectiveness of their training experience, and the differences in evaluation of the Interview suggest that Tavistock Ss are freer of their authority transference and perhaps also relieved at finding a genuinely responsive authority figure in whose presence they do not experience the psychological deprivation inherent in the Tavistock model.

Trainer effects. The data on trainer effects indicate that the outcomes of training are at least as much a function of trainer as they are of model. Like model, the trainer variable yielded no difference in level of experiencing, degree of affective involvement in the Interview, or in impression of the interviewer. However, in addition to differences in those areas affected as well by the model factor (evaluation of the Interview and reported self-change) the trainer variable yielded differences in Ss' reported feeling state during the Interview.

All trainer main effects reflect the same theme: Ss trained by T2 report greater involvement in the Interview and greater learning from the workshop than those trained by T1. Specifically, T2 groups report less anxiety and a trend toward greater spontaneity during the

Interview than do T1 groups. They also show a trend (at $p=.08$) toward an evaluation of the Interview as "deeper" than that made by the T1 groups, and they report greater improvement in their "understanding of people" than their T1 counterparts. Other differences between the trainers interact with sex and will be discussed in the section on sex effects.

These results indicate clearly that the personality and style of the trainer can be a potent force in determining outcomes of training. The fact that the trainers in this study were selected partially for their similar styles, training and orientation argues even more strongly for the potential influence of these factors on the total group experience and outcomes.

One may conclude that these outcomes for T2 Ss, while less indicative of deep personality change than would be an increment in level of experiencing, seem nevertheless to reflect changes in experiencing and not just in attitude or jargon. The results indicate changes in Ss' feelings during an interpersonal encounter--changes in level of anxiety and in degree of felt spontaneity--and changes in the meaningfulness of the exchange (how "deep" and "personal" it was rated). Considering the fact that the workshop was a one-weekend experience and that the outcomes were assessed about one month later, these differences as a function of trainer assume even larger significance.

The specific factors responsible for these outcomes are easily traced to the differences in Ss' experiences of the workshops. In an earlier discussion of these differences it was indicated that T2 groups were experienced as more personal, experiential, Rogerian and enjoyable than those trained by T1, differences which were interpreted to be products, in part, of T2's greater acceptance, congruence and ability to encourage experiential interaction during the workshops.

What is most striking in these findings is their close agreement with the theories of personality change advanced by Rogers (1957, 1959) and Gendlin (1962, 1964). The specific differences between trainers and the resulting differences reported by their groups occur largely along those dimensions considered by these authors to be critical for the process of personality change, specifically the dimensions of unconditionality of regard and congruence, for Rogers, and the dimension of experiential, "here-and-now" interaction emphasized by Gendlin.

One issue that is raised by Rogers' and Gendlin's approaches to personality change theory, and by the finding of greater change in Ss trained by T2 is whether the Tavistock consultant, in his prescribed role as a distant, formal, impersonal authority figure is necessarily an un-therapeutic or even anti-therapeutic force in the training group. In other words, can an individual both fulfill the

specifications of the role of Tavistock consultant and still encourage, or even permit, the development of an atmosphere and a mode of relatedness that foster learning and growth?

It should be stressed again that personality change is not the stated goal of Tavistock training, and thus this question does not bear directly on the issue of the appropriateness of such a consultant role for fulfillment of the Tavistock task. However, considering the ambiguous nature of the difference between personality change and experiential learning (the latter being a stated goal of the Tavistock model) this question may have more than just academic importance.

The most important point to be made with respect to this question is that the Rogerian qualities of unconditional regard, congruence and empathic understanding can be communicated in a wide variety of ways and through a wide variety of personal styles. Just as Lieberman, Yalom, & Miles (1972) found that individual trainers from the same theoretical orientation (e.g. Gestalt training) often differed more among themselves than in comparison with trainers of differently labelled orientations, so the model of training neither insures that an individual trainer will convey "therapeutic" qualities nor precludes that possibility.

In many cases the detached formality of the Tavistock consultant can convey, through his non-evaluative interventions, a

considerable degree of unconditionality of regard; except in the unlikely event of a transgression of the contract by a member the consultant is unlikely to respond judgmentally to member behavior. His regard, while neither positive nor negative, is unconditional. Similarly, through his (hopefully) accurate interpretation of the group process the Tavistock consultant can convey empathy to the members without expressing the personal warmth or concern which is liable to be inappropriately equated with empathy in the thinking of some individuals. And, as Barrett-Lennard (1962) stressed, an individual's degree of congruence is not a function of how much of his inner state he overtly conveys, but rather a function of the harmony that exists among the various modes of expression that he does give to any communication, i. e. through voice quality, gestures, posture, etc. "In other words, the highly congruent individual is completely honest, direct, and sincere in what he conveys, but he does not feel any compulsion to communicate his perceptions, or any need to withhold them for emotionally self-protective reasons /p. 4/. "

Strong evidence of the degree to which an individual trainer can convey more or less of these "therapeutic" qualities within a specific model of training is present in the discussion of the differences in these respects between T1 and T2, differences that are independent of model. Examination of data from the RI that are

not available to the reader reveals, further, that T2 was perceived as more therapeutic by his Tavistock group on three of the four dimensions, and on the total RI score, than T1 was by his Bethel group. This finding emphatically underlines the degree to which these qualities are more a function of individual style than of model, and the fact that a Tavistock consultant, despite the apparent distance of his prescribed role, can convey those qualities hypothesized to be necessary for effecting personality change.¹

It is concluded, therefore, that T2's perceived "acceptance," his greater congruence in his role, and his ability to foster a pronounced "here-and-now" pattern of interaction among group members were major factors in the development of a more personal, involving, experiential and Rogerian atmosphere in his groups, and in the eventually greater degree of personality change evidenced during the Interview by Ss trained in his groups.

Sex effects. Only a few differences between men and women do not interact with model or trainer: men reported less anxiety during the Interview than women, women reported greater self-change than men, and there was a trend toward women giving a greater number of "no impression" responses to the interviewer

¹This issue was raised in a personal communication from Laurence Gould.

than men (at $p=.08$).

Examination of the components of the anxiety score (Table 14) reveals not only that women reported a higher level of anxiety during the Interview than men, but that on two components of this score ("self-consciousness" and "nervousness") women's average rating fell on the "uncomfortable" side of the bi-polar scale while men's average rating fell on the "comfortable" side. In other words, men not only felt less anxious than women, but their feeling state was closer to "relaxed" and "unself-conscious" than it was to "nervous" and "self-conscious," the latter adjectives being a better description of women's reported state.

The trend (at $p=.08$) for women to report a greater number of "no impression" responses than men can be interpreted as further evidence of their greater anxiety, reasoning that a high level of anxiety makes individuals more guarded and thus less open to finer nuances in their environment and in their own experiencing.

Having no pre-treatment data on these measures it is difficult to decide whether these sex differences are the result of differential effects of treatment or simply manifestations of pre-treatment sex differences. (The N's for each sex in the control group are too small to allow comparisons using these subgroups.)

The evidence on this question with respect to the difference in anxiety level points to the conclusion that this finding is mainly

an expression of pre-treatment differences between the sexes. If the difference were an outcome of training it would be expected, as was suggested in the discussion of the same difference between the experimental and control groups, that it would be only one manifestation of a deeper reorientation of attitudes and experiencing and would thus be embedded in a pattern of differences among Ss in their experiences of the Interview. While there is such a (non-significant) pattern with respect to control vs. experimental Ss, there is no consistent pattern in the differences between men's and women's experiences of the Interview aside from the numerous indications of women's greater anxiety. In addition, the paucity of differences between men and women in their experiences of the workshop makes it even less likely that there would be a marked difference in the way that they were affected by their experiences.

Thus, one possibility is to interpret women's higher anxiety level during the Interview as a product of sex differences that existed prior to the workshop. Most likely, in this view, is the obvious possibility that women were made more anxious by the sexual tension between them and the male interviewer, a speculation (weakly) supported by the fact that although women tended to report a greater number of "no impressions" of the interviewer (at $p=.08$), they rated him (non-significantly) more "good looking" than the men

did. In addition, there is the related possibility that the interviewer's own behavior was systematically affected by this sexual tension, thereby contributing to the greater anxiety reported by the women.

There being almost as many plausible interpretations of this finding as there are differences between the sexes, this discussion will be concluded with a passing mention of only one more hypothesis, that the women did not really feel more anxious, but they were less inhibited about reporting their anxiety. The important idea in this discussion is not the specific sex difference that may have engendered greater anxiety in the women, but the statement that there is little support for interpreting this difference as a function of training.

Women's reportedly greater increase in their "acceptance" of others and greater change in their "interpersonal attitudes and values," being what we have been calling more "superficial" changes (attitudes, intellectual evaluations, etc.), can more easily be interpreted as a product of their workshop experience. It has already been suggested that women in our culture may be more naturally receptive to sensitivity-training than men, and specific evidence in this study was reviewed indicating greater involvement in the groups by women than by men (see Experience of the workshop: Sex effects). It appears that this greater involvement led to the women's belief, whether accurate or not, that they had changed

more than the men believed about themselves. Also, while baring this interpretation to charges of "male chauvinism," it is possible that women may tend to "dramatize" an experience more than men, resulting in the same type of exaggeration that was inferred from Bethel Ss' reports of self-change.

Thus, while women's higher anxiety level during the Interview was most likely a function of sex differences that are entirely independent of and unaffected by the training, their reports of greater self-change than the men's more likely reflect their greater involvement in the workshop and its interactive effect on their "feminine" tendency to "dramatize" events.

A number of interaction effects reveal that the pattern of outcomes as a function of model and trainer is very different for men and women. One finding is that where there are interactions between sex and model women show greater effects from Bethel training than from Tavistock training, while the opposite is true for the men. Thus, women from Bethel found the Interview more "enjoyable" than women from Tavistock, while men from Bethel found the Interview less "enjoyable" than men from Tavistock. Also, women from Bethel reported greater self-change than those from Tavistock on four dimensions: understanding of self, warmth, acceptance and attractiveness. Men showed the reverse pattern of reported change as a function of model on these same dimensions.

