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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Human beings exist in a complex network composed of numerous relationships and cultural forces. The demands of these bonds often conflict and place strains on the individuals involved. As a result, life is a series of partial adjustments to many worlds. The energy drain involved in maintaining this precarious balance leaves the individuals with little capacity to look within themselves and perhaps develop their own potentials (Bradford, 1964). Thus a tremendous demand exists in modern living for reduced alienation, for person-to-person communication, for more opportunity to be one's real self. Rogers (1969) claimed that the most important social invention of this century was probably the encounter group (including T-groups, sensitivity training, laboratory, etc.). These groups function as a micro-cosm of society where individuals analyze their behavior in a group and examine their actions in the everyday world.

Group experience has existed in various forms throughout history, but has only recently come into focus and been recognized as a relevant and respected form of counseling (Hansen et al, 1976). The first modern group experience can be traced to early laboratory training given in Bethel, Maine in 1947. Among the founders of these laboratories were Bradford, Gibb and Benne. They saw the group as the link between the individual person and the larger social structure. According to
them the group was a "medium for serving two sets of interrelated functions": the reeducation of the individual toward greater integrity, greater understanding of himself and of the social conditions of his life, greater behavioral effectiveness in planning and achieving changes both in himself and his social environment; and the facilitation of changes in the larger social structures upon which individuals lives depend (Bradford, Gibb and Benne, 1964, p. 5). The modern encounter group appeared in the 1960's. According to Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1963) the encounter groups excel in their ability to involve and to provide a setting in which certain basic human activities associated with productive change can occur. Individuals learn about themselves by assessing others reactions to their behavior. The encounter group provided settings for engaging in processes that are not usually available in the larger culture.

Group experiences have been utilized in varied settings: in communities, governmental and industrial organizations, and in education. This particular study examines personal growth courses which have become a part of the educational curriculum in various community colleges and universities. According to Creamer (1972) the main aim of the various Human Development of Personal Growth courses in the colleges was to encourage students to examine, assess and develop both intrapersonal and interpersonal life skills. These courses focus on aspects of affective education through examining emotions, feelings, interests, relationships and values. Creamer (1972) conducted a survey
of 120 colleges offering Human Development courses and isolated four
general objectives that were common to these courses:

1. To develop good interpersonal relations.

2. To allow one to examine his own values, attitudes, interests and beliefs.

3. To consider personal, academic, and vocational concerns.

4. To provide an intensive small group experience (p. 10).

As a whole, the various groups described above have common characteristics: they all focus on the individual, foster self-assessment and understanding and enhance desirable changes both in the individual and his social environment.

Research has supported the claim that group experiences have growth-producing effects. Group programs have resulted in changes in personal and interpersonal behavior, feelings and attitudes (Diedrich and Dye, 1972).

Considerable speculation and research has been directed toward an understanding of why some group members reach a mature and creative level of functioning while others do not; why some participants benefit from the group experience and some do not. According to Hansen, Warner and Smith (1976), "the success of group endeavors is a function of many variables, including the particular situation, the membership and the leader" (p. 285). According to them the most important of these variables is leadership. "For even with a 'good' situation and 'good' membership, a group with a poor leader will not function at optimum effectiveness" (p. 285). Cartwright and Zander (1968) stated
that the early work on leadership by Lewin, Lippit and White provided striking evidence that the same group of people will behave in markedly different ways when operating under leaders who behave differently. Lowrey (1943) stated that based on his study the most important factor in group therapy is the proper grouping of the participants and the second most important factor is the personality of the therapist since he is required to be all things to all the participants. Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973) in their extensive study on encounter groups concluded that the way leaders conduct themselves did make a substantial difference in terms of benefiting or harming group members. According to them, the leaders' behavior, attitudes and values become guides to behavior in the group. Yet differences in leader's theoretical orientation and technique based upon diverse schools of thought were not important.

Cartwright and Zander (1968) reported that the earliest approaches to research on leadership were concerned with identifying the characteristics of leaders. Many studies attempted to determine the physical, intellectual and personality traits of the leader as compared to the follower. According to their survey, some studies indicated that well-accepted leaders tend to display better adjustment on various personality tests. Other studies focused more on the leader's skills and styles. Various attempts were also made to develop techniques for identifying persons who have the qualities seen as important for leadership. "On the whole, however, the attempt to discover the traits that distinguish leaders from non-leaders has been
disappointing" (p. 303). According to Cartwright and Zander (1968) investigators came to conclude that traits of the leader that are necessary and effective in one group or situation may be quite different from those of another leader in a different situation. "The improvement of leadership may be expected not from improving leaders apart from the group but by modifying the relationship between leaders and the rest of the group" (p. 304). Gibb (1954) in a review of leadership research arrived at the same conclusions. Studies of the personality of leaders have failed to find any consistent pattern of traits that characterize leaders. Yet, on the basis of his investigations personality characteristics of the leader and the 'follower' greatly affects group outcomes. Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973); O'Day (1973); Riesel (1962) and others have recommended further examination of various aspects of leader-participant personality traits and its affect on group outcome. Leader's personality traits, self-concept, behavior and past experiences all influence the roles and behavior members take on in a group (Hansen et al, 1976). These various aspects of the leader's personality and the leader-member interaction have not been thoroughly investigated as of now. Few studies examined the leader's self-concept and its effect on group members (Mates, 1972; Lesser, 1961; Cooper, 1969; Peters, 1966).
PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study is to assess the relationship between similarities of trainer-participant self-concepts and the participants' change as a result of participating in an experiential group course. This course is offered at Oakton Community College under the title "Psychology of Personal Growth."

It is expected that the results of this study will produce further insight into the understanding of the relationship between leaders and group members outcome.

In addition this study hopefully will maximize the potential effectiveness of the group experience.

HYPOTHESES

1. The students' post self-concept will be more congruent than their pre self-concept regardless of the students' similarity to trainer.

2. There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concept and participants' positive change.

3. There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concept and participants' satisfaction with the course.

4. The students' post self-concepts will be more similar to the trainer's self-concept than were their pre self-concepts.
DEFINITION OF TERMS

A. Self-Concept Scores as Measured by Q-Sort -

Real-self - individuals' perception of their attributes, feelings and behavior.

Ideal-self - the attributes, feelings and behavior the individual admittedly would most like to possess.

Congruence - similarity between the person one believes himself to be and the person he wishes he were (Rogers and Dymond, 1954).

Positive Change - differences in self-concept in a direction of more congruent self-concept as participants move through the group experience, utilizing the pre-post Q-sort scores.

Negative Change - differences in self-concept in a direction of a less congruent self-concept as participants move through the group experience, utilizing the pre-post Q sorts.

Similarity between Q-sorts - a degree of similarity between two sorts would be the correlation coefficient between the two sorts using items as data point (Rogers and Dymond, 1954). This similarity coefficient will be used to measure Real-Ideal self-concept similarity on sorts done by the same person and similarities between sorts done by different persons.

Paired trainers - trainers were paired for statistical purposes in such a way that paired trainers were as dissimilar as possible.

B. Satisfaction with Course Process and Outcome - as measured by
Questionnaire developed by the investigator to assess subjects feelings about satisfaction with course and personal growth.

C. Psychology of Personal Growth Course - The general description of the Psychology of Personal Growth courses as stated in the Oakton Community College catalog reads as follows:

The focus of this course is a personal growth experience. Emphases will be on increasing awareness of values and other motivational factors that effect individuals' personal behavior and promote or inhibit their personal growth, through the exploration of various theories. Participants in this group experience will be expected to deal with their own personal development.

While the course objectives are common to all the Psychology of Personal Growth courses, the content and the learning experiences for each course are based on different theory and practical techniques.

RATIONAL

The literature review indicates that research in the area of leader and group-members interaction is needed. Results of research in the area of leaders personality and self-concept and its effect on group is modest.

The theory presented in this study is that an important prerequisite for inter-personal attraction is similarity of self-concepts. It is expected that a more effective therapeutic experience will be achieved when group members are attracted to their leader. Group members attraction to their leader is based on their self-concept similarity.
The methods employed for assessing self-concept vary depending on the theoretical background one takes. This study bases its assessment of self-concept changes on Rogers' theoretical views. According to Rogers (1951), the individuals' self-concepts are composed of such elements as their post-experiences, the way they see themselves, their goals and ideals. Individuals are considered congruent if a high level of similarity exists between the way they believe themselves to be (Real-self) and the person they wish they were (Ideal-self). People who experience a large discrepancy between their Real and Ideal-self may experience psychological discomfort. These people when enrolled in therapy, through self-exploration become more realistic in their perception of self and more able to accept themselves as they are. They discover that what they wished to be has shifted toward a more achievable goal and their new state has brought them closer to their former ideal. Through this process the individuals become more congruent.

Rogers (1951) recommends the use of a Q-sort method in studying the specific kind of changes in self-concept which occurs during therapy. A few studies have utilized Rogers' theory of the Q-sort method in a group setting (Lesser, 1961). The uniqueness of this study is its examination of self-concepts similarity of group members and their trainer and its effect on group members' change utilizing Block's Q-sort.
LIMITATIONS

1. The results and recommendations in this study are applicable only to Oakton Community College and similar college environments having a similar student population and offering similar courses. Thus, generalizability beyond this is questionable.

2. The self-concept changes are measured over a single sixteen week semester, therefore, it is not possible to ascertain if the changes are temporary or permanent.

3. The actual behavior of the students in the course is not observed, Conclusions are based on the pre- and post-data gathered as assessed by the instrument.

4. All ten instructors base their course and teaching methods on different theories and practical techniques. The presentation of these courses varied from instructor to instructor according to his personal preference.

5. The participants are involved in daily life activities which may affect their self-concept.

6. The same instrument is used for pre-testing and post-testing, and might serve to have a sensitizing effect.

ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter One has provided an introduction to the study, including background, purpose, hypotheses, definition of terms, rational and limitations. Chapter Two will review research on various group
experiences and outcomes in relation to the group leader. Chapter Three will provide a detailed outline of design of the study, and will further describe the personnel involved. Chapter Four will be a report of statistical analysis of data, and a discussion of those results. Chapter Five will contain a summary of this report, conclusions, and recommendations for further research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of the related literature. The topics included in the chapter are: 1) Historical background; 2) Participants; 3) Leader's role; 4) Research on leader-participants interaction; 5) Self-concept and Q-sort studies; 6) Therapist/leader-client personality similarity.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

In 1946 Kurt Lewin and his associates pioneered small group laboratories. Their primary aim was to increase the skill of businessmen, school teachers, labor leaders, etc., in dealing with community problems. They tried to facilitate an atmosphere in which social changes could occur. The specific objectives in these laboratories according to Bradford, Gibb and Benne (1964) were: 1) Increased awareness and sensitivity to emotional reactions and expression of one's self and others. 2) Enhance greater understanding of one's self and others. 3) Stimulate, clarify and develop personal values and goals. 4) Achieve effective behavior in transactions with one's environment. Subsequently, training groups and other growth producing groups became widely accepted. Many investigators claim that group experience has a growth producing
effect on the participants. Zimpfer (1972) sees the various sensi-
tivity groups as a process for aiding human beings in their social
and personal development and adjustment. However, there are also
reports that indicate that some participants had a negative experi-
ence and were harmed during the group process. Lieberman, Yalom
and Miles (1973) in their extensive study over seventeen types of
small group experiences found that about 60 per cent of the group
participants saw themselves as having benefited from their group
experiences while 19 per cent of the participants had a negative
impact from the experience. Six months later 10 to 20 per cent of
this total population were less enthusiastic about the positive
changes they previously reported.

Due to the contradictory results of the participants experi-
ence discussed above, many studies have attempted to investigate
the question of why some group participants benefit from the group
experience and others do not? What are the specific variables
necessary for producing a positive group outcome? Gazda (1971)
stated that many factors contribute to a group experience and out-
comes such as: the nature and needs of each individual; his expec-
tations and ability to become involved in the group process; the
group composition and process; the trainer's style and personality.
Many studies attempted to investigate which one of these variables
was most significant, yet the conclusions were equivocal.
PARTICIPANTS

According to Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973) individuals who attend sensitivity group should be drawn from non-psychiatric population. The primary goal of these groups is to improve participants behavior and increase awareness of feelings and thus improve their own functioning in the day-to-day life. House (1967) describes the participants in T-groups as adults settled in their ways, who have well established behavior patterns, habits, responses, values, emotional reactions and defense mechanism, which allow them to function in their surroundings. For them "the T-group experience is a very soul-searching process. It requires the individual to introspect, to look at his own values and his emotions, to ask himself whether and why he likes them and whether he wishes to live the way he has" (House, 1967, p. 25).

Olch and Snow (1970) in their study, compared personality characteristics of college students who volunteered for sensitivity groups with students who did not. The instrument selected for the study was the California Psychological Inventory. The results implied that students who volunteered for groups, like those who seek counseling, did so in order to deal with self-perceived personal and social difficulties.

Stock (1964) remarked that what an individual is when he comes to a group will have a great effect on the learning he takes away. Hansen, Warner and Smith (1976) elaborated on the individual
characteristic and state that "the roles that individual members choose to fulfill within the group are the product of four major influences: 1) the expectations of self and others; 2) personality factors; 3) the characteristic of the leader and 4) the characteristics of the group" (p. 324). They claim that individuals come to a group with their own personal history and experiences and this effects their performance in the group and their interaction with others. Individuals in a group present some social roles that are the by products of their occupation, social status, sex and ethnic background. Members also have certain expectations of other members and of the leader's behavior.

The personality traits of the individual has an influence on his behavior in the group and acts to stimulate behavior in others. According to Bennis and Peabody (1962):

"Research and theory in the area of group behavior have in general reflected two major orientations: first a personality emphasis where the group member's personalities provide the independent variables and social behavior is predicted from them (Schutz, W.C. Firo, 1958), and second, a structural orientation wherein personality variables are controlled in some fashion and a structural variable such as communication pattern, group size or status provides 'the experimental factors.'" (p. 203).

Very few studies have dealt with participants personalities and their effects on group outcomes. One study by Clark (1972) did investigate the relationship between the pre-group level of personality traits (dogmatism, empathy and self-disclosure) of clients and the behavioral changes resulting from a therapeutic
experience. The sample included thirty students who were placed in five groups and twelve students who served as control subjects. The groups were pre-tested on a battery composed of Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale form E, a modified form of Carkhuff's Index of Discrimination, a modified form of Jourard's Self-disclosure Questionnaire, and Part One of the Behavioral Scale. The groups met weekly for ninety minutes over twelve weeks. Results revealed that group participating clients did not have significantly greater behavioral changes than non-participating clients. Some studies have attempted to investigate the significance of personality traits and to determine what conditions produce behavioral change. In a study by Clark and Culbert (1965) they were unable to isolate the effect of personality and found that the condition of members' support was the main contributor for individual's change. This study however was poor in terms of its design and its limited sample. Anderson (1969) in his review of educational research concluded that the personality traits of individuals effect group outcome. Participants who function well in groups are ones who are affectively oriented, flexible, well adjusted in interacting with other members and have high desire to change.

Another area of investigation has focused on attraction among members and its effect on group outcome. Browne and Grove (1953) used sociometric choices to determine certain types of group members who were likely to choose or reject specific other types.
The sample included 100 subjects who were divided into six T-groups. Member participants were categorized into five types: the dependents, the self-sufficients, the rigids, the inhibited hostile, and the overt hostile. Results showed that members tended to choose other members like themselves. Members also tended to choose other members who have what they want, i.e. the "inhibited hostile" type tended to choose "dependent" members, who displayed the control over hostile feelings for which the inhibited hostiles were striving.

In summary, studies on group participants' personality traits and their effect on group outcome have addressed themselves to a wide variety of issues. Clark found that pre-group level of dogmatism, empathy and self-disclosure of group participants were not associated significantly with group outcome. In another study, Clark and Culbert found that group members who changed most through their group experience were the ones who reported to receiving group support. On the other hand Anderson concluded that group participants who are flexible, well adjusted and who have a desire to change would benefit from the group experience most. Browne and Grove in a sociometric choice study, concluded that personality characteristics of group participants had an impact on group outcome in terms of group members being attracted to other group members who were similar to them in personality traits or who had complimentary personality traits which they desired for themselves.
As a whole, investigators claim that personality characteristics of group members do influence group outcome, however more studies are recommended in order to understand the process which may block or permit desirable changes to occur.

**Human Development Courses**

The specific group experience utilized with the subjects in this study was a Psychology of Personal Growth course, which is one of the courses offered in colleges under the broader term Human Development courses. Some studies that were done on these courses will be examined. According to Creamer, et al (1972) Human Development courses and similar courses offered by colleges encourage the students to examine and develop both intrapersonal and interpersonal life skills. The objectives of these courses do not differ much from the various group experiences mentioned earlier. The objectives of the Human Development courses are: developing constructive interpersonal relations; helping one to examine his own values, attitudes, interests and beliefs and support changes in these areas; help in personal, academic and vocational concerns; and providing intensive small group experience.