The greater "enjoyment" of the Interview reported by Bethel women and Tavistock men probably stems from a number of related factors: having found their original workshops more "valuable" than their counterparts from Tavistock and Bethel, respectively, these groups probably brought a more positive "set" to the Interview, experiencing it almost as a sequel-to-yet-part-of their entire experience with this study. Speaking metaphorically, they were returning to a relatively happy home. This explanation seems more reasonable than one that hypothesizes, in the absence of other indications of different experiences of the Interview, that Tavistock men and Bethel women changed more from their workshops than their counterparts.

Another pattern to emerge, however, makes less intuitive sense. It has already been pointed out that women responded more favorably to T2 and men to T1, but inspection of the data reveals that men from T2 groups found the Interview more "personal" and felt more "emotional" during it than men from T1 groups, and women from T1 groups felt more "emotional" than those from T2 groups.

One possible interpretation of this pattern comes from Harrison & Lubin (1965). These authors suggest that the optimal group experience comprises two conditions necessary for learning: support for one's current personal style and confrontation with

opposites. Assuming that men experienced greater "dissonance" in T2 groups and women in T1 groups it would follow, from the Harrison & Lubin hypothesis, that these Ss would evidence greater learning than their counterparts who underwent more "consonant" workshop experiences.

A close inspection of the data on women's ratings of trainer behavior (information not available to the reader) provides support for this hypothesis. T2 was rated by women "moderately friendly," "slightly flexible," "extremely accepting," and "moderately tranquilizing," and T1 was rated "slightly unfriendly," "slightly rigid," "moderately critical," and "slightly provocative" on the same dimensions. Clearly the difference in women's experiences of the two trainers was more than just a matter of degree. Generalizing from this finding it is tentatively suggested that women in T1 groups and men in T2 groups may have evidenced greater change than their counterparts as a result of the beneficial effects of the felt dissonance between them and their trainer. Following Harrison & Lubin (p. 300), "It may be that the unresolved issues, the confrontations with differing outlooks and views, the feelings of outrage and dismay, puzzlement and challenge, last longer and are more of a force for learning than the warmth and comradeship and the feeling of completion and closure of a more 'successful' T-group experience."

Two other findings in this study can also be viewed in this way though the connections are considerably more tenuous. The

already mentioned differences between Tavistock and Bethel groups in their evaluations of sensitivity-training and in their reports of self-change indicate that the ratings by Tavistock Ss became increasingly more positive over time, while those of the Bethel Ss jumped markedly and then declined. It can be inferred from this finding that the Tavistock Ss derived a deeper and longer lasting effect from their training than did Bethel Ss, an interpretation supported also by the finding that Tavistock Ss rated the Interview as more "valuable" and more "personal" than Bethel Ss.

Viewing these findings in terms of the above hypothesis by Harrison & Lubin (1965) it can be suggested that those qualities of Tavistock training that make it a more "abrasive" experience than the relatively "cushioned" experience of Bethel (differences which have previously been described in great detail) also add elements of stimulation that contribute to the opportunities for "learning" enjoyed by its membership.

Finally, the finding of men's lowered anxiety level during the Interview can be viewed in these same terms. While discussed above in terms of pre-existing sex differences this sex effect can also be viewed as evidence that the men might have changed more from the sensitivity-training than the women. As was the case with Harrison & Lubin's task-oriented groups, men, more than women, might "find their personal styles greatly in conflict with the demands

of the T-group and the laboratory, and hence they /might/ experience more pressure to adapt by changing their behavior /pp. 298-299/." This conclusion is based, of course, on the hypothesis, above, that sensitivity-training is more "feminine" than "masculine" in terms of its values and goals.

In summary, a number of differences between men and women have been discussed from several points of view: the difference in level of anxiety during the Interview was discussed as a function of pre-treatment sex differences, and women's reports of greater self-change were hypothesized to be a result of their greater involvement in the workshop. The greater enjoyment of the Interview by Bethel women and Tavistock men was viewed as an understandable "halo effect" from their workshop experiences, and further, the greater change in women from T1 groups and men from T2 groups, the previously-discussed difference in evaluation of sensitivity-training by Bethel and Tavistock, and the lower anxiety level of men during the Interview were discussed in terms of an hypothesis advanced by Harrison & Lubin (1965) suggesting that "learning" requires both support and confrontation by the group.

Comparisons of self-reports of change with other data. The wide discrepancy in the data between Ss' own reports of substantial change as a result of training and the minimal evidence for such change on our more "objective" instruments raises important

questions about the meaning of both assessments.

In the ratings of self-change made during the last day of the workshop (TM2) experimental Ss reported at least "slight" change on all 14 scales summarized in Table 20, and "moderate" change on about half of these scales. At the time of the Interview (TM3) about one month later there was a decrease in reported change on five of these scales (one at $p=.06$), but the overall picture indicated that Ss' still felt that they had changed "slightly" to "moderately" on all 14 dimensions.

Ideally the control group should also have completed these self-evaluations in order to provide a base level for comparison. Nevertheless, it seems safe to assume that there would not have been any significant change reported by a control group at TM2 since the questionnaire requested estimates of change only "since the beginning of this workshop," a mere 30 hours earlier. It follows, too, that if the reported change were only a function of time, the magnitude of such change would be greater at TM3 than at TM2. The opposite result was found indicating, again, that the reported change is mainly a function of Ss' workshop experiences and only negligibly, if at all, a function of time.

In contrast to the extensive degree of change reported by the Ss, themselves, is the fact that the only difference in outcome between the combined experimental and control groups is the

degree of anxiety reportedly experienced during the Interview.

This discrepancy probably reflects, in part, a tendency toward "dramatization" of their workshop experience by participants, an hypothesis discussed above with specific reference to Bethel Ss and women, but which seems to apply in varying degree to most Ss. This hypothesis finds support in the fact that Ss' ratings of the extent to which they found the workshop to be a "valuable growth experience" and an "enjoyable" experience (Table 10), and their estimates of self-change on five of the 14 dimensions declined significantly from TM2 to TM3, a period of about one month.

This tendency toward "dramatization" of the workshop experience seems to have two roots, one being the simple fact of the unusually intense emotional level that is characteristic of sensitivity-training groups, a state of mind in which intellectual functioning is influenced to a greater than usual degree by emotional factors. Secondly, most Ss enter into the training experience with very high expectations of what it will be like and what they will get out of it. The combination of these high expectations and the money that they must pay for the experience (as in this study) leads to a potentially high level of "cognitive dissonance" which can be avoided most easily by believing that the experience was as good as one had expected. From the responses to item #23 on the PIF

(Table 1) it can be seen that Ss expected a "meaningful experience" from the workshop, an experience that "will improve my understanding of myself and others" and from which "I will come away changed, somewhat, as a result." And that is exactly what the Ss reported to have occurred.

An alternative hypothesis for this discrepancy is the possible lack of reliability, validity, and sensitivity of the instruments utilized to assess change. Since most of the questionnaires were simple rating scales or semantic differential type check lists it is the more complex Experiencing Scale that deserves most attention in this respect.

Evidence from previous research using the Experiencing Scale or its less refined predecessors indicates the scales' adequacy for assessing change in process level. Klein, Mathieu, Gendlin & Kiesler (1969), reviewing the use of the Experiencing Scale in five recent studies of therapy and level of experiencing, comment that in these studies "the Experiencing Scale (either overall level or trend) is consistently related to degree of patient disturbance and to outcome $\bar{p} . 14\bar{7}$." Describing the results of the application of the Experiencing Scale to "sampling interviews," in which the patient is interviewed only once every few months by a therapist whom he does not otherwise know and on which our own Interview was modeled, these same authors conclude "that sampling

interviews, as well as therapy interviews, can be the basis for valid distinctions /through use of the Experiencing Scale/ /p. 16/."

A number of other investigators used parts or all of Rogers' original Process Scale (Rogers & Rablen, 1958) to assess changes in personality as a result of sensitivity-training. Meador (1971), using the complete Scale, found significant increments in Ss' process level over the 16-hour duration of a "weekend basic encounter group," and a number of studies by the Clark group (Clark & Culbert, 1965; Clark, Culbert & Bobele, 1969; and Culbert, 1968) reported significant gains in Ss' "self-awareness" as measured by the Problem Expression Scale, an instrument modelled after one of the strands of Rogers' Process Scale.

Although these studies differ from the present investigation in that they use tape recordings of the group interactions as a basis for process ratings, their findings, along with those summarized in the Experiencing Scale Manual, indicate that the Experiencing Scale (which is a more highly refined instrument than its predecessors) is sufficiently sensitive to register changes in experiencing when such changes are clearly present.

The clear implication, then, is that the failure of the Experiencing Scale to detect changes in level of experiencing is a result of the fact that such changes did not occur in the present study.

The discrepancy between these negative findings of change

on the Experiencing Scale and the positive changes in process level reported independently by Meador and the Clark group would seem to stem from the fact that this study differs from those cited in that it attempts to evaluate level of experiencing in a setting outside of the workshop itself. This implies that there are changes in experiencing that do, in fact, occur from and during sensitivity-training, but that these changes are insufficiently internalized to withstand the threats posed by the internal pressures of the Ss' own defensive needs as well as by the needs and demands of the environment to which they return.

In light of this discussion it can be hypothesized that Ss' reports of self-change reflect, in part, their awareness of "real," incipient changes in their experiencing which, though they had found expression in the psychological safety of their training group, receded from overt expression into a state of "incubation" following Ss' return to their home environments. Thus, the fact that these changes failed to appear on the instruments utilized in this study simply reflects the nascent status of these developments at the time of the Interview. This issue will comprise one of the major themes in the following "Overview" of the results of this study.

Overview

Having thus far discussed Ss' experiences of the workshop and the relationships between these experiences and the outcomes

that appeared, the broader issue of why there are so few differences in outcomes between the experimental and control groups and between the two models of training used in this study will now be examined.