Noll and Watkins (1974) and Gilligan (1973) tried to determine what type of individuals enroll in Human Development courses. The first study compared eighty three college students (thirty-nine males and forty-four females) who participated in a Human Development course with eighty-eight students (forty males and forty-four females) who refused to participate. The instrument
used in the study was the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). Results suggested that males seeking such experience were less self-actualized and more difficult to work with than women who were seeking such an experience. The second study employed fifty-three Human Development students, as contrasted with a control sample of fifty-six students that were not involved in these groups. Both studies suggested that the more self-actualized person is more likely to enroll in a Human Development type of course than an average individual.

Trueblood and McHolland (1971) reported the effects of the Human Potential course at Kendall College in Evanston, Illinois. The sample consisted of thirty-three students in the experimental group and sixty-two students in the control group. The subjects were pre- and post-tested on the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI). The course ran for fourteen weeks. Results showed that a significantly higher number of students changed in a positive direction in the experimental group than in the control group. Significant changes from pre- to post-testing were found on the participants in the experimental group on the subscales of Self-Actualizing Value, Existentiality, Self-Regard and Nature of Man-Constructive. Another Human Development course research study was done by Whitehurst and Farnell (1974) at Houston Community College in Texas. They examined changes in self-awareness, self-understanding and behavior in relation to the course experience.
Ninety students enrolled in a three-hour, fifteen-week, Human Development course were pre- and post-tested on the Personal Orientation Inventory and a special designed Perception of Problem-Solving and Decision-Making scale. Results indicated a significant increase on scores in the following scales: Inner-Direction, Self-Acceptance, Self-Regard, Capacity for Intimate Contact, Spontaneity, Existentiality, Acceptance of aggression, Self-Actualizing and Time Competency.

Not all studies reported positive changes as a result of the Human Development course. Treppa and Fricke (1972) and Haygood (1974) evaluated the results of a Human Development course utilizing the Personal Orientation Inventory. The results from these studies showed that there were no significant changes from pre- to post-testing.

However as a whole, studies on Human Development-type experiences show patterns of positive learning outcomes which support the assumption that Psychology of Personal Growth groups are a viable way to promote positive personality and self-concept changes (Bebourt and Gordon, 1972; Seeman, Nichich and Banta, 1972; Nidich, Seeman and Dreskin, 1973; Whitehurst and Farnell, 1974).
LEADER'S ROLE

The leader's style, orientation, skills, attitudes, values, and personality traits play an important role in group outcomes.

Leader's roles are viewed in various ways. Historically groups were viewed as being subject to their leaders. This view that groups are composed of inferior individuals whose leaders provide them with impetus and ideas is a deeply rooted concept. It is strongly connected to the history of Idealistic philosophies, originating with Plato (Klaf, 1961). Freud claims that the cohesion of a group depends upon internal libidinal ties and on the external tie of each member to the group leader. The external tie has its origin in identification. Through this process the leader replaces the previous ego ideal of each group member, becoming the ego ideal common to the group (Klaf, 1961). Thus, Klaf (1961) states that

"the power of the group leader arose from his ability to reactivate stages of early ego development, particularly the stage when the child attributes omnipotence to his parents. Ambivalence, so important in these early stages, was related to the group-leader relationship." (p.50)

Group members transfer power to the group leader in return for order and protection. Once a firm identification is established with the leader, the learning process is facilitated. Some studies attempted to prove the significance of "identification" with the leader in relation to group outcome (Cooper, 1969).
Slavson (1962) also, sees the therapist as a model with whom group members desire to identify. According to Slavson the therapist in a group serves as an object of identification and as an ego ideal. His personality, poise, objectivity, honesty and capacity for relatedness are of crucial importance in the dynamics of identification transference (Slavson, 1950). "The personality of patients are to varying degrees patterned on that of the therapist as a model in somewhat the same manner as is a child's in relation to his parents though considerably less fundamentally" (p. 41). Slavson states that "It is commonly recognized that what a therapist is is at least as important as what he does." (p. 411). Accordingly, ideas can be taught but character must be demonstrated. Slavson believes that a therapist has to demonstrate traits such as self-congruence, stability, defenselessness, security, objectivity, possess a philosophy of life and a relevant value system, be empathic, genuine and perceptive to client's needs. These characteristics of the therapist are significant in a group process since according to Slavson the clients are alert to the therapist's quality as a person and they sense the therapist's frustrations, confusions, anger, anxiety, confidence, etc.

Cartwright and Zander (1968) in their discussion of leaders viewed leadership as the performance of those acts which help the group achieve its preferred outcomes. "Nearly every conception of leadership contains the notion that a true leader exerts more
influence on the group and its effectiveness than does the average member" (p. 304). Cartwright and Zander (1968) see the leader as one who utilizes social power. Theorists such as Russell, Simon, Dahl and others claim that this social power consists of the ability to influence other people by whatever means leadership involves. Leaders use their power for coordinating among the various group functions. The leadership functions includes various roles such as: executive, planner, policymaker, expert, external group representative, controller of internal relationships, arbitrator, exemplar, group symbol, ideologist, father figure, distributor of reward and punishment and more. Cartwright and Zander (1968) also describe the effective leader as one who "creates a good working team which has a friendly cooperative atmosphere with high group loyalty. He seems to build this high group loyalty through using participation and other recognized methods of group leadership. Moreover, the work group under his leadership exercises influence upward upon organizational objectives, methods, etc., and in turn accepts as group goals those objectives which must be achieved if the group is to do its part of the total task of the organization effectively and at a high level of performance" (p.302).

Bradford (1964) lists the leader's objectives as following:

1. The leader helps in developing a group whose purpose is to learn about the sensitivities, understanding and skills necessary for membership in social situations.

2. He helps in removing blocks to learning about self, about others and about the group.
3. He helps in developing a group climate in which learning can take place.

4. He helps the group discover and utilize methods of inquiry action, observation, feedback, analysis, experimentation—as ways of group development and individual growth.

5. He helps the group to learn how to internalize, to generalize, and to apply learning to other situations (pp. 211-212).

As a whole, the above descriptions and discussions of leadership point out the various functions that a leader performs and emphasize the significant role the leader assumes. The leader functions as a central figure with whom group participants identify, he serves as a model and provides directions. Consequently, research on leadership and its effect on group outcome is important. Professional group leaders may vary the degree to which they are active, structure the group, give feedback and adapt different roles. However, underlying these behaviors are their own personality characteristics which they utilize in facilitating a group experience.

A leader comes to the group with past experiences, attitudes, personality traits and behavior that influence the roles and behavior members take on. According to Hansen, Warner and Smith (1976) the leader's personality traits act in two ways which effect
members' role performance. First of all, the leader's personality will effect the kind of leader behaviors that he can utilize. The personality of the leader will directly effect the style he adopts. Second, the leader's personality traits will also cause the same type of interpersonal reflexes in members as do members' personalities.

Very few studies investigated the effect of leader's personality on group outcome. MacLennan (1975) claims that serious studies only recently began regarding the personality of the group leader and its influence on participants change. In the early days of group psychotherapy it was assumed that if a person had professional training he would be able to facilitate a group, although it was recognized that some leaders would not be able to work with certain population. However, these views are in a process of change as more information is being obtained in regard to groups. Riesel (1962) suggested that the failure to examine the role of the trainer in T-groups and its impact on group process and participants change, stemmed from the reluctance of T-group proponents to admit that the trainer is a direct and important influence in a group. O'Day (1973) and others urged investigators to examine the trainer's personality traits and its effect on group outcomes.
Research on Leaders' Personality

Gibb (1954) supports the position that leadership behavior to be truly effective, must be a product of an interaction between leader, group-members and a particular situation. Not all trainers will be able to work effectively with all groups. According to Gibbs, the trainer's behavior is not only a function of situational and membership conditions but is also a function of his or her personality, behavior patterns and training.

Berger (1972) states that social and behavioral scientists became increasingly aware of the necessity to study themselves as "objects" in terms of their personality traits and its effect on the therapeutic process. The personality of a therapist leads him to adopt a certain orientation in group therapy i.e. intervene in a soft-spoken-manner or in confronting fashion, etc. According to Berger, Grotjahn insisted that scientific techniques give the therapist tools to work with, but do not in themselves constitute the work of therapy. Numerous psychotherapists like Fromm, Horney, Whitaker and others have been noted for their capacity to utilize their personality to create therapeutic experiences for their clients.

On the other hand, Fiedler (1968) in his extensive studies over fifteen years on sixteen hundred groups, found that leader's personality per se did not have significant effect on group outcomes.
In his studies Fiedler attempted to investigate the leader's personality traits, behaviors and attitudes that contribute to group effectiveness.

According to MacLennan (1975) successful leaders know and understand the behavior and values of their participants. They have had experience with similar problems and can assist in finding solutions for these concerns. They can empathize with their group members and accept them. The successful leaders are self-aware, responsible and reliable, warm, eager to learn and desire greatly to help others.

Yalom and Lieberman (1976) attempted to investigate two different types of leaders and their effects on the group members. In their study leader type A was characterized by intrusive, aggressive stimulation, high charisma, high challenging, confronting and authoritarian control. This type leader was impatient and did not attend to the member's needs. Results indicated that groups that were led in this manner had casualties 44 per cent higher than the group led by leaders who were less authoritarian, more empathic and understanding, and less challenging and aggressive.

Truax and Carkhuff (1967) and Lieberman, et al (1973) stated that trainers must demonstrate a healthy personality in their therapeutic encounters. A healthy personality was defined as being congruent, nondefensive and authentic. Carkhuff (1969) claimed that an effective counselor must offer high levels of facilitative
conditions of empathy, warmth and respect. In addition he ought to be genuine, disclose his feelings, be confronting and deal with the immediate (here-and-now). Truax (1968) conducted a study on this subject. He recorded on tape thirty mental patients participating in group counseling with four different therapists. The recordings were analyzed in relation to pre-, post- and follow-up measures of outcomes. The hypothesis studied was: patients receiving high levels of therapist-offered differential reinforcement for self-exploration (using empathy, non-possessive warmth and genuineness as reinforcers) will show greater overall self-exploration and greater therapeutic improvement than patients receiving low or negative reinforcement. Findings confirmed these expectations. Altman and Scollon (1973) conducted a similar study resulting in similar findings. In their study they found that trainers with low facilitative level did not produce change in participants' self-esteem. They concluded that if a counselor is to influence self-esteem, a high level of facilitative functioning is a prerequisite to the use of any type of counseling technique.

In another study (Lundgren, 1974) the emergent status of members, their attitudes and behavior were examined. Two 10-men groups were included in a T-group experience for four days (total of 15 hours) with trainers utilized a nondirective, inactive style in group A and an active, directive style in group B. Each group was observed by a member of the research staff and was rated
on overall behavior. In addition, participants rated themselves and other participants on ten dimensions from the Group Semantic Differential Scale three times during the experience. Participants also responded after each group session on a 50-item "Attitudes toward trainer" checklist and trainers completed a post-meeting questionnaire regarding the trainer's behavior. Results have indicated that in group A, the higher the status of members, the greater was their tendency to identify with the group and change in a positive direction. However, in group B, the higher status members tended to be most negative in their attitudes toward the trainers and showed least identification with the group. The data revealed that the nature of attitudinal and behavioral correlates of members' status in T-groups may be directly contingent upon the type of role adapted by the trainer. The results of the study however, were not conclusive due to the short-term treatment plan and the small sample employed.

Sampson (1972) in his study hypothesized that groups led by trainers oriented toward the group members most liked by their group were more effective, in terms of members satisfaction and achievement of group goals, than groups led by trainers oriented toward least-liked members of their group. The study included three groups whose leaders were oriented toward the "sociometric stars" in their group and three groups whose leaders were oriented toward the "sociometric-isolated" in the group. A questionnaire
based on Passini and Norman's questionnaire (1966) was administered to the trainers and participants prior to the group experience and in addition subjects were asked to name three participants they liked most. Participants also rated other members on a questionnaire throughout the experience. Measure of group effectiveness were based on members' satisfaction, goal achievement and individuals perception of change as indicated by the questionnaire. Results supported the hypothesis in terms of members satisfaction, goal achievement and members attitude and behavioral change. This study raises some questions in terms of the measurements obtained since the instruments were highly subjective.

As a whole much research points toward a growing concern for the development of personality criteria for the selection of group leaders. Yet, major weaknesses still remain in regard to techniques and methodology in the selection of group leaders on the basis of their personality characteristics (MacLennan, 1975).

In summary, there is some agreement that affective personal and interpersonal characteristics of leaders are significant elements in understanding group growth. However, there are few experimental findings in this regard. Some investigators attempted to find the specific leadership traits that would enhance desirable group outcomes. Truax and Carkhuff; Lieberman, et al; Carkhuff; Truax; and Altman and Scollon all claimed that leaders who had high facilitative levels, had groups which showed greater therapeutic
improvement. Thus, a pre-requisite for successful group is for leaders to be empathic, genuine and warm toward their group members. Kinslinger (1966) found that leader's interest, self-perception and life history had an impact on group outcome. Lundgren found that leader's style (directive, active vs. nondirective, passive) had an influence on members' behavior and attitudes in groups. Sampson found that leaders oriented toward the group members most liked by their groups were more effective in terms of group satisfaction and goal achievement.

In general, the studies indicate that leader's personality is important in terms of group participants' change. Group members seem to be satisfied and attracted to leaders with specific traits. On the other hand, leader's personality seems to influence the particular style and theoretical background he will adopt which in turn will have an effect on the group.

RESEARCH ON LEADER-PARTICIPANTS INTERACTION

Stodgill (1948) stated that leadership was not a matter of passive status, or of the mere possession of some combination of traits. It appeared rather to be a working relationship among members of a group, in which the leader acquired status through active participation and demonstration of his capacity for carrying cooperative goals through to completion.
Studies indicated that the group leader functions as a model of behavior to the participants in the group. In his own communications to members, both verbal and non-verbal, he acts to establish the norms of behavior for all group members. The leader's values, attitudes and behavior become guides to members' behavior in the group (Peters, 1966; Culbert, 1968; Cooper, 1969).

Lundgren (1974) stated that it is feasible to view the trainer's role as primarily that of an influence agent. In his study he examined the influence of the trainer's attitudes upon members' attitudes toward the group, and the influence of members' attitudes upon trainer's self-attitudes in seven T-groups (N=71) that lasted for three days. The participants and trainers completed fifteen 10-point rating scales from the Semantic Differential (Osgood, et al, 1957, 1969) and Schutz's (1958) FIRO-B scales. His findings indicated that members accurately perceived the trainer's attitudes toward the group and that members' own attitudes corresponded closely with their perception of trainer's attitudes. The findings suggested that an important aspect of group formation involves an emerging identification of members with the group as a whole, and that trainers exerted substantial influence upon members' attitudes. The investigator recommended further research on the topic of leader-participant relationship and influence in a group experience.
Some research suggests that improvement in psychotherapy is related to the degree that a patient adopts his therapist's evaluative attitudes since the therapist is a potential model of "adaptiveness" (Parloff et al, 1960; Welkowitz, 1967). Drawing from attitude change research and theory, some initial patient-therapist attitude similarity is a necessary condition for beneficial attitude change. If patient and therapist attitudes are too discrepant a patient will not benefit from the treatment (Beutler, 1971; Rosenbaum, 1956).

Lundgren (1975) in a further analysis of his previous study (1974), examined the relationship between interpersonal needs for control and affection in group members and their valuative attitudes toward the trainer and the group as a whole. The study also examined the impact of trainer needs for control and affection on participants. His conclusions indicated that participants were most comfortable and satisfied when the trainer had the same kind of interpersonal orientation that they themselves possessed. As a whole, it was not the members' needs that were of primary importance in evaluative reactions to the trainer and the group, but their similarities to the trainer's needs. One of the shortcomings of the study was the brevity of the T-group experiences. Burke's (1965) study in 24 task oriented groups of leadership supports Lundgren's (1975) conclusions that leader-follower relationship varied as a function of follower-leader similarity of needs.
Leaders that differed in their needs and attributes from the followers created tense situations in their groups.

Kilmann (1974) studied the effect of participants' and trainer's interpersonal values utilizing the Interpersonal Values Constructs Inventory (IVC) on the behavior in eight T-groups. Results suggested that interpersonal values as communicated by mostly non-conscious expressions, did influence behavior in T-groups. In particular, the match between trainer's and participant's value construct (similarities or dissimilarities) was more likely to have "positive" interpersonal effect in the group. Specific values that a participant applied in his group effected his attractiveness to other group members.

Backner (1961) on the other hand, examined the style of leadership, follower personality and group composition. The study was based on Fromm's theory of symbiosis, the theory of identification in groups. The investigator predicted that participants would show greater attraction-to-group (a-t-g) when the leader complimented their control needs and the members of the group were homogeneous with respect to these control needs, than when the leader failed to compliment their control needs and the members of the group were heterogenous with respect to these needs. The results of this study based upon identification and internalization theories find that identification with trainer was likely to result if the trainer was seen as "attractive," meaning, the
trainer possessed attributes that the participant desired for himself, and therefore the participant wished to be involved in the group process. Internalization was likely to occur if the trainer was seen as self-congruent, meaning, honest, direct and sincere.

Cooper (1969) tested the same theories: identification, internalization and compliance on twelve T-groups which included 107 group participants and sixteen trainers. Various measures were obtained: measure of trainer attractiveness based on the Perceptual Inventory; measure of trainer's congruence assessed through the Relationship Inventory-Congruence Scale (Barrett-Lennard, 1962); behavioral changes assessed by an analysis of tape-recording of the sessions; Schutz's FIRO-B questionnaire used to measure attitude change. A change toward greater congruence in the self-concept was found if: a) Participants showed greater similarity between his self-percept and his ideal-percept at the end of the group. b) Participants showed greater similarity between self-percept and other participants' perception of him at the end of the group. c) Participants showed greater similarity between his self-percept and his actual behavior at the end of the group. He found that participants changed in their attitudes and behavior toward being more like the trainer if the trainer was attractive to him. He also found that participants showed an increased congruence in their self-concept if the trainers were seen by him as congruent.
As a group goes through stages of development, trust in the trainer usually develops, the continued exposure of the trainer's attitudes and behavioral style make him a model to the group. The balance then shifts toward a personal identification based on affection, perception of personal similarities and the desire to maintain this relationship. When members develop personal identification with the leader some behavioral modeling will follow (Slater, 1961). Peters (1966) examined certain aspects of this identification theory as applied to personal change in T-group; attitudinal identification, sex matching and occupational similarity. The sample included six T-groups, eleven to twelve participants in each group which met for twenty-two two-hour meetings in NTL at Bethel. Eight experienced T-group trainers led the groups. The member-trainer relationship was assessed by a battery of various instruments administered to participants four times during the two-week laboratory. Instruments included the semantic differential, self-report rating scales, sociometric ratings of other's attitudes and behavior and miscellaneous other measures. The trainers made several ratings of participants' attitudes and behavior in the end of the group experience and four trainers also completed the Semantic Differentials in the first week. The participants overall change was assessed on a self-anchored scale, made by the trainers and by a sociometric peer-rating. A multi-trait-multimethod analysis was performed on the various measures of change in "perceived" and "desired" similarity. Peters found that
participants began the T-groups with a small degree of self-concept similarity with the trainer and this gradually increased to a moderately high degree of similarity toward the end of the group experience (self-concept similarity increased from .25 correlation to .60). Attitudinal identification with the trainer was also related to personal change and group outcomes ($r = .48, p < .001$).

The study also examined the variables of sex-matching and occupational similarity. However, participants who were male (all trainers were males) and held similar occupations did not identify more than other participants. The investigator recommended further research in the area of trainer-participant personality traits and their effect on group outcome.

Two additional studies examined the effect of the group leader's personality on participants' personality and group outcome. One study (White, 1972) theorized that encounter groups, and the group-leaders in particular, would have significant bearing on changes in prejudice, social distance, self-actualization and personality of the group members. The study included forty-nine students who were randomly assigned to six encounter groups and the group-leaders--three described as rigid and three flexible--were randomly assigned to the six groups. An additional group served as a control group. The subjects were pre- and post-tested on the prejudice scale of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, the Cookston Intenacial Social Distance
Scale, the Personal Orientation Inventory and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaires. The groups lasted for ten days which seems to be a limited time for determining long lasting changes. However, the results indicated that rigid leaders encouraged the characteristics of frustration, tenseness, irritability and the absence of clear sense of a socially approved self in the group members. On the other hand, flexible leaders encouraged the characteristics of responsibility, maturity, practicality, composure, consideration of others and a clear sense of socially approved self.

The second study (Slager, 1972) was composed of six treatment T-groups and a reference group who were tested on the Eysenck Personality Inventory (EPI), Hill Interpersonal Matrix-Behavior (HIM-B), and Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) to determine changes in groups as a function of leader personality type. The sample consisted of fifty-four students assigned to groups on the basis of the EPI. The treatment groups met weekly for five weeks for three hour sessions. Each group was assigned a male and female co-leader pair who were pre-tested on the EPI and accordingly matched. The data was analyzed by analysis of variance techniques. Results as a whole did not show any difference between treatment groups and reference group and leader's personality did not seem to effect group outcome. The investigator suggested that the short duration of the experiment may have prevented the leader effect and the group changes, from appearing. The statistics
employed may have also been inappropriate for this data.

Summary

Studies dealing with leader-participant personality traits and their impact on group outcome supported the claim that these variables play a significant role in group process. Lundgren found that leaders exerted substantial influence upon group members attitudes and that members accurately perceived leader's attitudes toward groups. White on the other hand, examined leader's style and behavior in relation to group participants' personality change. He found that flexible leaders have a positive influence on individuals' personality change in the group as opposed to rigid leaders. In another study Lundgren found that a relationship existed between participants' interpersonal needs and their evaluative attitude toward the leader when the group and the leader's needs were similar to theirs. Burke reached similar conclusions in his study. He found that leaders that differed in their needs and personal traits from the participants' needs and personality, created tense situations in their groups. Kilmann found that leaders and group participants who had similar interpersonal value constructs had a more satisfying and positive group experience. Three studies had examined leader's influence on group participants, utilizing identification theory. Backner found that homogenous groups with leaders having complimentary interpersonal needs were
more attractive groups. Cooper found that participants tended to change in their attitudes and behavior and become more like the leader if the leader was attractive to them. Peters too, found that participants' self-concept and attitudes grew closer to that of the trainer's, yet sex and occupation similarity was not related to participants change.

Two important factors in group process are the leader-participant personality similarity and the leader personality traits which are viewed as desirable by participants.

**SELF-CONCEPT AND Q-SORT STUDIES**

Self-concept change as a result of group experience was investigated in several studies. Although one of the objectives in the various group experiences is to gain a more positive self-concept not all the studies indicate significant changes in this direction. One of the major problems in studying self-concept changes in therapy, according to Noy and Shanan (1964) stems from the difficulty of finding basic criteria for personality assessment appropriate to the evaluation of change. Some authors have used multiple criteria, representing various aspects of the personality. Following are some studies on self-concept which utilize the Tennessee Self-Concept Scale.

Brook (1968) in a study with a few methodological weaknesses, found that participants who went through seven consecutive days of T-groups did not change significantly in their self perception as a result of the experience. The subjects were tested on the Tennessee
self-Concept Scale (TSCS). Yet, another T-group study on participants' self-concept change as measured by the TSCS revealed significant differences on the scales of variabilities: Family, Self, and Identity (Letner, 1969). Young (1970) reported in his study that participants with relatively high initial self-concept had changed toward a more positive self-concept, more so than participants who had a low initial self-concept. The investigator utilized the TSCS as a measure for change. In another study Mates (1972) examined the effects of the trainer's self-concept and therapeutic behavior on the participants' self-concept change in T-groups. He had assumed that 1) Trainer's self-concept level would be positively related to participants' self-concept change, 2) trainer's self-concept level would be positively related to participants' ratings of trainer's behavior, 3) participants' ratings of trainer's therapeutic behavior would be positively related to self-concept change in participants. Results measured by the TSCS, rejected all the three hypothesis. Fitts et al, (1969) who had reviewed some studies utilizing the TSCS to assess the effectiveness of sensitivity training, claimed that this treatment did not generate universally positive self-concept changes, but changes did occur more often if it was considered in terms of initial self-concept level.

The methods employed for assessing self-concept generally depend upon the theoretical base of the researchers addressing the issue. The concept of self-concept was considered particularly central to Roger's theory and those of other humanistic psychologists (Rogers,
Rogers (1951) defined self-concept as

"an organized configuration of perceptions of the self which are admissible to awareness. It is composed of such elements as the perceptions of one's characteristics and abilities. The precepts and concepts of the self in relation to others and to the environment; the value qualities which are perceived as associated with experiences and objects; and goals and ideals which are perceived as having negative or positive valence" (p. 136-137).

A body of research investigating the concept of "congruence," defined as the similarity between the person one believes himself to be and the person he wishes he were, has emerged from this theory of personality. From a theoretical point of view, the way a person sees himself affects his behavior, thus a person who experiences a large discrepancy between his real and ideal self may experience psychological discomfort. Rogers explains that the client tends to enter therapy feeling worthless and judges himself in terms of standards set by others. He has a self-ideal that differs greatly from his present self. As therapy proceeds, through self-exploration, the individual becomes more realistic in his perception of himself and more able to accept himself as he is. He discovers that what he wishes to be has shifted toward a more achievable goal. His new state brings him closer to his ideal and he becomes more congruent.

Noy and Shanan (1964) proposed a method to assess personality change in group psychotherapy. Their model focused on the concept of self which included three dimensions: Real-Self, Ideal-Self and Social-Self and their interrelations. They proposed that the individual's change in self should be analyzed and studied through the congru-
ence-discrepancy relationship between the Real-Self (self description and evaluation), Ideal-Self (the way he desires to be) and the Social-Self (how a person feels he is seen by others).

This study bases its assessments of self-concept changes on Rogers (1951) theoretical views of Real-Ideal-Self discrepancy.

Burke and Bennis (1961) conducted an analysis of the perceptual transitions of six T-group members (N=84) involved in training at the NTL. The subjects were pre- and post-tested on the Group Semantic Differential (Osgood, 1957) and some scales from Schutz's (1958) scales and Carter's (1954) group factors. The groups met two hours daily for three weeks. Pre- and post-tests measurements revealed that changes did take place. Profile similarity between perceived actual self and perceived ideal self increased; the similarity between the individual's perceived actual self and mean perception of him by others increased. Members of the T-groups, during the experience became more satisfied in their perception of self, moved their actual perception in the direction of their ideal, became more congruent in their perception of others, and came to see others more like the others see themselves. Results supported the claim that training group can be beneficial to participants and that it is a powerful medium of change.

Rogers and Dymond (1954) and Butler and Haigh (1954) conducted some studies measuring self-concept change before and after therapy. In their studies they utilized a "Q" technique which examines the discrepancies of Real-Ideal Self before and after therapy. Results indicated changes in Ideal-Self toward a more realistic Real
and changes in the Real-Self in the direction of the Ideal-Self. A higher correlation between Real and Ideal-Self was achieved as a result of therapy, and the patients' state indicated greater congruence.

Another study (Sacks, 1972) utilized a Q-sort in order to test the hypothesis that the educational attitude of teachers and supervisors could be significantly influenced by group leadership, and the age, sex, race, years of experience and professional rank would be correlated with change in attitudes of the teachers in the direction of attitudes of the supervisors. Data was collected from thirty teachers and supervisors at a National Defense Educational Act Institute. Attitudes toward education were assessed with the Kerlinger Educational Q-sort, which was administered in the first and last day of the Institute. Results indicated that there was significant differences in the index of congruence for the thirty participants between their pre- and post-measures, and the changes were toward the attitude positions of the group leaders. However, no significant relationship was found between attitude change and the descriptive variables in the study.

Gardener (1974) utilized a "Q" sort technique in his study investigating the effects of group counseling of counselors upon counselor-client congruence and client congruence. In addition, he examined the movement, if any, in counselor-client congruence and the relationship to client congruence. The study included thirty-two counselor candidates who were enrolled in a guidance laboratory sequence. In addition, one client from each counse-
lor's case load was a subject for the study. One-half of the counselors were placed in counseling groups and the rest remained in a control group. The Corsini Q-sort was used to measure the congruency between the client's Ideal-Self and Real-Self and the change that occurred in these variables. The subjects completed their Real-Self sort, their Ideal-Self sort and a Real-Self sort of his counselor. The analysis of the data revealed that counselors in training in small groups were not more effective in increasing the Real-Ideal self congruency of their clients than counselors who were not enrolled in such training. Counselors who were exposed to such group experience were not more effective in increasing counselor-client congruence than counselors who did not receive group counseling. There were parallels between the congruence movements in counselor-client congruence and client congruence. Counselor-client congruence increased in short term counseling but not significantly. Client congruence, in general, increased in short term counseling but the differences were not always significant.

Two studies have utilized Block's Q-sort in their investigation. In the first study Block and Thomas (1955) examined the meaning of expressed satisfaction with self through the construct of ego control. They separated their subjects, who were students enrolled in three psychology classes (N=56), into three groups. The first group was the over-controller (OC) who were aloof, restrained and distant in their personal relationship. This group
tended to use mechanism of depression and denial. The second group were the undercontrollers (UC) who tended to manifest a high degree of emotional fluctuation, were nonconforming, needed immediate gratification and used mechanism of anxiety and despair. The third group was the appropriate-controllers (AC) who tended to be selectively bound and discharged their tension in accord with reality conditions. They were relaxed, informal and flexible. The first hypothesis stated that the degree of expressed self-satisfaction would be related to the amount of ego-control, i.e. OC's should express more self-satisfaction than AC's who in turn should express more self-harmony than UC's. The second hypothesis stated that the relationship of expressed self-satisfaction to adjustment was a curvilinear one, which at different points on the curve varied in its psychological import. Each student was asked to complete the MMPI and Block's Q-sort describing their Real and Ideal-Self. A significant correlation existed between the maladjusted individuals as expressed by Rogers in the Real-Ideal-Self discrepancy and the MMPI scales. Results indicated that both hypotheses were supported. The degree of self-satisfaction was curvilinearly related to the social dimension of adjustment and the degree of self-satisfaction was also related to the conceptual dimension of ego control. The second study utilizing the same Q-sort was done by Chang and Block (1960) who examined the Freudian theory that
homosexuality in the male is based upon an over-identification with the mother figure and an under-identification with the father figure. Two equivalent groups with respect to age, education and socioeconomic level served as the sample. One group (N=20) consisted of homosexual males and the second group consisted of heterosexual males. Each participant completed a Q-sort, describing their Real-Self, Ideal-Self, their mother's and father's Real-Self. Identification scores and a self-concept score were obtained for each individual, by comparing his Ideal-Self with that of the other individuals he described. The hypotheses were supported. Results indicated that homosexual males were more identified with their mothers and more dis-identified with their fathers than were the heterosexual males. Yet, the two groups did not differ significantly in their degree of self-acceptance.

In summary, very few studies examined self-concept change through therapy or group experience utilizing Real-Ideal-Self congruence as measure of change. Burke and Bennis found that group members' self-concept had changed in a more positive direction through their group experience. They became more congruent and more satisfied in their perception of self. Their Real perception moved in the direction of their Ideal-Self and their Ideal-Self moved toward their Real-Self.

Very few studies have utilized Q-sorts as a means of assessing self-concept changes. The few studies that have measured
self-concept changes through therapy utilizing the Q-sort reported that changes toward a more congruent self-concept had occurred (Rogers and Dymond; Butler and Haigh).

THERAPIST/LEADER-CLIENT PERSONALITY SIMILARITY

Fiedler (1953) in an investigation of three orientations to psychotherapy: Freudian, Adlerian and Rogerian, concluded that it was the quality of the relationship which was common to successful therapists of all three schools.

Glover (1958) reviewed replies to a questionnaire from twenty-four British analysts and found that 50 per cent of the analysts believed that the personality of the analyst was important in the conduct of psychoanalysis. Glad (1959) added that the question of how helpful a particular psychotherapist is for a particular person in distress may be "a matter of the degree to which the patient and the therapist are able to experience similar meaning" (p. 29). The criterion to follow according to Glad is to examine whether the therapist and the patient share enough beliefs and attitudes needed for developing mutual acceptance. Metzoff and Kornreich (1970) state that

"It is reasonable to expect that therapists who have personality characteristics similar to those of their patients and who have experienced similar feelings and conflicts would be more understanding and empathic. It is also reasonable, however, to expect that shared characteristics might interfere with effectiveness by making the therapist too involved, non-objective, and unable to help the patient cope effectively with his problems in new ways" (p. 311).

Kessele and McBrearty (1967 and Grunelbaum (1975) in their literature reviews state that several therapists and theorists claim that
it is important to match patient-therapist pairs on the basis of similarity of personality traits. According to them dissimilarity between patient-therapist values and attitudes will severely reduce the effectiveness of the therapy. It seems that

"all the speculations about similarity are based upon the assumption that something inherent in the dyadic relationship is the key to that which is therapeutic and that the therapeutic potential of this relationship is a direct function of the interaction of the two personalities who are partners to it" (Metzoff and Kornreich, 1970, p. 311).

Cook (1966) studied the effect of counselor-client similarity in values on clients' changes. Clients' changes were measured by semantic differential scales and four categories were examined: Own-Self, Ideal-Self, education and occupation. The sample included ninety college students who requested counseling and were seen by forty-two advanced counseling trainees for two to five sessions. Clients and counselors completed the Allport, Vernon and Lindzey Study of Values which served as a measure of similarity between counselor and client. The scores of similarity were divided into three groups: high, medium and low similarity and were analyzed with the change scores. The results indicated a curvilinear relationship between value similarity and changes of self-concept. Medium similarity was associated with more positive change than either high or low similarity. The limitations of this study according to Cook was that the index of similarity used might have been too global and that the measure seemed to be a mixture of interests and values. The appropriateness of the instrument measuring change has not been established for brief counseling.
In addition, the period of counseling was too brief to expect real change to occur and the students serving as counselors represented a poor choice of counselors for this purpose and they were probably too similar in their values to the students they have counseled.

Sapolsky (1960) in his study proposed that greater improvement would be found in patients who felt that they were similar to the therapist. The study included twenty-five female clients who were hospitalized, and two first year and one second year psychiatric residents. Similarity scores were based on semantic differential measures and improvement measures were based on ratings by supervisors. Results indicated that greater improvement was observed in those patients who felt that they were more similar to their therapist on two of three semantic differential factors. The shortcomings of the study were sample size and psychiatric residents' level of experience.