Since the adequacy of the instruments utilized appears to have been established, and since Tables 5, 6, and 9 confirm that Ss were actively involved in the workshop, an examination of the workshop experience and the nature of the dependent variables will be examined in order to better explain the obtained findings.

Level of "Necessary and Sufficient Conditions" in the Groups

One factor believed to be of great importance in understanding the minimal degree of personality change found as a result of training is the near absence in the groups of those conditions that are theoretically necessary for such change to occur.

In the Introduction it was indicated that according to a theory by Carl Rogers personality change will occur only under certain "necessary and sufficient conditions [1957]," in the absence of which it cannot occur. Ratings of the levels of these conditions in our groups reveal that the conditions of empathy, congruence, regard and unconditionality were only marginally (and in some cases negatively) present (Table 8).

Table 7 shows that, on the average, Ss rated the workshop

atmosphere as only "slightly accepting" ("acceptance" being a good synonym for "unconditional positive regard"), and rated Tavistock only "slightly empathic" though Bethel was described as "very empathic."

And even more directly, the data from Table 8 shows that Tavistock groups were experienced as un-Rogerian on three of the four dimensions rated ("level of regard" was the only one receiving a positive rating) and Bethel groups, while receiving significantly higher ratings on three of the four scales, were still experienced as negative on one scale, only marginally positive on two others, and moderately positive on "level of regard."

Some evidence of the importance of these conditions as catalysts for personality change has already been indicated, above, in the discussion of the greater degree of change shown by groups trained by T2. In that discussion it was concluded that the greater effectiveness of T2 groups in fostering such change resided in their trainer's perceived "acceptance" (in contrast to a description of T1 as "slightly critical"), in his congruence in his role, and in his ability to encourage here and now patterns of interaction. These qualities, it was hypothesized, had been a major influence in fostering a psychological atmosphere that was rated by the Ss as significantly more regarding, empathic and congruent than the atmosphere in groups trained by T1.

Thus, even while not showing changes in level of experiencing

and other important variables, the greater change in T2's groups in other areas as a result of training testifies powerfully to the potential influence of these "necessary and sufficient conditions" in fostering personal growth, a finding corroborated by other studies, as well (Clark & Culbert, 1965; Clark, Culbert & Bobele, 1969).

It is suggested, then, that the minimal presence (or even negative presence) of these conditions in these training groups reduced the effectiveness of the workshop far below what it could potentially have been. As a consequence, the degree of personality change that resulted from the training is much lower than what it would have been under more Rogerian conditions.

It is important to note, however, that this finding is not viewed as specific to the groups in this study. One of the most common problems faced by sensitivity-training groups, in general, is exactly this difficulty of creating an atmosphere that can be described, variously, as trusting, open, empathic, accepting, etc. In a paradoxical way, a major obstacle to effective training is exactly that cluster of interpersonal difficulties for which sensitivity-training is hoped to be a remedy: the inability of individuals to be open, accepting, empathic, etc., with one another.

In short, the finding of only minimal levels of regard, empathy, congruence and unconditionality in these groups is viewed as a reflection of the syndrome of intra- and interpersonal "alienation" that has become so characteristic of our times and

which acts as an inevitable and powerful counterforce to the effectiveness of short-term sensitivity-training. It seems possible, in fact, that one of the major differences between sensitivity-training and psychotherapy is that the latter relationship, in large part because of its duration, provides the client with a much greater opportunity to develop the kind of trust and rapport without which an interpersonal relationship cannot be "therapeutic."

Further research into Ss' experiences of sensitivity-training along these dimensions could provide important information about the way in which such conditions vary as a function of model, trainer style, scheduling, group composition, etc. Such data could prove to be of great value in the development of increasingly more effective environments for learning and personality change.

Nature of the Dependent Variables

In retrospect it is clear that personality changes of a depth and pervasiveness that were hoped for would require an intervention of major proportions to effect. The major dependent variables were carefully designed or selected with the goal of assessing personality changes whose roots lay in the Ss' modes of experiencing of their inner lives, and not in their values, attitudes, acquired jargon, or superficial behavior. The details of the Interview situation were designed for appreciable temporal and associational separation of the Ss from their workshop experiences in

order to permit assessment of those changes that would endure the erosive effects of time and distance on their post-workshop "euphoria" and on the felt support of their group and its norms.

A full appreciation of the depth of the personality changes that we have sought makes it less surprising that the results were so meagre. It is perhaps more unexpected that the studies mentioned above were able to record changes in process level even while making their assessments during the ongoing workshop.

The present results, while in no way deprecating sensitivity-training, provide further evidence of the need for greater clarification of the goals and limitations of this technique. It seems clear that the kind of experience provided by such workshops is not appropriate for effecting personality change at the level probed by our instruments. This conclusion is not a criticism of sensitivity-training, however, but rather an observation on the inappropriateness of that technique for achievement of the goals defined by this study.

Level of experiencing (as measured on the Experiencing Scale) refers to "the extent to which /an individual's/ ongoing, bodily, felt flow of experiencing is the basic datum of his awareness and communications about himself, and the extent to which his inner datum is integral to action and thought /Klein, Mathieu, Gendlin & Kiesler, 1969, p. 17." In effect, as has been repeatedly

emphasized, level of experiencing refers to an individual's "mode of being" in the world, and it is perhaps little short of grandiose to expect to introduce radical, observable, and enduring changes at that level through one weekend of sensitivity-training.

It is interesting in this regard to note the strikingly low variability among Ss in their rated mode level of experiencing: average ratings of the two judges place almost half of the Ss (14 out of 36) at a level of 2.0, with 22 Ss (almost 2/3) scoring 2.0 or 2.5. Out of a possible 7-point range, Ss scored only between 1.5 and 4.0 on this scale.

Stage 2 on the Scale indicates that while the speaker's association with or interest in the material is clear, "all comments, associations, reactions, and remarks serve to get the story or idea across but do not refer to or define the speaker's feelings (our underline) /from the Experiencing Scale, in Klein, Matthieu, Gendlin & Kiesler, 1969, p. 57/." Thus, based on the three-minute taped samples from the Interviews, it can be seen that almost two-thirds of the Ss in this study spoke about their lives and their thoughts for about 45 minutes with only minimal reference to their feelings or personal reactions to the content.

While this finding is, in itself, deserving of much more extensive exploration, it is introduced, here, mainly in order to elucidate the dimension of functioning assessed by the Experiencing

Scale and the extent to which such functioning is related to the most fundamental dynamics of personality. Movement in the direction of better commerce with and greater expression of feelings, in an individual who is more or less out of touch with his affective life typically involves the breaking down of defenses and the therapeutic "working through" of anxieties and fears, rational and irrational, that have cooperatively influenced the individual's "mode of being."

Meador found, in her study of process level during the workshop, that "individuals moved from a distancing of feelings, rigidity, and past orientation of stages 2 and 3 /on the Process Scale/, to allowing feelings to be expressed in the present, risking relating on a feeling basis, experiencing the inner self as a referent for behavior of stages 4 and 5 /1971, p. 74/. "

In the present study, however, there is little trace of this movement during an individual Interview one month after the workshop.

Conclusions

Role of sensitivity-training in fostering personality change.

The broad conclusion drawn from this study is that while a weekend sensitivity-training workshop cannot immediately effect basic, observable and enduring changes in the personalities of the participants, it may be effective in initiating or furthering a process of personality change the end products of which will become visible,

if at all, only after time and further nurturance from the environment.

While on the one hand this conclusion robs the technique of sensitivity-training of its image of a self-contained psychological potion, on the other hand it recognizes the potentially valuable role that this kind of experience can play in a capacity that is probably best described as catalyst.

This concept of sensitivity-training as a catalyst is part of a broader view of the process of personality change as one in which change frequently occurs only over long periods of time and in a direction determined by numerous influences acting as vectors which resolve into one line of force. And this concept includes, as well, the idea of nascent changes which can "incubate," unobservable from the outside, until their eventual death or evolution into felt, visible change.

Evidence of such a process comes from studies in which changes resulting from sensitivity-training are not manifest until months after the experience. Schutz & Allen (1966), in a study which they admit suffers from the fact that all dependent measures are self-reports, found that the greater shift in Ss' reported needs, attitudes and behavior (on FIRO) as a result of training occurred two to four months after the laboratory experience. They found, further, that those changes which faded most quickly were

the same ones which had shown prompt onset, while changes which tended to grow over time were not even noticed until two to four months after the workshop.

Further evidence of incipient effects from sensitivity-training is reported by Harrison (1966) in a study of cognitive change. He found that changes in Ss' "interpersonal concept systems" did not occur until three months after training. Harrison concluded that "this pattern of change would be expected if the participants went home with a readiness to perceive others in this new way . . . , and if they required some time and interaction with the others in order to obtain new information which was needed to activate the concepts /p. 520, our underlines7."

The implication of these two studies is that some of the learning that occurs during sensitivity-training (and perhaps the more significant learning) may take the form of a "readiness" to change given time and "support" from the environment. But the nature of changes that are typically encouraged by training groups frequently conflicts with the needs of others, the defensive needs of the participant, himself, and the mores of the environment to which he returns. Thus, the "activation" of these nascent changes is a delicate process that depends, for its success, on a number of factors that are outside the influence of the training group.

The findings described above (Clark & Culbert, 1965; Clark, Culbert & Bobele, 1969; Meador, 1971) indicating significant

increments in process level during training reflect exactly such a "readiness" to change. But the results of the present study indicate that after a period of about one month and in an Interview situation that is isolated from the support of the training group Ss do not manifest increments in level of experiencing to a degree that is statistically significant.