A number of investigators such as Axelrad (1952) have demonstrated a positive relation between similarity of client and therapist personality and therapeutic progress. In his study, Axelrad employed ten staff psychiatrists and forty psychoneurotic patients. Each psychiatrist had to select his two most and two least improved patients. Three judges rated the subjects on a seven-point scale on twelve traits. Patient-therapist pairs were compared on each trait individually and on all combined. In addition the Rorschach test was given to the therapist and
patients between the second and fifty sessions. Results showed that psychiatrists tended to achieve success with similar patients. This was a moderately poor study in terms of controlling for variables that might have contaminated the study i.e. selection of patients and therapist original judgement of success. The data did not reveal a highly significant score.

A similar study was conducted by Gerber (1958) where personality similarity between client-counselor and therapeutic progress was assessed. The sample included fifty-seven college students with emotional problems who were treated by five psychologists. Personality similarity was assessed by the Ewing Personal Rating Form taken by the therapists and the clients. The scores were classified in three levels: High, medium and low similarity and were compared with judged therapeutic progress. Results revealed that a medium amount of similarity was more conducive to positive therapeutic progress than either high similarity or low amount of similarity.

Mendelsohn and Associates (1963, 1966, 1967) in a series of well thought out studies have explored the effect of client counselor similarity in cognitive and perceptual style on length of stay in counseling, failure to keep appointments and client attitudes toward the counseling experience. The results in the study vary from group to group and variable to variable. The measures of similarity were assessed by the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator.
(MBII) and the instrument for measuring cognitive-perceptual orientation was a Jungean life style. In the first study (1963) the investigator observed that the greater the client-counselor dissimilarity for each dimension the shorter the duration of stay. The only dimension that yielded no significant correlations was that of thinking-feeling. In another study Mendelsohn (1966) attempted to replicate the 1963 study. In this study the author studied 111 male and ninety female clients that received counseling sessions by six female and five male professional psychologists. Results indicated that similarity between client-therapist is a necessary factor but not a sufficient condition for client to remain in treatment. In their third study, Mendelsohn, et al (1967) reanalyzed the effect of client-therapist similarity on early termination and missed sessions. The same instruments were used in this study and results indicated that the less similar the counselor to his clients the more the client missed appointments. The data showed that it was similarity and not counselor characteristics that was the significant criterion. In general, Mendelsohn and his associates did a careful, competent and methodologically sophisticated study (Meltzoff et al, 1970).

On the other hand there are studies that claim that client-therapist dissimilarity is conducive to positive therapeutic progress.
Carson and Heine (1962) measured personality similarity of client-therapist dyads using the MMPI. Fourth year medical-student therapists and sixty clients were utilized in the study. The clients met with their therapist once a week for eighteen weeks. The criterion for improvement was a composite of supervising psychiatrist rating the degree of clients' satisfaction, occupational adjustment, interpersonal relations and symptomatic status. The results showed a curvilinear relation of dissimilarity and clients' improvement. Improvement increased as dyads became more dissimilar, however, marked dissimilarity between client-therapist indicated improvement decline. A limitation of the experiment was the therapists' inexperience. Lichtenstein (1966) replicated this study using a similar sample and the same instrument and procedure, however, he found no relation between measures of similarity and therapeutic improvement. Carson and Llewellyn (1966) attempted again to replicate the study and found no relationship between client-therapist dissimilarity and therapeutic outcome.

Lesser (1961) studied the relationship between counselor empathic understanding, client-therapist similarity and the counseling progress. The study included twenty-two students and wives seen for counseling for a maximum of twelve hours. The measure for improvement was changes in Real-Ideal Self concept on the Butler-Haigh Q-sort. "Felt similarity" was appraised on a seven item scale devised to rate the counselor's feelings of similarity toward the client. Similarity of self-concept was
significantly and negatively related to counseling progress and was unrelated to client and counselor ratings of empathic understanding. Counselor feelings of similarity proved to be unrelated to therapeutic progress. Neither counselor's correct awareness of similarity nor counselor's unwarranted assumed similarity were related to empathic understanding. It was concluded that an incorrect perception of similarity may hinder counseling progress and empathic understanding, and an overestimation of similarity was not related to counseling progress. Questions regarding the methodology of the study can be raised in terms of the varying length of treatment received by each client and the limited sample employed.

A few studies dealt with the aspect of similarity in groups; among group members and between group participants and group leaders.

Bennis and Peabody (1962) examined the formation of subgroups in a group, on the basis of similarity in interpersonal orientation toward "authority" and "intimacy," based on Bennis and Shepard's theory of group development. T-groups from NTL were used as subjects. In the completion of the laboratory, staff members were asked to rate each of the participants in their groups on Dependency, Counterdependency, Overpersonalness and Counterpersonalness as defined by Bennis and Shepard. In addition group participants were asked to make a series of
sociometric choices among the other members and to indicate three members with whom he got along best, and three with whom he got along least well. The investigators found that members in the group, in particular the "Counterdependent" and "Overpersonal," were significantly attracted to other members similar to themselves and tended to reject those participants associated with the opposing orientation.

Beutler (1971) examined the therapist-group-participants attitudinal similarity on group outcome. Social judgment theory and dissonance theory were compared in their abilities to predict therapeutic outcome. Sixty-five mental health clinic outpatients were given a five scale attitude questionnaire derived from Rosenthal's (1955) attitude questionnaire. Sixteen therapists were included in the study. The therapists and the clients completed the attitude questionnaire before and after the approximately twelve therapy contacts. The subjects received either group (N=11), individual (N=14), or family (N=39) therapy. One of the study's findings showed that attitudinal similarity was not an adequate variable to predict many of the attitude-related changes that occur during therapy. On another study Beutler, Jobe and Elkens (1974) further examined the possibility of predicting group psychotherapy outcome on the basis of initial attitude acceptability and patient-therapist attitude similarity. The study included fifty-one clients enrolled in group psychotherapy and three
psychologists. The instruments administered was a seven attitude scale questionnaire derived from Rokeach's (1968) and Rosenthal's (1955) questionnaires. In addition, therapists rated the improvement of their clients on a seven-point scale and clients were asked to rate their own improvement on a scale developed by Wilson, Morton and Swanson (1971). Results indicated that no significant effects were obtained with regard to the patient's overall satisfaction with therapy as a function of therapist attitude acceptability. This study failed to demonstrate the tendency for clients to adopt their therapist's attitudes as a function of acceptability of those attitudes. This finding is consistent with the earlier findings of Beutler (1971). In regard to improvement rating, patient-therapist dissimilarity produces more attitude change than similarity, but similarity sufficient to allow the patient to see his therapist's attitudes as acceptable, produces more satisfaction with what happens in therapy.

Summary

It is evident that most of the studies above utilized and assessed a dyad situation. Matching client's and therapist's similarity or dissimilarity along personality dimensions revealed conflicting results. One of the reasons for this may be that these studies were by no means comparable. The nature of the therapist and the clients' population varied. Most of the studies utilized inexperienced therapists, and some of the studies examined psychotherapy while others
investigated short-term counseling. Therapist-client similarity was measured by different instruments in different studies. The criteria of outcome were also divergent and perhaps in some cases inadequate. Despite this non-comparability of studies, some studies found that similarity of therapist and client did affect therapeutic outcome. Dissimilarity of therapist and client had a negative effect on therapeutic outcome except in one study (Lesser). Furthermore, it appeared that a medium level of therapist-client similarity had a positive effect on outcome and there were some indications that a very high degree of similarity or dissimilarity had negative effects on therapeutic outcome.

Since the therapist's goal can be conceived as an attempt to change and influence the client's behavior and since interpersonal attraction has been shown to increase receptiveness to social reinforcement, one of the objectives of research would be to identify those variables which increase interpersonal attraction or help create a more effective therapeutic relationship. The theory presented here is that an important prerequisite for interpersonal attraction is similarity of self-concepts. When therapist/counselor-client have similar self-concepts, it is expected that the therapist will be more attractive to the client and thus will be more able to influence the client and in turn create a more effective therapeutic experience.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

This study considers the question of whether greater personal therapeutic outcome can be realized by participants when similarity of self-concept exists between the group members and their instructor. The study includes a sample of 174 students enrolled in seventeen courses of Psychology of Personal Growth at Oakton Community College. Ten student development faculty members (instructors) participated as group leaders in this program. Pre-test and post-test ratings on a Q-sort and a questionnaire provide the basis for analysis of student change over the period of time of the course in addition to a correlation of self-concept scores between the group instructor and the students.

Chapter III describes the methodology employed in the study including a description of the 1) sample, 2) group instructors, 3) group description, 4) instruments used, 5) procedure employed, 6) hypotheses, 7) statistical analysis.

SAMPLE

The sample was drawn from Oakton Community College. The invited sample included 213 students enrolled in eighteen courses of Psychology of Personal Growth offered during the Fall semester of 1977.
## Table I

**Demographic Information on Students Enrolled in The Human Development Courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor #</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age Ranges</th>
<th>Age Mean</th>
<th>Age S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18-21</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18-45</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>6.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18-22</td>
<td>18.91</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19-44</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>10.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18-23</td>
<td>19.25</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18-56</td>
<td>26.10</td>
<td>11.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18-39</td>
<td>21.44</td>
<td>6.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18-27</td>
<td>19.82</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21-47</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>8.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17-40</td>
<td>26.17</td>
<td>6.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE I
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION ON STUDENTS ENROLLED IN
THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor #</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Age Ranges</th>
<th>Age Mean</th>
<th>Age S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>1.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30-57</td>
<td>42.40</td>
<td>8.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18-61</td>
<td>40.70</td>
<td>12.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>18.67</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17-32</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>17-63</td>
<td>23.89</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oakton Community College has an open-door admission policy which was not altered for this study.

Thirty-nine of the students enrolled in the eighteen courses were not involved in the study since either the pre-test or post-test data was not available for them (see Appendix A). These were not students who dropped out, but were absent for at least one of the testing sessions. These students were randomly dispersed among the groups and therefore did not affect the individual group outcomes. However, in one instance an entire group had to be dropped from the study due to insufficient data. Eight out of twelve members were absent during the post-testing period. Thus the number of groups involved in the study were reduced from 18 to 17.

The final sample of the study was 174 students: 64 males and 110 females. The majority of the students (111 out of 174) fell in the "17 - 20" years old age range. The mean age was 23.89 with a standard deviation of 9.43. Table I provides certain demographic information on the sample. Table II gives the age frequency distribution for the sample. Socioeconomic background, origin, and race were varied.

**COURSE INSTRUCTOR**

Ten student development faculty members were involved in the study, 5 male and 5 female, ranging in age from 29 to 58 years with a mean age of 38.3 (see Table III). Two instructors taught 3 courses, 4 instructors taught 2 courses, and 4 instructors taught single courses. All but 1 of the 10 instructors were full time faculty members, the
### TABLE II

**FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS BY AGE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>Absolute Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17 - 20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>63.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 - 25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>12.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 - 30</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 - 40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 - 45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 - 50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>174</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.00%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
other was a part time faculty member.

Although coming from varied backgrounds their training in small group leadership was extensive. Educationally, (Appendix B) the instructors had B.A. degrees in a variety of disciplines. All but one had advanced degrees in fields of either Guidance and Counseling, Student Personnel Work, Sociology, or Social Work. One had attained the Ph.D. in Guidance and Counseling. All instructors had attended either various training programs, seminars or post-graduate courses, such as Human potential Training, Transactional Analysis (T.A.) training, small group training and supervision and group courses. Seven of the instructors had attended workshops, i.e. Gestalt, T.A., Psychodrama, Reality Therapy or Primo Therapy. All full-time faculty members had attended weekly two-hour in-service training sessions during which Human Development course issues and concerns were brought up for discussion and possible solutions to problems were offered. All instructors had worked on the student development staff at Oakton Community College from 3 to 6 years and all had taught at least 2 Human Development courses per semester (see Appendix C). Each instructor had at least 8 years of experience in leading Value Clarification groups, Human Sexuality groups, Life and Career Planning groups, Transactional Analysis groups, Marathon groups, and other therapeutic groups. As a whole, the 10 instructors had similar qualifications in small group leadership.
### DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT FACULTY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor #</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Full-time</th>
<th>Part-time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals**

5 5 \( \bar{x} = 38.3 \) 9 1
DESCRIPTION OF GROUPS

The study included seventeen courses of Psychology of Personal Growth offered during the Fall semester of 1977. The courses met for sixteen weeks, three hours per week. Course #1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 11, 17, and 18 met twice a week for one and one-half hours, and courses #5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16 met once a week for three hours. Fifteen courses were mixed courses; female and males, and participants varied in age. Two of the courses (Course #14 and 14) were courses designed exclusively for females returning to school and the age range was 25 years and above (except for one student who was 18 years old).

The general description of the psychology of personal growth courses as stated in the college catalog reads as follows:

The focus of this course is a personal growth experience. Emphasis will be on increasing awareness of values, emotions, and other motivational factors that affect individual's personal behavior and promote or inhibit their personal growth, through the exploration of various theories. Participants in this group experience will be expected to deal with their own personal development.

The courses provided individuals with an opportunity to develop and discover their uniqueness, and their individuality, set personal goals to be worked on in the group, and to plan their future goals. Goals of the courses included exploration of self-concept, development of communication skills, aid in dealing with personal issues, and help
the individuals become more aware of themselves. The course is a mixture of content and group process where the didactic portion includes discussion of theories or personal growth and group dynamics, and is related to personal experiences. The group serves as a laboratory for the participants' experimentation in behavioral change. The group experience is semi-structured with students participating in various exercises. Students are required to complete assignments and read books related to the course.

While all the Psychology of Personal Growth courses adhere to the same course objectives as stated above, the course content and learning experience is based on the instructor's theoretical orientation and his or her group techniques. The specific course descriptions, goals, techniques and theoretical orientation are described in Appendix D. In order to control for differences in time, in demographic characteristics, and in commonality of experience, statistical measures were utilized to test significant differences among groups.

INSTRUMENTS

A. Adjective Q-set for Non-professional Sorters (Block, 1961).

This Q-set (see Appendix E) yields a "comprehensive description" of personality using only commonly known adjectives. It can be administered with "self" descriptive instructions in order to obtain an index of self-concept (Robinson and Shaver, 1972, pp. 70-71). The scale includes seventy items which the sorter arranges into seven categories, with ten items in each category. The respondent places
a seven in front of the 10 adjectives "most like" him and a one in front of the 10 "least like" him, and so on.

If two "sorts" are obtained with one describing the Real-Self and one the Ideal-Self, a similarity coefficient between them can be calculated by the following formula:

\[ r = 1 - \frac{\text{Sum of the squared discrepancies}}{560} \]

However, one frequently finds that some subjects will fail to follow the precise instructions. The Pearson Correlation Coefficient formula will in this case still provide a meaningful coefficient of similarity, and will yield identical results as the above formula when instructions have been followed.

Since the coefficient of similarity between two sorts is really a Pearson Correlation Coefficient treating the items as if they were cases, the same type of procedures used for correlations can be applied to similarity coefficients. A matrix of similarity coefficients could thus be factor analyzed--this process is known as Q-factor analysis (Stephenson, 1953). It is also possible to use partial correlations as a coefficient of similarity between two sorts controlling for their mutual similarity to a third sort.

The scale as reported in Block (1961) contains no information about reliability, validity or sample on which the scale was devised and tested. However, Block and Thomas (1955) and Chang and Block (1960) have used this scale in their published studies.

The Adjective Q-set was selected due to the fact that it measures
the degree of similarity between two self-concepts and it has been
utilized in studies measuring the congruency coefficient of Real and
Ideal self-concept. This instrument is simple, self-administering
for either individuals or group. Rogers (1951) recommends the use of
a Q-sort in studies examining the change in congruency between Real
and Ideal self before and after course. "One of the advantages of
this technique is that it enables one to utilize rather elaborate
statistical procedures on large populations of items which may come
from small numbers of cases" (Rogers, 1951, p. 140).

B. Questionnaire

The questionnaire (see Appendix F) was designed by the investi­
gator under the supervision of experts in the field of group process.
The questionnaire was to assess participants' perceptions of what
happened to them in the group experience, their satisfaction with the
experience, and their satisfaction with self during and after the ex­
perience.

The fourteen questions included in the questionnaire were related
to personal changes, the extent to which goals were met through the
course, personal work in the group, group process and dynamics, per­
sonal satisfaction of the group and perception of leaders.

A principal components analysis was conducted on the fourteen
variables of the questionnaire using the Statistical Package for the
Social Sciences (Nie et al, 1971). Two eigenvalues were found to be
greater than unity and thus, two factors were submitted to a varimax
rotation (Gorsuch, 1974). These two factors accounted for 55.6 per
cent of the total variance. Seven items exhibited their highest loading on each of the factors, so 2 seven-item scales were formed from the instrument.

Factor I was labeled "Individuals' Satisfaction with Instructor." Starting with the highest loading item the following items loaded highest on this factor:

11. The group instructor understood the students.
12. The group instructor understood me.
10. The instructor was a good group instructor.
13. The instructor helped me understand myself and my needs.
14. If you had the choice and this course was not required, would you take it again.
3. I have become more aware of my needs, strengths and weaknesses.
2. I have learned new desired behaviors during the course.

Factor II was labeled "Individuals' Satisfaction with the Group." Starting with the highest loading item the following items loaded highest on this factor:

8. I was accepted by the group.
5. I was actively involved in the group experience during the course.
7. I was attracted to the group.
6. The group members' reactions and feedback helped me to change in a positive way.
9. I found the group experience helpful in general.
4. I felt this group was able to meet my expectations of the course.
1. The group has helped me accomplish the personal goals which I set
for myself.

The reliability found on the questionnaire included scores of the two sections and a score of the total questionnaire. The reliability coefficient utilized was Cronbach's Alpha. The reliability of the total questionnaire was 0.91, the reliability of Individuals' Satisfaction with Group scale was 0.84, and the reliability of Individuals' Satisfaction with the Instructors scale was 0.88.

PROCEDURE

Data Collection

Seventeen Human Development courses were pre- and post-tested. The ADjective Q-set was administered as a pre-test by the researcher during the second week of the sixteen week semester. The Q-set was given to the members of the seventeen classes as well as to the ten instructors. All subjects described their "real" self-concept, meaning the way each subject perceived him/herself. Next, they all described their "ideal" self-concept, meaning the person that they would like to be. They followed the procedure described in the explanation of the instrument (p. 95). All subjects submitted an attached sheet which included their name, age, sex, major at school and previous experience in groups. Post-test data was collected by the researcher during the 15th week of the 16 week semester. The Adjective Q-set and the investigator's questionnaire were administered to the seventeen classes as a post test.
Measures

It would be inadequate merely to test whether similarity to trainers is conducive to growth because trainers as a whole may simply be the sort of people who are likely to change in a positive direction, and similarity to them may be indicative of the type of personality who is likely to change positively. While this might be an interesting theoretical discovery, it would not help in the practical task of assigning students to trainers. It would therefore be necessary to control for the students similarity to some other trainer in order to show that the effect was produced by the students' similarity to his specific trainer.

In the calculation of similarity of Real or Ideal sort to that of the instructor's, each group instructor was paired with another trainer for statistical purposes. Trainers were paired in such a way that each pair was as dissimilar as possible. Since this was a statistical artifact it was done after the data was collected.

Similarity of students' Q-sort to the instructor's Real self utilized a partial correlation controlling for the Real-self of the paired trainer. Likewise, similarity of student's Q-sorts with their instructor's Ideal sort controlled for similarity to the Ideal-self of the paired trainer.

Trainers were paired in such a way as to avoid extreme similarity between their sorts and the paired trainer's sorts. The trainers were paired as follows:
Trainer #1 with Trainer #6
Trainer #2 with Trainer #9
Trainer #3 with Trainer #10
Trainer #4 with Trainer #5
Trainer #7 with Trainer #8

The similarity between each pair of Q-sort whether representing Real or Ideal-self, pre- or post-test, was calculated by treating each adjective as a data point and computing the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient. The congruence coefficient of post-test was compared to the pre-test. The difference between the two indicated the progress of students through the course and was referred to as "change."

Measures of similarity between each pair of sort (pre-Real-self, pre-Ideal-self, post-Real-self, post-Ideal-self) was calculated.

Congruence of pre-test Real and Ideal-self was compared to congruence of post-test Ideal-self to pre-test-Real-self. The difference between the two will be called "change of Ideal in direction of Real." Likewise, congruence of pre-test Real and Ideal-self was compared to congruence of post-test Real to pre-test Ideal. The difference between the two will be called "change of Real in direction of Ideal."

Four Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, were calculated between measures of satisfaction with the course as defined by investigator's questionnaire, and the congruence of students' pre-Real and Ideal-self to trainer's pre-Real and Ideal-self.
These measures will indicate whether self-concept similarity of students and trainers were related to students' satisfaction with the course.

The diagram listed below explores the relationships examined in this study.

\[ \text{RB} = \text{Real self-concept pre-test scores of students.} \]
\[ \text{IB} = \text{Ideal self-concept pre-test scores of students.} \]
\[ \text{RA} = \text{Real self-concept post-test scores of students.} \]
\[ \text{IA} = \text{Ideal self-concept post-test scores of students.} \]
\[ \text{RT} = \text{Real self-concept pre-test scores of trainers.} \]
\[ \text{IT} = \text{Ideal self-concept pre-test scores of trainers.} \]

A similarity coefficient will be designated by the two pairs of letters representing the sorts which it compares. Thus the Pearson Correlation between pre-test Real-self and pre-test Ideal-self is designed RBIB, while the partial correlation between pre-test Real-self and trainer's Real-self controlling for paired trainer's Real-self will be designated RBRT.
Pearson Correlations

--- Partial correlation controlling for similarity to Real sort of paired trainer.

--- Partial correlation controlling for similarity to Ideal sort of paired trainer.

A few additional symbols will be used:

\[ Ch = \text{Change} = RAIA - RBIB. \]

\[ CIR = \text{Change of Ideal in direction of Real} = RBIA - RBIB \]

\[ CRI = \text{Change of Real in direction of Ideal} = RAIB - RBIB. \]

\[ INSAT = \text{Satisfaction with instructor as derived from questionnaire.} \]

\[ GRSAT = \text{Satisfaction with group as derived from questionnaire.} \]

\[ TOTSAT = \text{Total satisfaction with the course as derived from questionnaire.} \]

**HYPOTHESES**

Each of the conceptual hypotheses stated in Chapter I will be tested through several subhypotheses.

**Hypothesis I**

The students' post self-concept will be more congruent than their pre-self-concept regardless of the students' similarity to the trainer.
Subhypothesis 1A. The congruence of the post-Real and Ideal-selves will be greater than the congruence of the pre-Real and Ideal-selves of the students.

$H_1; RAIA > RBIB$

$H_0; RAIA = RBIB$

Subhypothesis 1B. The post-Ideal-selves of the students will be more congruent with their pre-Real-self than will the pre-Real and Ideal-selves of the students.

$H_1; RBIA > RBIB$

$H_0; RBIA = RBIB$

Subhypothesis 1C. The post-Real-selves of the students will be more congruent with the pre-Ideal-self than will the pre-Real and Ideal-selves of the students.

$H_1; IBRA > RBIB$

$H_0; IBRA = RBIB$

Hypothesis 2

There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concepts and participants' positive change.

Subhypothesis 2A. There will be a significant positive relationship between the change in congruence as measured by Q-set scores for the individual and similarity of students' pre-Real-self and trainer's pre-Real-self.

$H_1; r (Ch) \ RBRT > 0$

$H_1; r (Ch) \ RBRT = 0$

Subhypothesis 2B. There will be a significant positive relationship between the change in congruence as measured by Q-set scores
for the individual and similarity of students' pre-Real-self and
trainer's pre-Ideal-self.

\( H_i; r (\text{Ch}) \text{ RBIT} > 0 \)

\( H_0; r (\text{Ch}) \text{ RBIT} = 0 \)

Subhypothesis 2C. There will be a significant positive relationship between the change in congruence as measured by Q-set scores for the individual and similarity of students' pre-Ideal-selves with trainer's pre-Real-self.

\( H_i; r (\text{Ch}) \text{ IBRT} > 0 \)

\( H_0; r (\text{Ch}) \text{ IBRT} = 0 \)

Subhypothesis 2D. There will be a significant positive relationship between the change in congruence as measured by Q-set scores for the individual and similarity of students' pre-Ideal-self with trainer's pre-Ideal-self.

\( H_i; r (\text{Ch}) \text{ IBIT} > 0 \)

\( H_0; r (\text{Ch}) \text{ IBIT} = 0 \)

Subhypothesis 2E. There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' and trainer's pre-Real-selves, and the change of the students' post-Ideal-selves in the direction of their pre-Real-selves.

\( H_i; r (\text{CIR}) \text{ RBRT} > 0 \)

\( H_0; r (\text{CIR}) \text{ RBRT} = 0 \)

Subhypothesis 2F. There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' pre-Real-selves and trainer's Ideal-self, and the change of the post-Ideal-selves of the students in the direction of their pre-Real-selves.

\( H_i; r (\text{CIR}) \text{ RBIT} > 0 \)
Subhypothesis 2G. There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' pre-Ideal-selves and trainer's Real-self and the change of the post-Ideal-selves of the students in the direction of their pre-Real-selves.

\[ H_0; r (CIR) \text{ RBIT} = 0 \]

\[ H_1; r (CIR) \text{ IBRT} > 0 \]

Subhypothesis 2H. There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' and trainer's pre-Ideal-selves and the change of the post-Ideal-selves of the students in the direction of their pre-Real-selves.

\[ H_0; r (CRI) \text{ IBIT} = 0 \]

\[ H_1; r (CRI) \text{ IBIT} > 0 \]

Hypothesis 3

There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concept and participants' satisfaction with the course.

Subhypothesis 3A. There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' and trainer's pre-Real-selves, and the satisfaction with the course as defined by replies on the investigator's questionnaire.

\[ H_0; r (TOTSAT) \text{ RBRT} = 0 \]

\[ H_1; r (TOTSAT) \text{ RBRT} > 0 \]

Subhypothesis 3B. There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' pre-Real-selves and trainer's pre-Ideal-self, and satisfaction with the course as defined by
replies on the investigator's questionnaire.

\[ H_i; r (TOTSAT) \text{ RBIT} > 0 \]

\[ H_o; r (TOTSAT) \text{ RBIT} = 0 \]

**Subhypothesis 3C.** There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' pre-Ideal-selves and trainer's pre-Real-self, and satisfaction with the course as defined by replies on the investigator's questionnaire.

\[ H_i; r (TOTSAT) \text{ IBIT} > 0 \]

\[ H_o; r (TOTSAT) \text{ IBIT} = 0 \]

**Subhypothesis 3D.** There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' and trainer's pre-Ideal-selves and satisfaction with the course as defined by replies on the investigator's questionnaire.

\[ H_i; r (TOTSAT) \text{ IBIT} > 0 \]

\[ H_o; r (TOTSAT) \text{ IBIT} = 0 \]

**Hypothesis 4**

The students' post-self-concept will be more similar to the trainer's self-concept than were their pre-self-concept.

**Subhypothesis 4A.** The similarity between the post-Real-selves of the students and the pre-Real-self of the trainer will be greater than the similarity between the pre-Real-selves of the students and that of the trainer.

\[ H_i; \text{ RART} > \text{ RBRT} \]

\[ H_o; \text{ RART} = \text{ RBRT} \]

**Subhypothesis 4B.** The similarity between the post-Real-selves of the students and the pre-Ideal-self of the trainer will be greater
than the similarity between the pre-Real-self of the students and the pre-Ideal-self of the trainer.

\[ H_i; \text{RAIT} > \text{RBIT} \]
\[ H_o; \text{RAIT} = \text{RBIT} \]

Subhypothesis 4C. The similarity between the post-Ideal-selves of the students and the Ideal-self of the trainer will be greater than the similarity between the pre-Ideal-selves of the students and that of the trainer.

\[ H_i; \text{IAIT} > \text{IBIT} \]
\[ H_o; \text{IAIT} = \text{IBIT} \]

Subhypothesis 4D. The similarity between the post-Ideal-selves of the students and the Real-self of the trainer will be greater than the similarity between the pre-Ideal-selves of the students and the Real-self of the trainer.

\[ H_i; \text{IART} > \text{IBRT} \]
\[ H_o; \text{IART} = \text{IBRT} \]

For each subhypothesis listed above differential effects of group membership will also be tested.

**STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

The subhypotheses corresponding to hypotheses I and IV were each tested through a 17 x 2 analysis of variance with repeated measures on the second factor. The first factor was fixed and corresponded to the seventeen treatment groups used in the study. The second factor corresponded to the two measures compared in each subhypothesis. Thus significance in the second factor, combined with the appropriate directionality
would confirm each of the subhypotheses.

Where a significant group x measures interaction was found the results were further explored through a one-way analysis of variance of the difference scores followed by Duncan's (Kirk, 1969) multiple range test for a posteriori contrasts. In addition repeated measures T-test were conducted separately for each group.

In order to test hypotheses II and III, analyses of covariance were conducted. For each subhypothesis "change" or "satisfaction" scores served as the variate, similarity to trainer served as the covariate and treatment group as the independent factor. In addition the intra-cell correlation for the pair of variables corresponding to each subhypothesis was calculated. Significance of the F-ratio for the regression procedure, together with appropriate directionality of the intra-cell correlation would lead to acceptance of the subhypothesis. In addition, a test of equality of slopes would ascertain whether significantly different correlations existed for different groups. Separate correlations were obtained for each group.

For hypothesis III the same procedure was also applied separately to satisfaction with the group and satisfaction with the instructor. While each hypothesis required appropriate directionality in order to be confirmed, two-tailed tests were used and significance at the .05 level were required for confirmation of each subhypothesis.

Even though these were not used in testing the hypothesis, T-tests and correlations were used to examine differences due to sex, age and group experience as well as the inter-relationship of various measures.
Chapter III has outlined the procedure followed for this study. Chapter IV will present the results of the statistical analysis as well as a discussion of those results.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results and statistical analysis of the students' self-concept change and satisfaction with the course and its relationship to their instructor's self-concept. Analysis was based on the pre- and post-test scores of the Block (1961) Q-sort and the investigator's questionnaire.

Two-way analysis of variance with repeated measures on the second factor was used to test hypotheses I and IV. Analyses of covariance and intra-cell correlations were utilized to examine individual groups and examine additional effects.

The results are presented in the following manner: 1) Hypothesis I, 2) Hypothesis II, 3) Hypothesis III, 4) Hypothesis IV, 5) Additional findings, 6) Summary.

This chapter will analyze and discuss the data following the hypotheses stated in Chapter III.

The diagram listed below will help clarify some of the relationships explored in this study.

\[
\begin{align*}
RT &= \text{Real self-concept pre-test scores of trainers.} \\
IT &= \text{Ideal self-concept pre-test scores of trainers.} \\
RB &= \text{Real before - Real self-concept pre-test scores of students.} \\
IB &= \text{Ideal before - Ideal self-concept pre-test scores of students.} \\
RA &= \text{Real after - Real self-concept post-test scores of students.} \\
IA &= \text{Ideal after - Ideal self-concept post-test scores of students.}
\end{align*}
\]
Diagram of Data Analysis of Q-sort

\begin{itemize}
  \item Pearson correlation
  \item Partial correlation controlling for similarity to Real sort of paired trainer.
  \item Partial correlation controlling for similarity to Ideal sort of paired trainer.
\end{itemize}

A few additional symbols will be used:

- \( \text{Ch} = \text{Change} = \text{RAIA} - \text{RBIB} \)
- \( \text{CIR} = \text{Change of Ideal in direction of Real} = \text{RBIA} - \text{RBIB} \)
- \( \text{CRI} = \text{Change of Real in direction of Ideal} = \text{RAIB} - \text{RBIB} \)
- \( \text{INSAT} = \text{Satisfaction with instructor as derived from questionnaire.} \)
- \( \text{GRSAT} = \text{Satisfaction with group as derived from questionnaire.} \)
- \( \text{TOTSAT} = \text{Total satisfaction with course as derived from questionnaire.} \)

**HYPOTHESIS I**

The students' post-self-concept will be more congruent than their pre-self-concept regardless of the students' similarity to trainer.

In this section the degree of students' change through the period of the course is assessed.
One of the goals of Psychology of Personal Growth courses was to increase students' self-awareness and understanding and thus improve their self-concept. This hypothesis will examine the degree to which this goal was achieved.

Hypothesis I was supported by two subhypotheses. Subhypothesis IB could not be confirmed. Each subhypothesis was tested through use of a two-way analysis of variance with repeated measures in the second factor. In each case a significant between measures result indicated that the subhypotheses could be confirmed but for hypothesis IB the directionality was opposite to that predicted.

**Subhypothesis IA**

The congruence of the post-Real and Ideal-selves of the students will be greater than the congruence of the pre-Real and Ideal-selves of the students.

In testing whether change had actually occurred a significant between measures result was found ($F = 17.87 \ p < .001$). The mean congruence between Real and Ideal-self for the total sample was: .57 for the pre-test and .63 for the post-test. Thus the subhypothesis could be confirmed. Neither the between groups nor the interaction $F$-ratios were significant (see Table IV).

**Subhypothesis IB**

The post-Ideal-selves of the students will be more congruent with their pre-Real-selves than with the pre-Real and Ideal-selves of the students.

In testing whether students' post-Ideal-selves has moved in the direction of their pre-Real-selves by the end of the course, a signifi-
TABLE IV
TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUBHYPOTHESIS 1A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>RAIA:RBIB</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error I</td>
<td>9.215</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between measures</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>17.87</td>
<td>p&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures x groups</td>
<td>.454</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error II</td>
<td>2.821</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

cant between measures result was found (F = 18.47, p<.001). The mean congruence between pre-Real and pre-Ideal-self for the total sample was: .57 and between the pre-Real and the post-Ideal-self was .54. Thus the directionality of the effect was opposite that predicted and the sub-hypothesis could not be confirmed. Neither the between groups nor the interaction F-ratio were significant (see Table V).