However, even in the absence of increments in level of experiencing in the data there is sufficient evidence to justify, in light of this discussion, the hypothesis that the training experience did initiate (or catalyze) incipient changes in experiencing which, given appropriate conditions for their "activation," will find visible expression at a later time. This evidence appears in the findings that the combined experimental group reported a lower level of anxiety during the Interview than did the control group, that T2 groups reported lower anxiety during the Interview than T1 groups (a finding that was interpreted as evidence of the importance of the psychological atmosphere), that Ss generally reported considerable self-change as a result of their training experience (reports that were concluded to have been "dramatized" only in part), and that almost every other difference between the experimental and control groups fell in the direction predicted by our hypotheses. In addition, there is also the fact that outcomes in this study were assessed only about one month after the workshop while the results

reported by Harrison (1966) and Schutz & Allen (1966) indicate that significant changes often do not appear until two to four months after training.

In the present view, then, sensitivity-training is neither the easy antidote to alienation as claimed by its more fanatical supporters, nor the vapid emotional exercise that its more ardent critics would have us believe. It is, instead, a potentially effective catalyst in the process of personality change, only one link in the little understood chain of events that encourages and supports the endless process of personal growth.

Comparison of the effects of Bethel and Tavistock training on level of experiencing. Although the main goal of this study was, at its conception, a comparison of the effects of Bethel and Tavistock training on level of experiencing and related outcome measures, the finding of no observable effects on these variables at the time of the Interview precludes the drawing of any conclusions about the relative merits of the models in this sphere. It is believed that any further extrapolation along this line beyond that already discussed is unjustified by the data.

The findings of markedly different experiences of these two models, and the suggestive though sparse differences found on some of the outcome measures indicate a strong possibility that major differences in outcomes from Bethel and Tavistock training

could be found through the use of carefully selected dependent variables. Further research into this area is strongly indicated.

Implications for further research. Studies reporting changes in aspects of personality that are more superficial than those assessed in this study do not, of course, contradict these findings or conclusions. The present finding, however, that deep personality changes do not immediately occur as a result of training underlines the need for a fuller understanding of the nature of isolated changes in areas like person perception, personal values and attitudes, understanding of human relations, etc., to cite just a few of the many dependent variables used in outcome studies. As argued above, with respect to differences in anxiety levels during the Interview, a change in one aspect of personality will probably have a different meaning in the absence of broader-based change than it would as one facet of a more pervasive reorganization of personality.

Campbell & Dunnette (1968) express a similar reservation in their comment on studies reporting changes in "interpersonal sensitivity." They questioned, in much the same manner as the present study, whether these findings "actually represent increased sensitization to interpersonal events or merely the acquisition of a new vocabulary [p. 92]." The broader question implicit in this specific inquiry can be answered only by more and better research.

Contributions to the literature. The results of this study make important contributions to the literature on sensitivity-training in a number of areas.

The data on Ss' experiences of the workshops provide the first empirical results on the experiential differences between Bethel and Tavistock training, establishing, thereby, that many of the theoretical differences between these two models find expression in the actual processes of the training groups. In addition, the data verify, for the trainers used in this study, that the differences between the two models remain constant across trainers, providing the first evidence of the replicability of these models.

The findings on sex differences in experiences of the workshop indicate important differences between the sexes in their receptivity to Bethel and Tavistock models of training.

The successful adaptation of the Relationship Inventory for use with sensitivity-training groups opens up new possibilities for future research into the role of Rogerian constructs in this setting.

The use of the Experiencing Scale as a dependent variable to assess changes in Ss' level of experiencing outside of the training group represents an important extension of the growing literature on process level during the ongoing workshop.

The data on outcomes as a function of trainer provide important empirical evidence of the applicability of the theories of

personality change advanced by Rogers and Gendlin to the area of sensitivity-training.

The sparse data on outcomes as a function of model provide tentative evidence of deeper, less "dramatized" and more enduring effects of training in the Tavistock model than in the Bethel model.

Summary

Experience of the Workshop

Model effects. The results strongly confirm that Bethel and Tavistock are two distinct and replicable models of training in which the differences in trainer style, importance of issues, patterns of interaction and emotional atmospheres reported by the Ss are congruent with the stated goals of the respective models.

Bethel groups were characterized by a warmer, more genuine and more supportive trainer, a greater emphasis on issues of affection and individual feedback, and a more frequent interaction in the here and now with both trainer and other members. Tavistock groups were characterized by a colder, more formal and distant consultant, a greater emphasis on issues of authority relations, a more historically-oriented pattern of interaction and less frequent interaction with the consultant.

Bethel groups experienced the workshop as more personal, friendly, experiential and Rogerian than Tavistock groups, and

reported deeper and more positive affective involvement in the workshop than their Tavistock counterparts.

These differences were found to be consistent across the two trainers used in this study, but should not be generalized beyond them.

Trainer effects. Marked differences between groups as a function of trainer were found to be largely non-interactive with model. T2's more accepting, congruent, and experiential style fostered a group atmosphere that was rated significantly more personal, experiential, Rogerian and enjoyable than that of T1's groups.

Sex effects. Differences between men and women in their experiences of model and trainer, and in their inferred involvement in the workshops were interpreted as a function of their respective "masculine" and "feminine" orientations.

Outcomes

Original hypotheses. Only one of the eight hypothesized outcomes received any statistically significant support from the data. Hypothesized differences between the combined experimental and control groups and between the Bethel and Tavistock groups in level of experiencing, degree of affective involvement in the Interview, and impressions of the interviewer could not be confirmed

by the results. The hypothesized difference between the Bethel and Tavistock groups in their feeling state during the Interview was similarly unconfirmed, but a difference between the combined experimental and control groups in reported level of anxiety lent partial support to this hypothesis with respect to these groups.

Comparisons between the control and experimental groups.

The only significant difference in outcome that was found between the control group and the combined experimental group was a lower level of anxiety during the Interview reported by the experimental group. This difference was interpreted as a reflection of relatively pervasive personality change rather than as a behavioristically determined effect.

Non-significant differences between the control and experimental Ss were almost uniformly in the directions predicted by the hypotheses.

Comparisons among experimental groups.

Model effects. Comparisons of outcome measures as a function of model indicated some isolated differences in evaluation of the Interview and in ratings of self-change but revealed no differences at "deeper" levels of personality (i. e. , experiencing).

Differences in ratings of self-change were interpreted as evidence that Bethel Ss tend to dramatize the effectiveness of their

training, and the differences in evaluation of the Interview were viewed as evidence that Tavistock Ss had successfully worked through some of their authority transference, leaving them freer to engage in meaningful communication with the interviewer, and as an expression of the relief assumed to be felt by these Ss in finding that the interviewer was markedly more personal and interactive than their consultants had been.

Differences between Bethel and Tavistock groups in their evaluation of sensitivity-training over time were interpreted as an indication that Tavistock training, as a result of the greater degree of "dissonance" in its format, may lead to deeper and longer lasting effects than the more comfortable atmosphere of Bethel training. This hypothesis was based on an earlier study and discussion by Harrison & Lubin (1965).

Trainer effects. Comparisons of outcome measures as a function of trainer indicated that the changes evidenced by T2 groups in their more open experience of the Interview and in their reports of greater self-change were a function of the more experiential and Rogerian atmosphere in their training groups in comparison with those trained by T1.

Sex effects. Differences in outcomes as a function of sex were interpreted in a number of ways. The difference in

level of anxiety during the Interview was viewed as a function of pre-treatment sex differences, and women's reports of greater self-change were viewed as a result of their greater involvement in the workshop. The greater enjoyment of the Interview by Bethel women and Tavistock men was understood as a "halo-effect" from their workshop experiences, and the greater change in women from T1 groups and in men from T2 groups was discussed in terms of the hypothesis advanced by Harrison & Lubin (1965) that "learning" requires both support and confrontation from the group.

Comparisons of self-reports of change with other data. The finding that a wide discrepancy exists between Ss' own reports of substantial change as a result of training and the minimal evidence for such change on more "objective" instruments was interpreted in a number of non-conflicting ways. It was suggested that the unusually intense emotional tone of the experience and the potential cognitive dissonance encouraged by the situation led all Ss, in varying degrees, to "dramatize" their reported experiences of the workshop. These relatively generous appraisals of self-change were also hypothesized to reflect, in part, Ss' awareness of "real" but incipient changes in their experiencing which had not yet found expression in ways that are observable on the instruments used to assess outcomes in this study.

Examination of results from other studies using instruments

related to the Experiencing Scale eliminated the possibility that the reported discrepancy in ratings of self-change stemmed from the inadequacy of this instrument.

Overview

Level of "necessary and sufficient conditions" in the groups.

It was concluded that the presence of only minimal levels in the groups of those conditions theoretically "necessary and sufficient" for personality change was a major factor in limiting the effectiveness of the workshops. It was further suggested that the difficulty in establishing a Rogerian atmosphere is one shared by sensitivity-training workshops, in general.

Nature of the dependent variables. It was concluded that observable personality changes at the level probed by our instruments would be unlikely to occur after only one weekend of sensitivity-training.

Conclusions

Role of sensitivity-training in fostering personality change.

Discussion of results from this and other relevant research led to the broad conclusion that while a weekend sensitivity-training workshop cannot immediately effect basic, observable and enduring changes in the personalities of the participants, it may be effective

in initiating or furthering a process of personality change the end products of which will become visible, if at all, only after time and further nurturance from the environment. This conclusion recognizes the potentially valuable role that this kind of experience can play in a capacity that is probably best described as catalyst.

Comparison of the effects of Bethel and Tavistock training on level of experiencing. The finding of no observable effects of training on level of experiencing at the time of the Interview precludes the drawing of any conclusion about the relative merits of the two models in this regard.

Implications for further research. The finding that deep personality changes do not immediately occur as a result of training was felt to underline the need for a fuller understanding of the nature of changes in isolated areas of functioning, as reported in other research.