Correlated pairs T-test done for individual groups indicated that no significant change took place for any of the groups. (see Appendix G and H).

Subhypothesis 1C

The post-Real-selves of the students will be more congruent with the pre-Ideal-selves than the pre-Real and Ideal-selves of the students.

In testing whether students' post-Real-selves had moved in the direction of their pre-Ideal, a significant between measures effect was found (F = 4.67, p<.05). The mean congruence between pre-Real and pre-
TABLE V

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUBHYPOTHESIS 1B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>RBIA:RBIB</th>
<th>S.S</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error I</td>
<td>11.10</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>.071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between measures</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>18.47</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures x groups</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error II</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>157</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ideal-self for the total sample was: .57 between pre-Ideal and post-
Real-self was .59. Thus the subhypothesis could be confirmed. No sig-
nificance between groups was found but a significant interaction effect
was encountered (F = 1.84, p < .05) (see Table VI). Duncan's (Kirk, 1969)
multiple range test for a posteriori contrasts was performed on the dif-
ference scores. This test indicated that groups #2, #11 and #9 were
significantly different from groups #8 and #15. Groups #8 and #15 showed
a greater degree of congruence between the post-test Real and the pre-
test Ideal than the congruence between the pre-test Real and the pre-
test Ideal. In other words, they showed greater positive change of Real
in the direction of the Ideal. On the other hand, for groups #2, #11 and
#9 the post-test Real moved further away from the pre-test Ideal than the
pre-test had been.

T-tests done for each group separately revealed that groups #8,
#15 and #17 exhibited significantly greater congruence between post-Real
and pre-Ideal than between pre-Real and pre-Ideal (p < .05, p < .01 and
p < .01) (see Appendix G and H).

TABLE VI

TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUBHYPOTHESIS 1C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables IBRA:RBIB</th>
<th>S.S</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error I</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between measures</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures x groups</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error II</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To summarize, it appears that by and large a positive change did take place as was hypothesized. Two of the subhypothesis were confirmed subhypothesis 1B could not be confirmed.

Diagram III will help clarify the effects reported above.

As can be seen positive change took place through adjustment of the Real-self to conform to the Ideal-self but not through adjustment of the Ideal-self to conform to the pre-Real-self.
There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concepts and participants positive change.

It was posited that the greater the similarity of students to trainer the greater would be their change toward congruence. The following subhypotheses examine this assumption.

For each subhypothesis an analysis of covariance was conducted with 'group' as the independent factor, 'change' as the dependent variable and 'similarity to trainer' as the covariant.

A test of equality of regression slopes did not yield significant results for any of the subhypotheses. Thus, no evidence that the relationship between change and similarity to trainer was different for different groups, was found.

A significant F-ratio for the regression effect was found for the first two subhypotheses and this will be discussed first.

Subhypothesis 2A

There will be a significant positive relationship between the change in congruence as measured by Q-set scores for the individual and similarity of students' pre-Real-self and trainer's pre-Real-self.

Subhypothesis 2B

There will be a significant positive relationship between the change in congruence as measured by Q-set scores for the individual and similarity of students' pre-Real-self and trainer's pre-Ideal-self.

Significant F-ratio were found for the regression effect of RBRT on 'change' (F = 14.62, p < .001) and for the regression of RBIT on 'change' (F = 10.71, p < .001). However an examination of the intra-cell
correlations revealed the relationship to be negative (r = -.29 and r = -.25, respectively). Thus similarity to the trainee was here related to negative change. Subhypotheses 2A and 2B cannot be confirmed since the direction is opposite to that predicted (see Table VII). The result is probably due to the ceiling effect inherent in the measure of congruency. Subjects who were less like the trainer had more room to grow and apparently did.

TABLE VII
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR HYPOTHESIS II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>F-ratio for equality of slopes (d.f.=16,140)</th>
<th>F-ratio for regression (d.f.=1,156)</th>
<th>F-ratio for between group differences (d.f.=16,156)</th>
<th>Intra-cell correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ch by RBRT</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>14.62***</td>
<td>1.85*</td>
<td>-.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch by RBIT</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>10.71***</td>
<td>1.99*</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch by IBRT</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch by IBIT</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR by RBRT</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR by RBIT</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRI by IBRT</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>1.83*</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRI by IBIT</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.04*</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05

*** p < .001
Subhypothesis 2C

There will be a significant positive relationship between the change in congruence as measured by Q-set scores for the individual and similarity of students' pre-Ideal-selves with trainer's pre-Real-self.

Subhypothesis 2D

There will be a significant positive relationship between the change in congruence as measured by Q-set scores for the individual and similarity of students' pre-Ideal-self with trainer's pre-Ideal-self.

Subhypothesis 2E

There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' and trainer's pre-Real-selves, and the change of the students' post-Ideal-selves in the direction of their pre-Real-selves.

Subhypothesis 2F

There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' pre-Real-selves and trainer's Ideal-self, and the change of the post-Ideal-selves of the students in the direction of their pre-Real-selves.

Subhypothesis 2G

There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' pre-Ideal-selves and trainer's Real-self, and the change of post-Ideal-selves of the students in the direction of their pre-Real-selves.

Subhypothesis 2H

There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' and trainer's pre-Ideal-selves, and the change of the post-Ideal-selves of the students in the direction of their pre-Real-selves.
No significant regression effects were found for any of the above subhypothesis and thus none could be confirmed (see Table VII). Correlations for each group are reported in Appendix G.

In summary, the assumption that student-trainer similarity led to greater positive change was not supported by any of the subhypotheses.

**HYPOTHESIS III**

There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concept and participants' satisfaction with the course.

It was assumed that the more similar the individual to the trainer, the more attracted the student would be to the group. The satisfaction score was based on the investigators questionnaire. The questionnaire was composed of two general sub-scales. One dealt with students' satisfaction with the group through the course and was called 'satisfaction with the group.' The second dealt with the satisfaction of the individuals with the course instructor and was called 'satisfaction with instructor.' The combined score was called 'total satisfaction with course.'

**Subhypothesis 3A**

There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' and trainer's pre-Real-selves, and satisfaction with the course as defined by replies on the investigator's questionnaire.

**Subhypothesis 3B**

There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' pre-Real-selves and trainer's pre-Ideal self, and satis-
faction with the course as defined by replies on the investigator's questionnaire.

Subhypothesis 3C

There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' pre-Ideal-selves and trainer's pre-Real-self, and satisfaction with the course as defined by replies on the investigator's questionnaire.

Subhypothesis 3D

There will be a significant positive relationship between similarity of students' and trainer's pre-Ideal-selves and satisfaction with the course as defined by replies on the investigator's questionnaire.

For each subhypothesis an analysis of covariance was conducted with 'groups' as the independent factor, 'satisfaction' as the dependent variable and 'similarity to trainer' as the covariant.

The test of equality of regression slope did not yield significant results for any of the subhypotheses (see Table VIII). Thus we cannot conclude that the relationship between satisfaction with course and pre-test similarity to trainer was significantly different for different groups.

Also none of the regression effects were significant either for total satisfaction with course or for either of the two subscales (satisfaction with instructor and satisfaction with group).

Individual correlations for each group are reported in Appendix G.
TABLE VIII

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR HYPOTHESIS III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables (d.f.=1,156)</th>
<th>F-ratio for equality of slopes</th>
<th>F-ratio for regression (d.f.=16,140)</th>
<th>F-ratio for group differences (d.f.=16,156)</th>
<th>Intra-cell correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTSAT by RBRT</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSAT by RBRT</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSAT by RBRT</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTSAT by RBIT</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSAT by RBIT</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>-.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSAT by RBIT</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTSAT by IBRT</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSAT by IBRT</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSAT by IBRT</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTSAT by IBIT</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSAT by IBIT</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSAT by IBIT</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

HYPOTHESIS IV

The students' post-self-concept will be more similar to the trainer's self-concept than were their pre-self-concept.

This hypothesis examines the students' change toward greater similarity to the trainer over the period of time in which the course was offered. It was posited that students' self-concept would become more similar to the trainer's self concept by the end of the course than it was initially.

This hypothesis was tested through four subhypotheses. Each subhypothesis was tested through use of a two-way analysis of variance with repeated measures in the second factor.
Two of the subhypotheses were confirmed and the other two could not be confirmed. Since groups had different trainers, significant differences between groups were expected and found. However, no significant group x measures interactions were found.

**Subhypothesis 4A**

The similarity between the post-Real-selves of the students and the pre-Real-self of the trainer will be greater than the similarity between the pre-Real-selves of the students and that of the trainer.

In testing whether subjects' Real-selves had moved closer to the trainer's Real-self the results indicate significant difference between measures ($F = 10.52, p < .01$). The mean congruence between pre-Real of subjects and the Real of the trainer was .26 and the mean congruence between post-Real of subjects and trainer's Real-self was .29. Thus the subhypothesis can be confirmed (see Table IX).

Separate T-tests were done for individual groups. Group #14 showed significantly greater congruence between Real-self and the Real-self of the trainer in the post-test than in the pre-test (see Appendix G and H).

**TABLE IX**

**TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUBHYPOTHESIS 4A**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>RART:RBRT</th>
<th>S.S</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F.ratio</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error I</td>
<td>4.64</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between measures</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures x groups</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error II</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subhypothesis 4B

The similarity between the post-Real-selves of the students and the pre-Ideal-self of the trainer will be greater than the similarity between the pre-Real-self of the students and the pre-Ideal-self of the trainer.

In testing whether students' Real-selves had become closer to the trainer's Ideal-self the results indicate significant differences between measures ($F = 10.48, p < .01$). The mean congruence between pre-Real of students and the Ideal of the trainer was .21. The mean congruence between post-Real of students and the Ideal of the trainer was .24. Thus the subhypothesis can be confirmed (see Table X).

Separate T-tests were done for individual groups. Groups #4, #6 and #15 showed significantly greater congruence between subjects Real-self and the Ideal-self of the trainer in the post-test than in the pre-test. (see Appendix G and H).

TABLE X
TWO-WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUBHYPOTHESIS 4B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>RAIT:RBIT</th>
<th>S.S</th>
<th>d.f</th>
<th>M.S</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>17.20</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error I</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between measures</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>10.48</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures x groups</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error II</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subhypothesis 4C

The similarity between the post-Ideal-selves of the students and the Ideal-self of the trainer will be greater than the similarity between the pre-Ideal-selves of the students and that of the trainer.

In testing whether students' Ideal-self had become closer to the trainer's Ideal-self, no significant between measures effect ($F = .08, N.S.$) were found. The mean congruence between pre-Ideal of students and the Ideal of the trainer was .39. The mean congruence of students' post-Ideal and the Ideal of the trainer was .39. Thus the subhypothesis cannot be confirmed (see Table XI).

Separate T-test were done for individual groups. Group #7 showed significantly greater congruence between subjects Ideal-self and the trainer's Ideal-self in the post-test than in the pre-test (see Appendix G and H).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>IAIT:IBIT</th>
<th>S.S</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>7.53</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>18.96</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error I</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between measures</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures x groups</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>N.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error II</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subhypothesis 4D

The similarity between the post-Ideal-selves of the students and the Real-self of the trainer will be greater than the similarity between
the pre-Ideal-selves of the students and the Real-self of the trainer.

In testing whether students' Ideal-self had become closer to the trainer's Real-self, no significant between measures effect \((F = 1.55, \text{ N.S.})\) were found. The mean congruence between pre-Ideal of students and the Real of the trainer was .40. The mean congruence of students' post-Ideal and the Real of the trainer was .38. Thus the subhypothesis cannot be confirmed (see Table XII).

Separate T-test were done for individual groups. No group showed a significant increase in the predicted direction. However, group #9 and #14 showed a significant increase in the opposite direction (see Appendix G and H).

In summary, it appears that participants' Real-self did change in the direction of the trainer but there was not a corresponding change for the participants' Ideal-self.

**TABLE XII**

**TWO WAY ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR SUBHYPOTHESIS 4D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>IART:IBRT</th>
<th>S.S.</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>M.S.</th>
<th>F-ratio</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>6.63</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error I</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between measures</td>
<td></td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measures x groups</td>
<td></td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>N.S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error II</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Relationships other than those posited emerged from the study. Although these did not directly relate to the hypotheses, they served to clarify sex and age variables and satisfaction with the course.

**Sex Differences**

T-tests were performed on all the measures to investigate sex differences. Significant results were obtained for RBRA ($t=-3.26, p<.001$), IBIA ($t=-2.29, p<.05$), CRI ($t=-3.23, p<.001$) and INSAT ($t=-2.11, p<.05$). A negative $t$-score in each case indicated a higher score for female subjects.

It therefore appears that males were less stable from pre- to post-test and tended to answer differently in each testing session. However, this change in score does not translate itself to a greater congruence at the second testing.

Regarding change of the Real-self toward the pre-Ideal-self (CRI), males actually had a negative score which suggests that their post-Real-self had moved further away from their pre-Ideal-self by the end of the course, whereas the post-Real-self of females moved closer to their pre-Ideal self. Females also appeared to have been satisfied with their instructor more than were the males (see Table XIII).

Looking at Table XIV, one can see that significant results were obtained on the Pearson Correlation for age and the following variables: RAIA ($r=.19, p<.01$), IBRA ($r=.19, p<.01$), RBRA ($r=.20, p<.01$), IBIA ($r=.15, p<.05$), Ch ($r=.15, p<.05$), CIR ($r=.19, p<.01$), CRI ($r=.16, p<.05$), TOTSAT ($r=.32, p<.01$), GRSAT ($r=.32, p<.01$), INSAT ($r=.25, p<.01$).
### TABLE XIII

**T-TEST ON SEX DIFFERENCES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>No. of Cases</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Standard error</th>
<th>T-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBRA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-3.2**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-2.22*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRI</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-3.22**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSAF</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>23.21</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>-1.99*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01

### Age Differences

**TABLE XIV**

**PEARSON CORRELATION SCORES OF AGE WITH VARIOUS VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAIA</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBRA</td>
<td>.20**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRA</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIA</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>.19**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRI</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTSAT</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSAT</td>
<td>.32**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSAT</td>
<td>.25**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05  ** p < .01
The results indicate that the older the students were the more congruent they tended to be after the course but not necessarily in the beginning of the course. The older students' Real and Ideal-selves were more stable than the younger ones', since their pre-Real sorts were more congruent with their post-Real sorts and the same was true for their two Ideal sorts. Also the older the students tended to be the more their post-Real-self came closer to their pre-Ideal-self. It was also found that the older students changed in a positive direction more than the younger ones (Ch, CIR and CRI). In addition, older students were found to be significantly more satisfied with the total course, the instructor and the group than were the younger students.

To summarize, the older the students the more congruent they tended to be after the course, the more stable their self-concept tended to be the more they changed in a positive direction, and the more they were found to be satisfied with the course as a whole.

**Satisfaction with Course**

**TABLE XV**

**PEARSON CORRELATION OF SATISFACTION WITH COURSE WITH VARIOUS VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>TOTSAT</th>
<th>GRSAT</th>
<th>INSAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAIA</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RART</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIT</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.16*</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIR</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRI</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
<td>.17*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .01**  

**p < .05**
Additional relationships were discovered between students' satisfaction with course and the following variables: RAIA (r = .22, p < .01), RART (r = .17, p < .05), RAIT (r = .16, p < .05), Ch (on GRSAT scale r = .16, p < .05), CIR (r = .17, p < .05) and CRI (r = .19, p < .01).

Looking at Table XV, one finds that individuals who were more congruent in the end of the course were also more satisfied with the group and with the course as a whole. The students who were more satisfied with the group and with the course as a whole also changed significantly in a positive direction (except to total group with pre- and post-change). Students who were satisfied with the course and group were more similar to the instructor's Real and Ideal-self in their post-Real-self description. However, all but one variable (CRI) did not correlate significantly with students' satisfaction with the instructor.

Additional findings done with T-tests indicated that Ideal-sorts changed less from pre-to post- than did Real-sorts. Correlated paired T-test compared RBRA (x̅ = .66) with IBIA (x̅ = .78) revealed the latter was significantly greater (t = -10.99, p < .001).

It was also found on correlated T-test that similarity of the Ideal-self to either the Real or the Ideal of the trainer was greater than similarity of the Real to the Real of the trainer and this in turn was greater than similarity of the Real to the Ideal of the trainer. This result held for both the pre- and post-test.

\[ RBIT < RBRT < IBIT = IBRT \]
\[ RAIT < RART < IAIT = IART \]

These results are probably due to the fact that different individuals' Ideal-selves are much more like each other than are the respective
Real-selves. At the same time a person's Real-self may be more similar to another person's Real-self than to the other person's Ideal-self, since both Real-sorts include human flaws which one would recognize in one's self, but would not incorporate in one's Ideal-self.

Summary

Students' movement toward more congruence was examined in Hypothesis I along three dimensions. It was apparent that a significant change along those three dimensions took place however, for hypothesis IB the directionality was opposite to that predicted. Thus Hypothesis I was partially confirmed.

The assumption that student-trainer similarity led to significant greater positive change was examined through Hypothesis II. Results did not support the claim that a significant relationship existed between students' similarity to trainer and students' positive change.

Hypothesis III examined the relationship between students' similarity to trainer and students' satisfaction with course. The assumption that student-trainer similarity led to students' satisfaction with course was not supported. Thus Hypothesis III could not be confirmed.

Hypothesis IV examined students' similarity change toward the trainer over the period of the course. Results indicated that students' Real-self did change in the direction of the trainer but there was not a corresponding change for the students' Ideal-self.

Additional findings that did not relate directly to the hypotheses emerged from the study. It was found that significant correlations existed between age and post-test congruence, age and positive change,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$H_1$</th>
<th>$H_0$</th>
<th>Hypothesis Accepted</th>
<th>Comments Significant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I 1A.</td>
<td>RAIA &gt; RBIB</td>
<td>RAIA = ABIB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1B.</td>
<td>RBIA &gt; RBIB</td>
<td>RBIA = RBIB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1C.</td>
<td>IBRA &gt; RBIB</td>
<td>IBRA = RBIB</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II 2A.</td>
<td>$r$ (Ch) RBRT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (Ch) RBRT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B.</td>
<td>$r$ (Ch) RBIT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (Ch) RBIT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C.</td>
<td>$r$ (Ch) IBRT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (Ch) IBRT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2D.</td>
<td>$r$ (Ch) IBIT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (Ch) IBIT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2E.</td>
<td>$r$ (CIR) RBRT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (CIR) RBRT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2F.</td>
<td>$r$ (CIR) RBIT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (CIR) RBIT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2G.</td>
<td>$r$ (CRI) IBRT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (CRI) IBRT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2H.</td>
<td>$r$ (CRI) IBIT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (CRI) IBIT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. 3A.</td>
<td>$r$ (TOTSAT) RBRT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (TOTSAT) RBRT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3B.</td>
<td>$r$ (TOTSAT) RBIT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (TOTSAT) RBIT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C.</td>
<td>$r$ (TOTSAT) IBRT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (TOTSAT) IBRT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3D.</td>
<td>$r$ (TOTSAT) IBIT &gt; 0</td>
<td>$r$ (EXSAT) IBIT = 0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. 4A.</td>
<td>RART &gt; RBRT</td>
<td>RART = RBRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B.</td>
<td>RAIT &gt; RBIT</td>
<td>RART = RBRT</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4C.</td>
<td>IAIT &gt; IBIT</td>
<td>IAIT = IBIT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D.</td>
<td>IART &gt; IBRT</td>
<td>IART = IBRT</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
age and satisfaction with the course. The older the students were, the more congruent they tended to be after the course, the more they changed in a positive direction and the more satisfied they were with the course. The older the students were their self-concept tended to be more stable.

Another relationship was revealed between sex differences and several variables. It appeared that males were less stable from pre- to post-test, and tended to answer differently in each testing session. Also males' post-Real-self had moved further away from their pre-Ideal-self in the end of the course. On the other hand, females' post-Real-self moved closer to their pre-Ideal-self. Females also appeared to have been satisfied with their instructor more than the males.

An additional relationship was revealed between students' satisfaction with group and with the course as a whole and several variables. Students' who were more satisfied with the group and with the course as a whole were more congruent in the end of the course, they have also changed significantly in a positive direction and their post-Real-self became more similar to the instructor's Real and Ideal-self.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY

THE PROBLEM

Research has supported the claim that certain group experiences have growth producing effects in terms of personal and interpersonal behavioral changes. Considerable speculation and research has been directed toward the understanding of the nature and characteristics of these effective group experiences. It was concluded that many factors contribute to a group experience including the particular situation, the membership, and the group leader.

Studies examining leaders' personality characteristics indicated that leaders' personalities have a significant effect on group outcome. However, research in this area have been modest.

A few studies have examined leaders' self-concept and its effect on group-members. These studies claimed that a more effective group experience would have been achieved if group members were attracted to the leader. Attraction to the leader was related to leader-participant personality similarity. The literature review indicated that further investigation was needed in this area.

This study examined self-concept similarity between the leader and group-members and how in turn, this was related to self-concept change on the part of members in an experiential group course.
THE PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationship between similarity of trainer-participant self-concepts and the participants' self-concept change as a result of participants were enrolled in a psychology of personal growth course at Oakton Community College. The study was based on Roger's theoretical views of self-concept change and utilized Q-sort methodology.

HYPOTHESES

1. The students' post-self-concept will be more congruent than their pre-self-concept regardless of the students' similarity to trainer.

2. There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concepts and participants' positive change.

3. There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concept and participants' satisfaction with the course.

4. The students' post-self-concept will be more similar to trainer's self-concept than were their pre-self-concepts.

These hypotheses were further broken down into nineteen subhypotheses.
THE INSTRUMENTS

The two instruments that were utilized in this study were the Adjective Q-set for Non-Professionals and investigator's questionnaire. The questionnaire was designed to assess participants' satisfaction with the course, including satisfaction with the group and the instructor.

The Q-set is a self-reported inventory of self-concept. It was developed by Block (1961) and it measures the degree of similarity between Real and Ideal-self-concepts.

SAMPLE

The sample included 174 students, 64 males and 110 females drawn from 17 psychology of personal growth courses at Oakton Community College. The mean age of students was 23.89. Ten instructors of psychology of personal growth courses were involved in the study, five males and five females.

PROCEDURE

All participants completed the Q-sort at the beginning and the end of the course describing their "Real" and "Ideal" self-concepts. Instructors completed the Q-sort at the beginning of the course describing their "Real" and "Ideal" self-concepts. Participants filled out the investigator's questionnaire at the end of the course.
Measures of congruence and similarity between each pair of sort was calculated utilizing the Pearson Product Moment Correlation Coefficient.

RESULTS

Two-way analysis of variance with repeated measures on the second factor and analysis of covariance and intra-cell correlation were the statistical techniques used to analyze the hypotheses. T-test and Pearson Correlations were utilized to examine individual groups and obtain additional results.

The data was analyzed following the four general hypotheses which were broken down to more specific subhypotheses.

The following hypotheses were partially confirmed:

I. The students' post self-concepts will be more congruent than their pre-self-concepts regardless of the students' similarity to one trainer.

IV. The students' post-self-concepts will be more similar to the trainer's self-concept than were their pre-self-concepts.

In general there was evidence of growth in congruence from pre- to post-testing. The overall gain was significant at the .001 level. A significant interaction effect was also encountered in the third subhypothesis of hypothesis I. However, subhypothesis IB was not confirmed since the directionality was opposite to that predicted.
Part of hypothesis IV was confirmed. Results revealed that students' Real-self did change in the direction of the trainer's Real-self and Ideal-self. Thus, students' selves became more similar to the trainer's toward the end of the course. However, students' post Ideal-selves did not change toward the trainer's self-concept.

The following hypotheses were not confirmed:

II. There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concept and participants' positive change.

III. There will be a positive relationship between the similarity of students' and trainer's self-concept and participants' satisfaction with the course.

The hypothesis that student-trainer similarity led to greater positive change was not supported. Contrary, it was found that a significant relationship in the opposite direction existed between student-trainer similarity and positive change. The less similar students were to the trainer the more they grew.

The assumption that student-trainer similarity led to students' satisfaction with course was also not supported. No relationship was evidenced between students' satisfaction with course as measured by the Q-sort.

Additional findings which did not relate directly to the hypotheses revealed that the older the students were the more they
changed, the more satisfied they were with the course, and the more congruent they tended to be at the end of the course. It also appeared that students who were more congruent in the end of the course and have changed in a positive direction were also more satisfied with the course as a whole and with the group. In addition their post-Real-selves became more similar to the instructor's Real and Ideal-self.

It was also found that females tended to be more stable from pre- to post-test than male students. Females post-Real-self moved closer to their pre-Ideal-self and they tended to be more satisfied with the instructor than were the male participants.

DISCUSSION

This section presents an examination of various factors contributing to the results obtained in Chapter IV. The hypotheses and the additional findings are treated individually.

1. The most important question when one assesses a course is whether the course has had a positive effect on the individual. The results of this study indicate that personal growth occurred. Positive change took place through adjustment of the Real-self to conform to the Ideal-self but not through adjustment of the Ideal-self to conform to the pre-Real-self. In general, individuals became more congruent by the end of the course than they were initially, according to the Q-sorts. The question could be asked as to
whether growth was due to the influence of the group-course experience, or simply a function of the passing of time. The presence of a significant interaction between group membership and change of Real in direction of Ideal seems to point to possible differential effects of group experience. However, since group membership was not randomly assigned and groups differed in their demographic characteristics, the question of causation must remain open.

2. In general the prediction that student-trainer similarity would be related to greater growth was not supported. This could be a function of several factors. First there is the possibility that there is no real relationship between students' growth and similarity to the trainer. Another is that several confounding effects may have clouded this outcome. There were: (a) all the trainers were found to be highly congruent and very similar to each other, therefore it was extremely difficult to effectively analyze and control for those characteristics common to all trainers. This trainer congruence may be a function of trainers truly being congruent or trainers being very skilled at identifying and using positive responses in the sort and questionnaire. (b) The other possible explanation for these results is that since the trainers were highly congruent, individuals who were similar to them had very little room to grow and, therefore, showed very little movement.

3. Satisfaction with the course did not appear to relate to students' pre-test self-concept similarity to the trainers.
Pre-test measures were not quite able to predict satisfaction with the course. However, post-test Real-Ideal congruence was related to satisfaction with the group but not with the instructor, as was post-test similarity of Real-self to instructor's Real-self. It appears that satisfaction with the group was a function of the experience and not of entering characteristics of the participants.

4. Individuals' Real-selves did move toward greater congruence with both the Real and Ideal-self of the trainer. However, individuals' Ideal-selves did not move toward congruence with the trainer. Movement of the subjects' Real-self toward the trainer could be due to several reasons: (a) Students in this study have generally changed their self-image in a positive direction (see hypothesis I) and this has made them more similar to the trainer, even after controlling for similarity to the paired trainer. (b) Trainers served as a role model for the student; therefore, the student grew more like the trainer. Peters (1966), Lundgren (1974), and Cooper (1969) came to the same conclusion that an identification process occurs between group-leader and participants, and participants become more like their trainer. (c) Another possible factor is that students have become more sophisticated about definition of self and stated this definition rather than an accurate definition of self.

Failure of the Ideal-selves to move in the direction of the trainer seems to be due to the relative stability of Ideal-selves when compared to Real-selves and to the fact that Ideal-selves were
rather similar to the trainer to begin with.

5. One unhypothesized finding of this study was that age correlated significantly with growth, congruence at the end of the course, and satisfaction with course. The older the students were the more they changed and grew and the more they were satisfied with the course.

   Older students tended to be concentrated in groups #14 and #15, so it was difficult to separate groups effects from those of age. However, examination of correlations between age and satisfaction for each group separately reveals the same trend towards greater satisfaction for older students. The correlation of age with the other variables are less consistent from group to group. The older students appeared to be more motivated and thus treated the course more seriously than the younger students.

6. Indications were that both Real and Ideal self-concept were more stable for female than for males and that change of the Real in the direction of the Ideal was significantly higher for the females than for the males with mean scores for male participants actually showing negative movement.

   Since, however, males and females were not randomly assigned to the various groups, and participating females tended to be older, it is difficult to derive gender-related conclusions from these results.
LIMITATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Change and similarity were both defined in terms of self-concept. Thus it would be difficult to avoid confounding of effects in studying the relationship between the two. Furthermore, to hypothesize that subjects who are more similar to the trainer in self-concept should change more, would be to assert that subjects are likely to modify their self-concept so as to decrease their similarity to the trainer. Were similarity to be measured in terms of cognitive or interpersonal style, for example, these difficulties might be minimized. Such a study should probably be conducted.

2. Trainers were found to be highly similar to each other in self-concept. High similarity between the trainers confounds real similarity to a trainer with similarity to a cultural Ideal. The statistical manipulations employed were unable to eliminate this confounding effect. In retrospect, the person who is already very similar to the trainer would tend to be similar to the cultural Ideal and would thus not have much room to grow. Thus the negative correlations between change and similarity to trainer may well have been artifacts of this nature. A similar study using other measures (i.e. cognitive or interpersonal style) to measure similarity is recommended in order to control for this artifact.

3. The students employed in the study were not randomly assigned to groups and the groups were found to differ in terms of demographic characteristics. Thus inter-group differences could not be
ascribed to the treatment but could be due to the interaction of demographic characteristics with the measures.

Thus it is recommended that a study be done with randomly assigned subjects including two control groups: one in a non-therapy group session (i.e. history class) and the other in a non-group setting.

4. The self concept changes were measured over a single sixteen week semester; therefore, it was not possible to ascertain if the changes were temporary or permanent. Thus a follow-up would have contributed meaningful additional information.

5. The actual class procedures of the courses were not structured, recorded or observed. This limitation was essentially imposed by time and situational restrictions. It is recommended that any repeated study should avoid such a critical methodological limitation.

6. All ten instructors based their course and teaching methods on different theories and practical techniques according to their personal preference. It is recommended that future studies exercise some control over these variables.

7. It is recommended that similar studies be conducted with T-groups, encounter groups, etc., in which the participants would be volunteers with a primary goal of achieving personal growth.
The major function of the study was to investigate some of the factors taking part in leader's influence upon group members.

Based on the finding of this study there are several areas which have implications in practice in working in groups. Three major areas were identified and these were related to leaders' influence upon group members, factors which foster satisfaction with group experience among members and finally, the effects of leader-participants similarity as a basis for personal growth.

**Leader's Role**

Research in the area of group leadership has historically sought answers to the nature of influence that group-leaders exert upon group members. There is in general agreement that leaders play a significant role in group outcome since they function as a central figure toward whom participants turn and follow (Slavson, 1950). This study confirms the assumption that leaders serve as models with whom group members desire to identify. The leader becomes a model by virtue of his/her position in the group and in his/her communication to members both verbal and non-verbal, the leader acts to establish the norms of behavior for all group members. One of the results of his/her modeling is the development of an identification process among group participants toward their leader. Group participants tend to identify with the leader's personality
characteristics and behavior and begin to model their behavior after him/her. Studies conducted by Backner (1961), Cooper (1969) and Peters (1966) examined aspects of group members identification with their group leader. They found that participants changed in their attitudes and behavior toward being more like the trainer. Peters (1966) in particular found that group members began the group with a small degree of self-concept similarity with the trainer and this gradually increased to a moderately high degree of similarity toward the trainer. An important finding of this study indicates that the leader indeed serves as an object of identification to their group members. Group members self-concepts became more similar to their trainer's by the end of the group. This implies that the initial similarity of participants to the group trainer was less important than what the trainer represented and modeled. Thus, coming back to the initial question one can respectively see, based on the study's finding, that leaders did influence group members significantly by serving as models to the participants. Through modeling and the resulting of identification process, group leaders did influence group members to become more like them.

The finding is of crucial importance since it deals with the issue of human beings influencing other human beings to act like them, adopt their values, attitudes and behaviors. Considering these results caution may need to be exercised in the selection of leaders in classrooms, therapy, organizations and governmental
Satisfaction with Group

Practitioners and researchers both have been concerned with the issue of group members' satisfaction with the group experience. It is commonly held knowledge that some group members benefit from group experience and are satisfied with the experience while others are not. This issue has been studied from a number of aspects such as group composition, group process and dynamics and the leader's role. Very few studies have examined leader's personality attributes and its effect on group outcomes.

This study focuses on the issue of group members' personality characteristics. The research attempts to identify what personality traits contribute to satisfaction with group experience and further, can predictions of satisfaction be made on the basis of personality characteristics. It was assumed that a high level of self-concept similarity between the leader and group members would lead toward more satisfaction with the group experience. This assumption was not supported in this study. The results of this study indicate that satisfaction appears to be related more to terminal measures than entering characteristics. Satisfaction with the group seems to be a function of the effect which experience had on the group members than personality characteristics of the group members. Thus, the reply to the question whether one could predict participants' satisfaction with the group experience on the basis of entering personality characteristics is negative.
A major implication of this finding for group leaders is concerned with the creation of a positive group experience. The findings indicate that pre-selection of group members based on personality characteristics, may not assure a positive outcome. What really matters for satisfaction is the group experience which members participate in.

**Leader-participants Similarity**

Another area of investigation concerns the conditions which contribute to participants personal growth through a group experience. This study hypothesized that an important prerequisite for participants positive change would be self-concept similarity of the participants to their leader.

Since the leader's goal can be conceived as an attempt to influence the group participants' behavior, and since interpersonal attraction has been shown to increase receptiveness to group experience, one has to identify these variables which increase interpersonal attraction to help create a more effective relationship between the leader and group participants. Thus, it was expected that participants would be more attracted to their leader when they possessed similar self-concepts. The literature review revealed controversial views and findings in regard to this matter. Some investigators claim that it is necessary to match therapist-client pairs on the basis of similarity in personality traits for achieving desirable therapeutic progress (Axelrad, 1952; Garber, 1958;
Mendelsohn, 1963, 1966, 1967; Kessel et al, 1967; Grunelbaum, 1975). On the other hand, other investigators claim that dissimilarity between the therapist and his client would be more beneficial in therapy. Lessor (1961) found that client-therapist self-concept similarity was negatively related to counseling progress.