Contributions to the literature. The results of this study make important contributions to the literature on sensitivity-training by providing data on the experiential differences between Bethel and Tavistock training, by adapting the Relationship Inventory for use with sensitivity-training groups, by using the Experiencing Scale to assess process level outside of the ongoing workshop, and

by providing empirical evidence of the applicability of the personality theories of Rogers and Gendlin to the area of sensitivity-training.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76 (No. 43).
- Bass, B. M. Reactions to Twelve angry men as a measure of sensitivity-training. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1962, 46, 120-124.
- Baumgartel, H. & Goldstein, J. W. Need and value shifts in college training groups. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1967, 3, 87-101.
- Burke, R. & Bennis, W. G. Changes in perception of self and others during human relations training. Human Relations, 1961, 2, 165-182.
- Cadden, J. J., Flack, F. F., Blakeslee, S., & Charlton, Jr., R. Growth in medical students through group process. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 126 (6), 862-868.
- Campbell, J. P. & Dunette, M. D. Effectiveness of T-group experiences in managerial training and development. Psychological Bulletin, 1968, 70, 73-104.
- Clark, J. V. Authentic interaction and personal growth in sensitivity-training groups. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1963, 3, 1-13.
- Clark, J. V. & Culbert, S. A. Mutually therapeutic perception and self-awareness. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1965, 1, 180-194.
- Clark, J. V., Culbert, S. A. & Bobele, H. K. Mutually therapeutic perception and self-awareness under variable conditions. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1969, 5, 65-72.
- Culbert, S. A. Trainer self-disclosure and member growth in two T-groups. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1968, 4, 47-73.

- Frank, J. D. Training and therapy. In L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb, & H. P. Benne (Eds.), T-group theory and laboratory method. New York: Wiley, 1964. Pp. 442-451.
- French, Jr., J. R. P., Sherwood, J. J., & Bradford, D. L. Change in self-identity in a management training conference. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1966, 2, 210-218.
- Gendlin, E. T. Experiencing and the creation of meaning. New York: Free Press, 1962.
- Gendlin, E. T. A theory of personality change. In P. Worchel & D. Byrne (Eds.), Personality change. New York: John Wiley, 1964.
- Gendlin, E. T. Focusing. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice, 1969, 6 (1), 4-15.
- Gibb, J. R. & Platts, Grace N. Role flexibility in group interaction. American Psychologist, 1950, 5, 491 (abstract). Cited by D. Stock, 1964. P. 431.
- Gottschalk, L. A. & Pattison, E. M. Psychiatric perspectives on T-groups and the laboratory movement: an overview. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 126 (6), 823-839.
- Harrison, R. Impact of the laboratory on perceptions of others by the experimental group. In C. Argyris, Interpersonal competence and organizational effectiveness. Homewood: Dorsey, 1962.
- Harrison, R. Cognitive change and participation in a sensitivity-training laboratory. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 30, 517-520.
- Harrison, R. & Lubin, B. Personal style, group composition, and learning. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1965, 1, 286-301.
- Harrison, R. & Oshry, B. Laboratory training in human relations and organizational behavior. Unpublished manuscript, available from authors, 1970.
- Hays, W. L. Statistics for psychologists. New York: Holt, 1963.

- Klein, E. B. & Astrachan, B. M. Learning in groups. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1971, 7, 659-683.
- Klein, M. H., Mathieu, P. L., Gendlin, E. T., & Kiesler, D. J. The experiencing scale. A research and training manual. Madison: Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, 1969.
- Laing, R. D. The politics of experience. New York: Ballantine, 1967.
- Leonard, G. B. Education and ecstasy. New York: Dell, 1968.
- Lieberman, M. A., Yalom, I. D., & Miles, M. B. The impact of encounter groups on participants: Some preliminary findings. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1972, 8, 29-50.
- Lippitt, G. Effects of information about group desire for change on members of a group. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, American University, 1959. Dissertation Abstracts, Vol. XX, 10, 1960. Cited by D. Stock, 1964. P. 429.
- May, R. The origins and significance of the existential movement in psychology. In R. May, E. Angel, & H. F. Ellenberger (Eds.), Existence. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1958.
- Meador, B. D. Individual process in a basic encounter group. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1971, 18, 70-76.
- Miles, M. B. Human relations training: Processes and outcomes. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 301-306.
- Myers, G. E., Myers, M. T., Goldberg, A., & Welch, C. E. Effect of feedback on interpersonal sensitivity in laboratory training groups. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1969, 5, 175-185.
- Rogers, C. R. Client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.
- Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 95-103.
- Rogers, C. R. A process conception of psycho-therapy. American Psychology, 1958, 13, 142-149.

- Rogers, C. R. Therapy, personality and interpersonal relationships. In S. Koch (Ed.), Psychology: A study of a science. Vol. 1. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1959.
- Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Rogers, C. R. (Ed.). The therapeutic relationship and its impact: A study of psychotherapy and schizophrenics. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967.
- Rogers, C. R. The group comes of age. Psychology Today, 1969, 3 (7), 27.
- Rogers, C. R. & Rablen, R. A. A scale of process in psychotherapy. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1958.
- Schubert, M. L. Love me or leave me. Voices, 1971, 7 (2), 37-39.
- Schutz, W. C. & Allen, V. L. The effects of a T-group laboratory on interpersonal behavior. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1966, 2, 265-286.
- Singer D. L., Astrachan, B. M., Gould, L. J., & Klein, E. B. A group is not a group is not a group: Psychological work in groups from an organizational and systems perspective. Unpublished manuscript, 1972.
- Slater, P. E. Microcosm. New York: Wiley, 1966.
- Steele, F. J. Personality and the "laboratory style." Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1968, 4, 25-47.
- Stock, D. Factors associated with change in self-perception. In D. Stock & H. A. Thelen (Eds.), Emotional dynamics and group culture. New York: New York University Press, 1958. Cited by D. Stock, 1964. P. 428.
- Stock, D. A survey of research on T-groups. In L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb, & H. P. Benne (Eds.), T-group theory and laboratory method. New York: Wiley, 1964. Pp. 395-441.
- Tillich, P. The courage to be. New Haven: Yale, 1952.

Veen, F. van der & Tomlinson, T. M. A scale for rating the manner of problem expression. In C. R. Rogers (Ed.), 1967.

Winthrop, H. Blocked communication and modern alienation. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1963, 3, 98-111.

APPENDIX A

APPLICATION FOR PARTICIPATION IN A SENSITIVITY-TRAINING WORKSHOP

Application for sensitivity-training workshop

Name _____

Address _____

Telephone _____

Age _____ Sex _____ School _____

Weekends during March and April during which you will NOT
be available to attend a workshop (list dates):

Mail to:

Michael Schubert
31 West 87 Street
New York, N.Y. 10024

APPENDIX B

CONFIRMATION OF ASSIGNMENT TO A WORKSHOP

To: participants in the weekend sensitivity-training workshop

The workshop which you will be attending will be held at:

The Psychological Center (CCNY)
3332 Broadway (corner 135 and Broadway)
New York, N.Y. 10031

on:

Saturday, March 27th,
from 9 AM to 7:30 PM, and,

Sunday, March 28th,
from 9 AM to 7:30 PM

There will, of course, be breaks for rest and lunch. There are numerous restaurants in the immediate area of the workshop. Please eat breakfast before you come.

Please bring a pen to the workshop both days.

We suggest that you dress very comfortably.

Transportation:

To get to the Psychological Center you should take the

7th Ave-Broadway LOCAL (IRT) to 137 St. station

You can get this LOCAL, going uptown, at the 96 St. EXPRESS stop of the 7th Ave-Broadway line (IRT). Or, you can switch at 59 St. (Columbus Circle) from the A or D lines.

The Psychological Center is located a few doors south of the SE corner of 135th and Broadway. Walk up one flight to the workshop.

Payment:

If it is all possible we prefer that you bring a check or money order rather than cash. The cost is \$9. Make the check or money order payable to:

Michael Schubert.

See you Saturday morning,

Michael Schubert

APPENDIX C
PERSONAL INFORMATION FORM (PIF)

name _____ group _____

address _____

phone _____ date of birth ____/____/____ sex _____

religious affiliation _____ school _____

years in college _____ major subject _____

numbers of brothers _____ number of sisters _____

birth order:

a) oldest b) youngest c) only child d) other _____

marital status:

a) single b) in steady relationship c) married
d) separated or divorced

residence:

a) with family b) with roommate c) with lover
d) alone e) other _____

After what age would you begin to think there is something wrong with a man who is not yet married?

a) 20 b) 25 c) 30 d) 35 e) 40 f) never

After what age would you begin to think there is something wrong with a woman who is not yet married?

a) 20 b) 25 c) 30 d) 35 e) 40 f) never

How important do you think it is for an intelligent man to earn a college degree if he wants very much to be happy?

a) absolutely essential b) important
c) useful d) absolutely irrelevant

How important do you think it is for an intelligent woman to earn a college degree if she wants very much to be happy?

a) absolutely essential b) important

In your opinion, how effective is psychotherapy in helping people find happier lives?

- a) extremely effective
- b) very effective
- c) moderately effective
- d) slightly effective
- e) totally ineffective

Please indicate below the phrase which best summarizes your general political orientation:

- a) radical right
- b) left liberal
- c) liberal
- d) middle road
- e) moderate right
- f) conservative
- g) radical right

Please indicate which statement is closest to your own view:

- a) Sensitivity-training is an important and effective method of helping individuals grow into psychologically healthier and happier human beings.
- b) Sensitivity-training is an experimental technique which may be effective in helping individuals grow into psychologically healthier and happier human beings.
- c) Sensitivity-training is a current fad, something like discotheque dancing, which provides groups of people with a harmless and entertaining experience that is unlikely to have any deep influence on their lives.
- d) Sensitivity-training is a technique which is more likely to have harmful than beneficial effects on the participants.

What kind of experience do you expect the sensitivity-training workshop to be for you?

- a) A profound experience. I expect to undergo great change and experience deeply meaningful insight about myself and my relations with others.
- b) A meaningful experience. I expect that some aspects of the workshop will improve my understanding of myself and others and that I will come away changed, somewhat, as a result of the experience.
- c) An enjoyable experience. I expect to have a good time at the workshop, as I would at a party.
- d) A boring experience. I expect the workshop to be a tedious and boring exercise in meaningless psychological jargon and phony interpersonal relationships. I expect it to have no effect on me other than to turn me off.

name _____ group _____

APPENDIX D
PERSON DESCRIPTION INSTRUMENT (PDI)

Your name _____ group _____

Person being described: (do not use person's name!)

(self; closest friend of same sex; closest friend of opposite sex)

nondefensive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	defensive
high ability	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	low ability
shows feelings	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	hides feelings
tactful	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	tactless
informed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	uninformed
outspoken	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	reserved
sympathetic	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unsympathetic
competent	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	incompetent
enthusiastic	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unenthusiastic
nonthreatening	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	threatening
high status	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	low status
emotionally expressive	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	unemotional
considerate	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	inconsiderate
influential	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	uninfluential
loud	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	quiet
accepts others	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	rejects others
high prestige	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	low prestige
demonstrative	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	undemonstrative
flexible	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	inflexible
responsible	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	irresponsible
active	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	passive
accepts suggestions	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	rejects suggestions

APPENDIX E
SCHEDULES FOR EXPERIMENTAL WORKSHOPS

Schedule for weekend workshopSaturday

arrive
9:00

questionnaires
9:30-10:30

session 1
10:30-12:00

lunch
12:00-1:00

session 2
1:00-2:30

coffee break
2:30-2:45

session 3
2:45-4:45

coffee break
4:45-5:15

session 4
5:15-6:45

Sunday

arrive
10:15

session 5
10:15-11:45

coffee break
11:45-12:00

session 6
12:00-1:30

lunch
1:30-2:30

session 7
2:30-4:00

questionnaires
4:00-5:30
(Coffee will be available until
5:15. Please remain in your room
from 5:15 to 5:30.)

session 8
5:30-7:30

Room 2

Group BSchedule for weekend workshopSaturday

arrive
9:00

questionnaires
9:30-10:30

session 1
11:00-1:00

lunch
1:00-2:00

session 2
2:00-3:30

coffee break
3:30-4:00

session 3
4:00-5:30

coffee break
5:30-5:45

session 4
5:45-7:15

Sunday

arrive
9:00

session 5
9:00-10:30

coffee break
10:30-10:45

session 6
10:45-12:15

lunch
12:15-1:15

session 7
1:15-2:45

questionnaires
2:45-4:15
(Coffee will be available until
4:00. Please remain in your room
from 4:00 to 4:15.)

session 8
4:15-6:15

Room 48

Group CSchedule for weekend workshopSaturday

arrive

9:00

questionnaires

9:30-10:30

session 1

11:00-1:00

lunch

1:00-2:00

session 2

2:00-3:30

coffee break

3:30-4:00

session 3

4:00-5:30

coffee break

5:30-5:45

session 4

5:45-7:15

Sunday

arrive

9:00

session 5

9:00-10:30

coffee break

10:30-10:45

session 6

10:45-12:15

lunch

12:15-1:15

session 7

1:15-2:45

questionnaires

2:45-4:15

(Coffee will be available until
4:00. Please remain in your room
from 4:00 to 4:15.)

session 8

4:15-6:15

Room 48

Group DSchedule for weekend workshopSaturday

arrive
9:00

questionnaires
9:30-10:30

session 1
10:30-12:00

lunch
12:00-1:00

session 2
1:00-2:30

coffee break
2:30-2:45

session 3
2:45-4:45

coffee break
4:45-5:15

session 4
5:15-6:45

Sunday

arrive
10:15

session 5
10:15-11:45

coffee break
11:45-12:00

session 6
12:00-1:30

lunch
1:30-2:30

session 7
2:30-4:00

questionnaires
4:00-5:30
(Coffee will be available until
5:15. Please remain in your room
from 5:15 to 5:30.)

session 8
5:30-7:30

Room 2

APPENDIX F
LIST OF NEIGHBORHOOD RESTAURANTS

The following is a list of some of the restaurants within walking distance of the Psychological Center:

Hong Kong - 140-1 & Bway - Cuban, Chinese (Good, inexpensive)

Wah May - 138-9 (3415 Bway) - Chinese (O.K.)

Siboney - 137-8 & Bway (3405 Bway) - Drinks served; Spanish fare

La Nueva China - 137-8 & Bway - Spanish, Chinese

Pizza Shop - 138 & Bway

El Barrin - 3410 Bway - Cuban specialties

La Paella - 136 & Bway - Excellent Spanish fare, priced accordingly

Hudson View Luncheonette - 136 & Bway - Few seats; counter only; Good and inexpensive

"The Greeks" * - corner 139 & Amsterdam - American fare; good and reasonably priced

Coffee Shop* - corner 139 & Amsterdam

*Closed Sunday

APPENDIX G

WORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE (WOQ)

- WOQ 1 - Experience of group atmosphere
- WOQ 2 - Most extreme degree of affect during workshop
- WOQ 3,4- Evaluation of workshop
- WOQ 5 - Ratings of trainer behavior
- WOQ 6 - Ratings of interaction patterns
- WOQ 7 - Ratings of topic importance
- WOQ 8-11 - Relationship inventory (RI)
- WOQ 12 - Ratings of self-change

experienced them. For each characteristic below please indicate the point that best describes your group, in general, during the SECOND half of the workshop - after members have had time to become acquainted.

extremely
very
moderately
slightly
slightly
moderately
very
extremely

open (free and honest)

warm (affectionate, caring)

accepting (uncritical, not judgmental)

close (strong group feeling)

intellectual (verbal, academic)

sexual (sexual themes, feelings, common)

structured (strong leadership, clear goals)

empathic (understanding)

competitive (rivalrous)

didactic (like a classroom)

personal (self-revealing)

closed (unfree, dishonest)

cold (unaffectionate, uncaring)

rejecting (critical, judgmental)

distant (weak group feeling)

affective (emotional, feeling-dominated)

asexual (sexual themes, feelings, rare)

unstructured (weak leadership, vague goals)

unempathic (no understanding)

cooperative (no rivalry)

experiential (like "life")

impersonal (abstract, not about self)

name

group

1001

193

Next to each word below please place a check on that part of the scale which best describes the MOST EXTREME DEGREE to which you felt that feeling during the workshop. For our purposes it is not important whether you had the feeling for a long time or for a very short time.

	not at all	slightly	moder- ately	very	extremely
happy	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
sad	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
hurt	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
angry	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
anxious	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
relaxed	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
jealous	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
affectionate	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
excited	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
trusting	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
involved	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
sexual	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
competitive	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
distrustful	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
defensive	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
embarrassed	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
insulted	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
nervous	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

name _____ group _____

name _____ group _____

1. To what extent do you feel that you understand yourself better as a result of this workshop?

a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

2. To what extent do you feel that you have a better understanding of people in general as a result of this workshop?

a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

3. To what extent have your values, attitudes or ideas about people and interpersonal relationships changed as a result of this workshop?

a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

4. To what extent has the workshop been a valuable growth experience for you?

a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

5. To what extent has the workshop been a painful experience for you?

a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

6. To what extent was the workshop an enjoyable experience for you?

a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

7. How do you feel about the prospect of attending another workshop with a format similar to this one?

a) would not want to at all b) slight interest

c) substantial interest d) eager to attend

8. Please indicate which statement is closest to your own view:

a) Sensitivity-training is an important and effective method of helping individuals grow into psychologically healthier and happier human beings.

b) Sensitivity-training is an experimental technique which may be effective in helping individuals grow into psychologically healthier and happier human beings.

c) Sensitivity-training is a current fad, something like discotheque dancing, which provides individuals with a harmless and entertaining experience that is unlikely to have any deep influence on their lives.

d) Sensitivity-training is a technique which is more likely to have harmful than a beneficial effect on the participants.

9. Which of the following best describes the kind of experience that this workshop has been for you?

a) A profound experience. I underwent great change and experienced deeply meaningful insight about myself and my relationships with others.

b) A meaningful experience. Some aspects of this workshop have improved my understanding of myself and others and I have changed, somewhat, as a result of this experience.

c) An enjoyable experience. I had a good time at the workshop, as I would at a party.

d) A boring experience. The workshop was a tedious and boring exercise in meaningless psychological jargon and phony interpersonal relationships. The only effect it had on me was to turn me off.

For each characteristic below please indicate that point which best describes your "trainer's" ("consultant's") behavior during the small group sessions.

	extremely	very	moderately	slightly	slightly	moderately	very	extremely	
friendly									unfriendly
likable									dislikable
intelligent									unintelligent
strong									weak
formal									informal
rigid									flexible
critical									accepting
open									closed
intellectual									emotional
authentic									role-playing
warm									cold
soft									hard
intimidating									reassuring
supportive									unsupportive
spontaneous									calculated
provacative									tranquilizing

name _____

group _____

name _____ group _____

For each of the activities described below please estimate the frequency with which members of your group engaged in that activity over the course of the workshop.

1) giving feedback - "feedback" is defined as any verbal communication to a group member which gives that member information about how he has affected others by his behavior.

Feedback can be a spontaneous, emotional, eruptive reaction (ex. "You're full of shit!") or, at the other extreme, a thoughtful, considered statement of feelings (ex. "In my opinion you have been the most helpful member of this group."). Both of these responses are "feedback".

a) very frequently b) sometimes c) rarely d) not at all

2) interacting directly with the trainer (consultant) - i.e. a group member speaking directly to the trainer, not just about him.

a) very frequently b) sometimes c) rarely d) not at all

3) interacting with another member - i.e. one member speaking directly to a specific other member, not to the group as a whole.

a) very frequently b) sometimes c) rarely d) not at all

4) sharing of "here-and-now" feelings with another member or with the group as a whole - i.e. a member expresses to another member or to the group as a whole, the feelings he is experiencing during the workshop, very near to the time that he is feeling them.

a) very frequently b) sometimes c) rarely d) not at all

5) sharing of "historical" facts with another member or with the group as a whole - i.e. a member relates something about his past life, about his family, friends, school, lovers, general personality, etc., without reference to how he is feeling in the present moment (here-and-now).

a) very frequently b) sometimes c) rarely d) not at all

6) dealing in depth with one member at a time - i.e. the group members focus on one member for some period of time, giving him feedback, asking him questions, and discussing his personality and behavior in an attempt to understand him better.

a) very frequently b) sometimes c) rarely d) not at all

Below is a list of topics or issues that may have been discussed in your group during this workshop. Please mark each topic in the left margin according to how IMPORTANT that topic (including closely related issues) was to your group. Consider how frequently and thoroughly the topic was discussed, how interesting it was to the group members, and to what extent it helped the group understand its own interaction. Write in: (a), (b), (c), (d) or (e), to stand for the following responses:

- (a) never discussed
- (b) one of the least important topics discussed
- (c) one of many topics of only minor importance
- (d) one of the more important topics discussed
- (e) one of the most important topics discussed

- _____ sexual attraction and feelings
- _____ competition
- _____ affection
- _____ trust
- _____ need for approval
- _____ anger
- _____ need for structure
- _____ honesty (openness)
- _____ relationships with your trainer (consultant)
- _____ relationships with authority figures, in general
- _____ expression of feelings
- _____ role of feedback in the group
- _____ dependency on others
- _____ non-verbal communication
- _____ sex differences

name _____ group _____

Below are listed a variety of ways that one person could feel or behave in relation to a group. Please consider each statement with respect to whether you think it is true or not true, in general, in your present relationship with your group. Mark each statement in the left margin according to how strongly you feel it is true or not true. Write in +1, +2, +3; or -1, -2, -3, to stand for the following answers:

+1: I feel that it is probably true, or more true than untrue

+2: I feel that it is true

+3: I strongly feel that it is true

-1: I feel that it is probably untrue, or more untrue than true

-2: I feel that it is not true

-3: I strongly feel that it is not true

- ___ 1. They respect me.
- ___ 2. They try to see things through my eyes.
- ___ 3. They pretend that they like me or understand me more than they really do.
- ___ 4. Their interest in me depends partly on what I am talking to them about.
- ___ 5. They disapprove of me.
- ___ 6. They understand my words but not the way I feel.
- ___ 7. What they say to me rarely conflicts with what they think or feel.
- ___ 8. They always respond to me with warmth and interest - or always with coldness and disinterest.
- ___ 9. They are curious about "the way I tick", but not really interested in me as a person.
- ___ 10. They are interested in knowing what my experiences mean to me.
- ___ 11. They are disturbed whenever I talk about or ask about certain things.

- ___ 12. Their feeling toward me does not depend on how I am feeling toward them.
- ___ 13. They like seeing me; like my being part of the group.
- ___ 14. They nearly always know exactly what I mean.
- ___ 15. I feel that the group has unspoken feelings or concerns that are getting in the way of our communication.
- ___ 16. Their attitude toward me depends partly on how I am feeling about myself.
- ___ 17. They are indifferent to me.
- ___ 18. At times they jump to the conclusion that I feel more strongly or more concerned about something than I actually do.
- ___ 19. They behave just the way that they are, in our relationship.
- ___ 20. Sometimes they respond to me in a more positive and friendly way than they do at other times.
- ___ 21. They appreciate me.
- ___ 22. Sometimes they think that I feel a certain way, because they feel that way.
- ___ 23. I do not think that they hide anything from themselves that they feel with me.
- ___ 24. They like me in some ways, dislike me in others.
- ___ 25. They are friendly and warm toward me.
- ___ 26. They understand me.
- ___ 27. If I feel negatively toward them they respond negatively toward me.
- ___ 28. They care about me.
- ___ 29. Their own attitudes toward some of the things I say, or do, stop them from really understanding me.
- ___ 30. They do not avoid anything that is important for our relationship.
- ___ 31. Whether I am expressing "good" feelings or "bad" ones seems to make no difference to how positively - or how negatively - they feel toward me.

- ___ 32. They feel that I am dull and uninteresting.
- ___ 33. They understand what I say, from a detached, objective point of view.
- ___ 34. I feel that I can trust them to be honest with me.
- ___ 35. Sometimes they are warmly responsive to me, at other times cold or disapproving.
- ___ 36. They are interested in me.
- ___ 37. They appreciate what my experiences feel like to me.
- ___ 38. They are secure and comfortable in our relationship.
- ___ 39. Depending on the group's mood, they sometimes respond to me with quite a lot more warmth and interest than they do at other times.
- ___ 40. They just tolerate me.
- ___ 41. They play roles with me.
- ___ 42. They are equally appreciative - or unappreciative - of me whatever I am telling them about myself.
- ___ 43. They do not really care what happens to me.
- ___ 44. They do not realize how strongly I feel about some of the things we discuss.
- ___ 45. There are times when I feel that their outward response is quite different from their inner reaction to me.
- ___ 46. Their general feeling toward me varies considerably.
- ___ 47. They seem to really value me.
- ___ 48. They respond to me mechanically.
- ___ 49. I don't think that they are being honest with themselves about the way they feel toward me.
- ___ 50. Whether I like or dislike myself makes no difference to the way they feel toward me.
- ___ 51. They dislike me.
- ___ 52. I feel that they are being genuine with me.

- _____ 53. Sometimes they respond quite positively to me, at other times they seem indifferent.
- _____ 54. They are impatient with me.
- _____ 55. Sometimes they are not at all comfortable but we go on, outwardly ignoring it.
- _____ 56. They like me better when I behave in some ways than they do when I behave in other ways.
- _____ 57. They feel deep affection for me.
- _____ 58. They usually understand all of what I say to them.
- _____ 59. They do not try to mislead me about their own thoughts or feelings.
- _____ 60. Whether I feel fine or feel awful makes no difference to how warmly and appreciatively - or how coldly and unappreciatively - they feel toward me.
- _____ 61. They regard me as a disagreeable person.
- _____ 62. What they say gives a false impression of their total reaction to me.
- _____ 63. I can be very critical of the group or very appreciative of the group without it changing their feeling toward me.
- _____ 64. At times they feel contempt for me.
- _____ 65. When I do not say what I mean at all clearly they still understand me.
- _____ 66. They try to avoid telling me anything that might upset me.
- _____ 67. Their general feeling toward me (of liking, respect, dislike, trust, criticism, anger, etc.) reflects the way that I am feeling toward them.
- _____ 68. They try to understand me from their own point of view.
- _____ 69. The group can be deeply and fully aware of my most painful feelings without being distressed or burdened by them themselves.

name _____ group _____

Below are a list of dimensions along which individuals differ in their relationships to themselves and to others. Please consider each dimension with respect to whether you feel that you have changed in that area since the beginning of this workshop. Mark each dimension (or characteristic) in the left margin according to how much and in what direction you feel that you have changed. Write in: 0, +1, +2, +3, +4, or -1, -2, -3, -4, to stand for the following responses:

- + 4: extreme positive change
- + 3: considerable positive change
- + 2: moderate positive change
- + 1: slight positive change
- 0: no change
- 1: slight negative change
- 2: moderate negative change
- 3: considerable negative change
- 4: extreme negative change

For example: on the line next to the first dimension, "openness", write -1, -2, -3 or -4 if you feel that you have become LESS open since the workshop, or write +1, +2, +3, or +4 if you feel that you have become MORE open since the workshop. A higher number indicates a greater degree of change in a given direction. If you feel that there has been no change in yourself since the beginning of this workshop, write "0" in the margin.

- _____ 1. openness - sharing personal thoughts and feelings with others.
- _____ 2. warmth - feeling close to and affectionate toward others.
- _____ 3. acceptance - understanding and responding to others' "worlds" without judging them "right" or "wrong".
- _____ 4. intellectuality - interacting with others through thoughts and ideas ("headiness").
- _____ 5. emotionality - interacting with others through feelings ("gutsiness").

- _____ 6. sexuality - feeling oneself more attracted to and attractive to others in a sexual way.
- _____ 7. trust - feeling more confidence that others are "with you" rather than "against you"; i.e. that others will respect your feelings and do what they can to help rather than hurt you.
- _____ 8. attractiveness (likability) - feeling that others like you, find you interesting, enjoy your company and feel generally positive toward you.
- _____ 9. adventurousness - the degree to which you take personal "risks" in your relationship with others.
- _____ 10. activity - the degree to which you participate with others.
- _____ 11. awareness of your own feelings - degree to which you are conscious of what is going on inside of you.
- _____ 12. awareness of others' feelings - degree to which you are conscious of what is going on inside of others.

APPENDIX H

RESPONSE TO DISCUSSION (RED)

- RED 1 - Most extreme degree of affect during Interview
- RED 2 - Feeling state during Interview
- RED 3 - Impressions of the interviewer
- RED 4 - Evaluation of the Interview
- RED 5 - Degree of authenticity during the Interview
- RED 6 - Ratings of self-change (duplicate of WOQ 12)
- RED 7 - Evaluation of workshop (duplicate of WOQ 3-4)

Next to each word please place a check on that part of the scale which best describes the most extreme degree to which you felt that feeling at any time during the interview. For our purposes it is not important whether you had that feeling for a long time or for a very short time.

	not at all	slightly	moder- ately	very	extremely
happy					
sad					
hurt					
angry					
anxious					
relaxed					
intimidated					
affectionate					
excited					
trusting					
distrustful					
sexual					
competitive					
involved					
nervous					
defensive					
embarrassed					
insulted					

These instructions will guide you in the way you feel and act during the second half of your interview - after the initial adjustment period.

Even if you acted differently from the way you felt please indicate here, your feeling. Thus, if you felt nervous, but acted relaxed, please indicate that you felt nervous. (Put only one mark on each line!)

	extremely	very	moderately	slightly	slightly	moderately	very	extremely	
self-conscious									unself-conscious
nervous									relaxed
involved									uninvolved
open									closed
honest									dishonest
spontaneous									cautious
warm									cold
intellectual									emotional
personal									impersonal
"real"									"false"
trustful									distrustful
loose									tight
up									down
comfortable									uncomfortable

name

group

Please indicate that point on the scale which best describes your feelings about, or your evaluation of the interview you just completed.
(Please make only one mark on each line below!)

	extremely	very	moderately	slightly	slightly	moderately	very	extremely	
appropriate									inappropriate
personal									impersonal
valuable									worthless
structured									unstructured
enjoyable									unpleasant
easy									difficult
comfortable									uncomfortable
ordinary									unusual
contrived									natural
evaluative									non-evaluative
manipulative									non-manipulative
stimulating									boring
directed									undirected
rewarding									unrewarding
"real"									"false"
deep									superficial

In designing the interview situation that you just left it was our goal to maximize the chances of getting an honest, undistorted picture of who you are as an individual. We hoped to create an atmosphere in which you would feel comfortable "being yourself", in which you would not be overly concerned with being judged or criticized, in which you would feel understood and respected.

We would like to know to what extent we have succeeded in these goals. We would like to know the extent to which, in your opinion, we have gotten an accurate and complete picture of you within the limits imposed by a 45 minute interview.

Please indicate which statement best describes your evaluation of the interview in terms of the factors discussed above:

a) During most of the interview I was completely myself. I was able to be open and honest with the interviewer and withheld practically nothing from him. At no time did I become afraid of revealing too much about myself.

If a stranger were to hear a tape recording of this interview he would get a very accurate picture of who I "really" am.

b) During much of the interview I was able to be myself. Considering that the interviewer was a stranger I was very open and honest with him. Although at times I decided not to share certain thoughts or feelings, much of what I talked about was genuinely "me". At times I felt reluctant to reveal too much, but overall I let myself be known.

If a stranger were to hear a tape recording of this interview he would get a fairly accurate picture of who I "really" am.

c) During much of the interview I was uneasy and self-conscious. I frequently held back information that I felt would embarrass me or put me in a bad light. I frequently felt uncomfortable sharing private thoughts and feelings with a total stranger and often decided to play a role rather than be spontaneous and open. Overall, I let the interviewer see or know only limited aspects of myself.

If a stranger were to hear a tape recording of this interview he would know very little about who I "really" am.

d) During most of the interview I was uneasy, self-conscious and guarded. I felt that it was inappropriate for me to share personal thoughts and feelings with a total stranger. I let the interviewer see only the outervost layer of myself and chose to keep my "real" self hidden.

If a stranger were to hear a tape recording of this interview he would know practically nothing about who I "really" am.

Below are a list of dimensions along which individuals differ in their relationships to themselves and to others. Please consider each dimension with respect to whether you feel that you have changed in that area since having attended the sensitivity-training workshop. Mark each dimension (or characteristic) in the left margin according to how much and in what direction you feel that you have changed. Write in: 0, +1, +2, +3, +4, or -1, -2, -3, -4, to stand for the following responses:

- +4: extreme positive change
- +3: considerable positive change
- +2: moderate positive change
- +1: slight positive change
- 0: no change
- 1: slight negative change
- 2: moderate negative change
- 3: considerable negative change
- 4: extreme negative change

For example: on the line next to the first dimension, "openness", write -1, -2, -3 or -4 if you feel that you have become LESS open since the workshop, or write +1, +2, +3, or +4 if you feel that you have become MORE open since the workshop. A higher number indicates a greater degree of change in a given direction. If you feel that there has been no change in yourself since the workshop, write "0" in the margin.

1. openness - sharing personal thoughts and feelings with others.
2. warmth - feeling close to and affectionate toward others.
3. acceptance - understanding and responding to others' "worlds" without judging them "right" or "wrong".
4. intellectuality - interacting with others through thoughts and ideas ("headiness").
5. emotionality - interacting with others through feelings ("gutsiness").
6. sexuality - feeling oneself more attracted to and attractive to others in a sexual way.
7. trust - feeling more confidence that others are "with you" rather than "against you"; i.e. that others will respect your feelings and do what they can to help rather than hurt you.
8. attractiveness (likability) - feeling that others like you, find you interesting, enjoy your company and feel generally positive toward you.
9. adventurousness - the degree to which you take personal "risks" in your relationships with others.
10. activity - the degree to which you participate with others.
11. awareness of your own feelings - degree to which you are conscious of what is going on inside of you.
12. awareness of others' feelings - degree to which you are conscious of others.

1. To what extent do you feel that you understand yourself better as a result of the workshop?

- a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

2. To what extent do you feel that you have a better understanding of people in general as a result of the workshop?

- a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

3) To what extent have your values, attitudes or ideas about people and interpersonal relationships changed as a result of the workshop?

- a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

4) To what extent has the workshop been a valuable growth experience for you?

- a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

5) To what extent was the workshop a painful experience for you?

- a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

6) To what extent was the workshop an enjoyable experience for you?

- a) not at all b) slight c) moderate d) very great

7) How do you feel about the prospect of attending another workshop with a format similar to that of the one you attended?

- a) would not want to at all b) slight interest
c) substantial interest d) eager to attend

8) Please indicate which statement is closest to your own view:

a) Sensitivity-training is an important and effective method of helping individuals grow into psychologically healthier and happier human beings.

b) Sensitivity-training is an experimental technique which may be effective in helping individuals grow into psychologically healthier and happier human beings.

c) Sensitivity-training is a current fad, something like discotheque dancing, which provides individuals with a harmless and entertaining experience that is unlikely to have any deep influence on their lives.

d) Sensitivity-training is a technique which is more likely to have a harmful than a beneficial effect on the participants.

9. Which of the following best describes the kind of experience that the workshop was for you?

a) A profound experience. I underwent great change and experienced deeply meaningful insight about myself and my relationships with others.

b) A meaningful experience. Some aspects of the workshop improved my understanding of myself and others and I changed, somewhat, as a result of the experience.

c) An enjoyable experience. I had a good time at the workshop as I would at a party.

d) A boring experience. The workshop was a tedious and boring exercise in meaningless psychological jargon and phony interpersonal relationships. The only effect it had on me was to turn me off.

APPENDIX I

SAMPLE COMPUTER PRINT-OUT FOR 2x2x2
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Sample computer print-out for 2x2x2 analysis of variance

Variable number 6, WOQ1 4
Analysis of variance summary table

Since cell frequencies are not equal, this is an approximate analysis using the unweighted means technique

Source		Sums of squares	df	Mean squares	F ratio	Probability
1	Model	30.0014	1	30.0014	11.741	0.002
2	Trainer	29.4668	1	29.4668	11.531	0.002
3	Sex	1.1365	1	1.1365	0.445	0.510
12		11.1905	1	11.1905	4.379	0.046
13		00.2776	1	0.2776	0.109	0.744
23		3.5149	1	3.5149	1.375	0.251
123		11.5209	1	11.5209	4.509	0.043
error		71.5500	28	2.5554		
Total sum of squares				564.0		
Correction factor				445.8		
Corrected total sum of squares				460.9		

APPENDIX J

SAMPLE COMPUTER PRINT-OUT FOR 2x2x2x2
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Sample computer print-out for 2x2x2x2 analysis of variance

Analysis of variance summary table

Source	Sums of squares	df	Mean squares	F ratio
--------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------

Between subjects

1 Model	0.100000D 00	1	0.100000D 00	0.084
2 Trainer	0.108707D 01	1	0.108707D 01	0.915
3 Sex	0.640000D 01	1	0.640000D 01	5.387
12	0.348591D 01	1	0.348591D 01	2.934
13	0.313330D 01	1	0.313330D 01	2.637
23	0.422017D 00	1	0.422017D 00	0.355
123	-0.519960D 00	1	-0.519960D 00	-0.438
error	0.332667D 02	28	0.118810D 01	

Within subjects

4 Time	0.347222D 00	1	0.347222D 00	0.611
14	0.277778D 00	1	0.277778D 00	0.489
24	0.310673D 00	1	0.310673D 00	0.547
34	0.277778D 00	1	0.277778D 00	0.489
124	0.200691D 00	1	0.200691D 00	0.353
134	0.233586D 00	1	0.233586D 00	0.411
234	0.881247D 00	1	0.881247D 00	1.552
1234	0.710260D-01	1	0.710260D-01	0.125
error	0.159000D 02	28	0.567857D 00	

Grand total = 0.183000D 03

Number of data points = 72

Correction factor = 0.465125D 03

Uncorrected sum of squares = 0.531000D 03

APPENDIX K

SAMPLE COMPUTER PRINT-OUT FOR $2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 3$
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE

Sample computer print-out for 2x2x2x3 analysis of variance

Analysis of variance summary table

Source	Sums of squares	df	Mean squares	F ratio
--------	-----------------	----	--------------	---------

Between subjects

1	Model	0.778241D 00	1	0.778241D 00	0.084
2	Trainer	0.152763D 00	1	0.152763D 00	0.706
3	Sex	0.444907D 00	1	0.444907D 00	2.057
12		0.407972D-01	1	0.407972D-01	0.189
13		0.860149D-01	1	0.860149D-01	0.398
23		0.677332D-01	1	0.677332D-01	0.313
123		0.313950D-01	1	0.313950D-01	0.145
	error	0.605556D 01	28	0.216270D 00	

Within subjects

4	Time	0.796296D 00	2	0.398148D 00	3.793
14		0.762037D 00	2	0.381019D 00	3.630
24		0.340959D 00	2	0.170479D 00	1.624
34		0.453704D-01	2	0.226852D-01	0.216
124		0.274757D-01	2	0.137379D-01	0.131
134		0.201539D-01	2	0.100770D-01	0.096
234		0.232358D 00	2	0.116179D 00	1.107
1234		0.564239D 00	2	0.282120D 00	2.688
	error	0.587778D 01	56	0.104960D 00	

Grand total = 0.199000D 03

Number of data points = 108

Correction factor = 0.366676D 03

Uncorrected sum of squares = 0.383000D 03