It is apparent that 'similarity' is an important factor in group outcomes however, it was not clear how important this factor is and whether similarity or dissimilarity create a positive group experience. The results of this study seem to be in the same direction of Lessor's finding. The less similar the students were to their leader the more they became congruent. However, these results can not be conclusive since the study had some methodological artifacts which may have tainted the findings. In addition, growth may be attributed to personality variables not investigated in this study such as similarity in cognitive or interpersonal style between trainer and group participants. These are factors which deserve further investigation since previous results concerning their effects have been non-conclusive.

**Summary**

The results from this study have implications for practitioners and researchers concerned with the effects of the group experience upon its members. Evidence was obtained to support the assumption that leaders did have an influence on group outcome. Participants
did change as a result of a process of identification with the leader who served as model. In addition, the group experience itself served as a contributor to positive change among members. Attention to these variables by group leaders could result in increased effectiveness of the group experience for its members.

Self-concept similarity, the ways in which a person sees himself, between trainer and group members is another issue which group leaders should be aware of. Although similarity of self-concept between trainer and participants did not yield significant growth producing effects, the results are not conclusive.
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## APPENDIX A

**STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE HUMAN DEVELOPMENT COURSES WHO WERE NOT INVOLVED IN THE STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor #</th>
<th>Course #</th>
<th>Total Students Enrolled</th>
<th>Students Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals 213 39
## APPENDIX B

### EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDENT

#### DEVELOPMENT FACULTY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor #</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Post Graduate Course and Various Training</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>In Service Training at Oakton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>B.S. in Economics ME.D. in Counseling and Guidance</td>
<td>Advanced certificate in higher education</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>B.A. Political Science M.A. Counselor Education</td>
<td>Twelve hours training in Human Potential Seminars. In-service training while employed at Educational Resources Inc. as group leader.</td>
<td>Various seminars, workshops over last seven years</td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>B.A. in Sociology M.S. in Counseling Psychology</td>
<td>Four years on going training as a youth worker</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>B.A. ME.D. Ph.D in Guidance</td>
<td>Three years supervision in group at Loyola and the I.I.T.</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>B.S. in Chemical Engineering ME.D. in Education</td>
<td>Transactional Analysis group training program, 6 years.</td>
<td>Workshops on various group approaches: Gestalt, T.A., etc.</td>
<td>4-½ years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor #</td>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>Post Graduate Course and Various Training</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>In Service Training at Oakton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>B.A. M.A. in Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>Training in Human Potential groups by McHolland, Tardi &amp; Johnson. Training in Assertion Training by P. Jacubowski.</td>
<td>Oasis</td>
<td>6 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>B.A. in Sociology M.A. in Sociology</td>
<td>Transactional Analysis Training for 3 years</td>
<td>Various Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>B.A. in Sociology M.A. in Social work Ph.D. student in higher education</td>
<td>Post Master Training in social work including specialization with group process and group supervision. Human Potential</td>
<td>Transactional 4 years Analysis Workshops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor #</td>
<td>Degrees</td>
<td>Post Graduate Course and Various Training</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>In Service Training at Oakton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>B.A. in Social Science, M.A. in Student Personnel and higher education</td>
<td>15 hrs. post Masters courses in group work.</td>
<td>Small group training, a week of intensive training, various workshops.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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## Experiential Background of the Student Development Faculty Members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor #</th>
<th>Years Working on the Student Development Staff at Oakton Community College</th>
<th>Years of Group Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 years experience, an average of five courses per year</td>
<td>A total of ten years of experience in leading various groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 years experience, an excess of 25 groups</td>
<td>Seven years of experience in various kinds of group-leadership training, Value Clarification, Human Sexuality, Life and Career Planning and group leader for Educational Resources, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3 years experience, an average of five courses per year</td>
<td>Total of six years experience leading various groups, instructing and counseling in college. 12 years experience leading small groups with teenagers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 years experience, an average of four courses per year</td>
<td>Total of ten years experience with group work which include groups of adolescents of high school, Human Potential groups at colleges, and various other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 years experience, an average of four courses per year</td>
<td>3,000 hours leading Transactional Analysis Group. Leading groups at Kendall College for a year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4 years experience, an average of four courses per year</td>
<td>Leading Marathon groups, Leading groups for four years at Brookdale College. Leading teenage groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## EXPERIENTIAL BACKGROUND OF THE STUDENT DEVELOPMENT FACULTY MEMBERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructor #</th>
<th>Years working on the student development staff at Oakton Community College</th>
<th>Years of groups experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6 years experience, an average of four courses per year.</td>
<td>Leading groups for two years in a high school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4 years experience, an average of four courses per year.</td>
<td>Instructing in college for eight years. Group therapist for nine years in private practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4 years experience, an average of 3-4 groups per year.</td>
<td>6 years leading and instructing groups in various places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4 years experience, an average of four groups per year.</td>
<td>5 years leading groups and counseling in college level. Leading various groups sponsored by Oakton.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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HUMAN DEVELOPMENT COURSES PSYCHOLOGY OF PERSONAL GROWTH COURSE DESCRIPTIONS

The general description of the psychology of personal growth, courses as stated in the college catalog reads as follows:

The focus of this course is a personal growth experience. Emphasis will be on increasing awareness of values, emotions, and other motivational factors that affect individual's personal behavior and promote or inhibit their personal growth through the exploration of various theories. Participants in this group experience will be expected to deal with their own personal development.

However, each instructor provides a unique psychological orientation and instructional methodology as is evidenced by the following course description:

**Instructor #1**

**Courses #1, 2, 3**

The theoretical background employed in this course are a combination of Egan's Model, Rogerian theory and some transactional analysis.

The goal of the course is to expend ones self-concept, gain self-understanding and self-awareness, learn how one communicates with others, set personal goals and try new behavioral patterns.

The students learn about their values, attitudes and feelings by giving feedback, confronting, sharing, supporting and listening. The course includes learning new communication skills, active listening skills, and trying out new behaviors.
The course is a mixture of process and content. About 50 percent of the course time is spent on cognitive studies and 50 percent on group experience.

The techniques utilized in the course are role-playing and active listening exercises and other group exercises. The course assignment includes reading a textbook, writing a paper on personal philosophy and work on personal goals.

Instructor #2

Course #4, 5

The following theories are introduced in the course: Transactional Analysis, Rogers, Value Clarification and a general overview of "humanistic psychology."

The goals of the course is to identify ones values, needs, strengths, interests and attitudes, set personal goals to be followed, identify ones own communication patterns and change it if desired. Identify individuals' feelings about their selves and others, learn to be responsible and in control of their own lives and learn to develop intimacy.

The course is a mixture of process and content. About 40 percent of the course time is spent in cognitive studies and 60 percent in group experience.

The instructor participates in all the activities and models behavior for the group.
The techniques utilized in the course are role-playing and various communication and group exercises.

The course assignment includes the reading of a textbook, and writing a personal-growth paper.

Instructor #3
Courses #6, 7, 8

The theoretical background employed in these courses were Rogers theory, Transactional Analysis and Egan's Model.

The goals of the course is for students to become more aware of how they make choices in their life and how they communicate with each other. They will learn more about themselves gain more self-understanding and try out new behavior.

During the first eight weeks about 25 percent of the time is spent in straight lecture format, 25 percent in general discussion on cognitive material and how it relates to their life experience and 50 percent in structured and unstructured group experience. In the second eight weeks, 80 percent of the time is spent by students individually making contact with each other to foster understanding, communication and intimacy. The remaining 20 percent is spent giving theoretical material as the need arise.

The techniques utilized are various communication exercises, fantasy work and self-disclosure, support, confrontation and feedback. The course assignment includes the reading of a textbook and writing a paper about their own growth.
The theoretical background employed in these courses is basically Egan's model.

The course's goal is self-exploration and self-understanding, trying out new desirable behavior and learning interpersonal communication skills, students are expected to be genuine, confrontive, initiative and set personal goals and pursue them. They learn about their own communication style and decide whether they desire to change it.

The course is a mixture of content and personal group experience. About 50 percent of the course time is spent on didactic studies and 50 percent on group experience. The instructor takes an active role in the group experience, and provides less and less structure as the semester progresses.

The techniques utilized in the course are role-playing, videotapes, Gestalt exercises and active listening exercises.

The course assignment includes completing the exercises in a work-book and reading a textbook.

The theoretical background employed in the course is transactional analysis.

The goals of the course is to provide the students with understanding of what is social control and where they are in regard to their own social control. They will gain self-awareness, they will
learn who they are, who are the other individuals in their life and how they communicate and relate to others. The students will learn and understand their personality through the construct of T.A.

The course is a mixture of content and personal group experience. About 40 percent of the course time is spent on cognitive studies and 60 percent in group experience.

The techniques utilized in the course are Gestalt exercises, audio-tapes and films.

The course assignments include reading the textbook, writing an autobiography (past, present and future) and a one-to-one interview.

Instructor #6

Course #12

The theoretical background employed in the course is Transactional Analysis.

The goals of the course include gaining more self-awareness, learning communication skills and active listening. The course provides one with tools for setting personal goals and pursuing them. Individuals are encouraged to try out new behaviors and make up constructs to be followed in the group.

The course is a combination of content and personal group experience. About 40 percent of the course time is spent in cognitive studies and 60 percent in group experience.

The techniques utilized in the course are Gestalt exercises, relaxation exercises and fantasy work. The course assignments include
the reading of a textbook, making contracts and reporting on them filling out a workbook and prepare a personal project.

Instructor #7

Course #13

The theoretical background employed in this course is based on Transactional Analysis theory in combination with Egan's model.

The goals for this course is to help individuals in self-exploration and behavioral and attitudinal changes. This would include individual's setting personal goals, learning new behavioral patterns, gain more self-understanding, develop communication skills and learn some cognitive concepts particularly T.A. concepts.

The course is a mixture of process and content. The content material is related to their personal experiences. The group spent about 20 percent of the course time on didactic studies and 80 percent on group experience and personal involvement.

The techniques utilized in the course were role-playing, audio-tapes and various group exercises. Course assignments included two book reports, working on personal goals, audio tapes on communication skills.

Instructor #8

Course #14

The theoretical background employed in this course was basically Transactional Analysis.

In general the course is geared toward gaining self-awareness and
self-acceptance, helping individuals change in desirable ways, getting in touch with one's own strength and needs and facilitate a positive self-concept.

Students will learn communication skills, engage in process of problem-solving, participate in a group experience and be expected to give feedback, confront, listen, support and share their own feelings.

The course is a mixture of process and content. About 25 percent of the course time is devoted to cognitive studies and 75 percent to group experience.

The techniques utilized in the course are role-playing, various listening exercises, Gestalt exercises, fantasy work, rehearsals for situations and more. The course assignment includes reading a book, design contracts and work on them and write an autobiography and a personal journal.

Instructor #9

Course #15

The theoretical background employed in this course is basically Transactional Analysis and Egan's communication model.

The goal of the course is self-exploration, examining how one interacts with others, gain self-awareness and self-acceptance, learn tools for thinking productively about oneself and others, taking responsibility for oneself and making decisions about how one chooses to live his/her life.

The course is a combination of group experience and cognitive studies. About 25 percent of the course time will be spent on cognitive
studies and 75 percent on group experience. The instructor will present a brief overview of human behavior using Transactional Analysis as a conceptual model in order to provide a common frame of reference.

The techniques utilized in the course include various exercises, discussions, role-playing and personal inventories. The course assignments include reading a textbook and writing an autobiography (past present and future).

Instructor #10

Course #16, 17

The theoretical background employed in this course is basically Rogerian. The theoretical concepts used are: genuineness, positive regard and warmth. The course is positive oriented and avoids negative feedback. The goals of the course are: self-exploration including ones values, strengths, attitudes, feelings and ways of communication. Setting personal goals and take actions to achieve them, develop listening skills and communication skills. Increase self-awareness and self-acceptance and explore ones career interests.

The course is a combination of group experience and cognitive studies, about 70 percent of the course time is spent in group and personal experience and 30 percent in cognitive studies.

The techniques utilized in the course are role-playing, various communication exercises and discussions. The course assignments include reading a textbook, personal growth project and self-awareness journal.
ATTACHED are two self-concept Q-sorts each containing 70 adjectives and an information sheet. You are asked to fill in the information and rate yourself on the Q-sort on a 1 to 7 scale, where 7 represents the adjectives "most like" you, and 1 represents the adjectives "least like" you.

This instrument is being used only for research purposes. Your name will not be used, and no one will know how you personally filled out the answers. The research is only concerned with how different group-instructors influence the students through the course. Once you fill out the Q-sort, you will only be a number on an IBM card. However, please answer honestly, since your response will be important in studying the relationship between instructors and students and hopefully it will lead to an improvement in the course outcomes.

Attached are two identical Q-sorts. In the first Q-sort you will describe yourself as you honestly see yourself.

When you have completed the first Q-sort turn to the second one. In the second Q-sort you will describe your "ideal-self", the way you would like to be and the behavior and feelings you would like to possess.

INSTRUCTIONS

Look through the list of adjectives and notice that a good many of them are descriptive of you, to a greater or lesser degree. Others of the adjectives are quite undescriptive of you and are even the opposite
of the way you see yourself. Your task is to indicate the various DEGREES with which each adjective describes you.

As a first step, look through the list and then pick out the approximately TEN adjectives or phrases you feel are most characteristic or descriptive of you. Put the number 7 in front of these words. Now, look through the list again and pick out the approximately TEN words which you feel are quite characteristic of you (excluding from consideration those words you have already given the number 7 to). Write the number 6 in front of these words. Now of those words that remain, pick out the approximately TEN adjectives that you feel are fairly descriptive of you and place the number 5 in front of them.

Now work from the opposite and toward the middle. Of those words not yet numbered, pick out about TEN adjectives that are most uncharacteristic of you and give them the number 1. Pick out the TEN adjectives that you feel are quite uncharacteristic of you and give them the number 2. Now choose the TEN adjectives fairly uncharacteristic of you and give them the number 3. Place the number 4 in front of the TEN words remaining without numbers and your task is finished.

INFORMATION SHEET.

Name ____________________________________________
Address __________________________________________
Sex __________________ School __________________________
Date of Birth ________________________________
Major ____________________________________________

Have you had previous group experiences? Yes ____ No ____

I greatly appreciate your cooperation.
Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself.

1. absent-minded
2. affected
3. ambitious
4. assertive, dominant
5. bossy
6. calm
7. cautious
8. competitive
9. confident
10. considerate
11. cooperation
12. cruel, mean
13. defensive
14. dependent
15. disorderly
16. dissatisfied
17. dramatic
18. dull
19. easily embarrassed
20. easily hurt
21. energetic
22. fair-minded, objective
23. feminine
24. frank
25. friendly
26. guileful
27. helpless
28. hostile
29. idealistic
30. imaginative
31. impulsive
32. intelligent
33. versatile
34. introspective
35. jealous
36. lazy
37. likable
38. perservering
39. personally charming
40. reasonable
41. rebellious
42. resentful
43. reserved, dignified
44. restless
45. sarcastic
46. poised
47. self-controlled
48. self-indulgent
49. selfish
50. self-pitying
51. sense of humor
52. sentimental
53. shrewd, clever
54. sincere
55. sophisticated
56. stubborn
57. suspicious
58. sympathetic
59. timid, submissive
60. touchy, irritable
61. tactless
62. unconventional
63. undecided, confused
64. unhappy
65. uninterested, indifferent
66. unworthy, inadequate
67. warm
68. withdrawn, introverted
69. worried anxious
70. wise
Describe your "ideal-self" the way you would like to be.

1. absent-minded  
2. affected  
3. ambitious  
4. assertive, dominant  
5. bossy  
6. calm  
7. cautious  
8. competitive  
9. confident  
10. considerate  
11. cooperation  
12. cruel, mean  
13. defensive  
14. dependent  
15. disorderly  
16. dissatisfied  
17. dramatic  
18. dull  
19. easily embarrassed  
20. easily hurt  
21. energetic  
22. fair-minded, objective  
23. feminine  
24. frank  
25. friendly  
26. guileful  
27. helpless  
28. hostile  
29. idealistic  
30. imaginative  
31. impulsive  
32. intelligent  
33. versatile  
34. introspective  
35. jealous  
36. lazy  
37. likable  
38. perservering  
39. personally charming  
40. reasonable  
41. rebellious  
42. resentful  
43. reserved, dignified  
44. restless  
45. sarcastic  
46. poised  
47. self-controlled  
48. self-indulgent  
49. selfish  
50. self-pitying  
51. sense of humor  
52. sentimental  
53. shrewd, clever  
54. sincere  
55. sophisticated  
56. stubborn  
57. suspicious  
58. sympathetic  
59. timid, submissive  
60. touchy, irritable  
61. tactless  
62. unconventional  
63. undecided, confused  
64. unhappy  
65. uninterested, indifferent  
66. unworthy, inadequate  
67. warm  
68. withdrawn, introverted  
69. worried and anxious  
70. wise
COURSE SATISFACTION EVALUATION

DIRECTIONS: Using the following rating scale:

4 = strongly agree
3 = somewhat agree
2 = somewhat disagree
1 = strongly disagree

Please indicate your satisfaction of the course by circling the number following each item.

1. The group has helped me accomplish the personal goals which I set for myself.
   1  2  3  4

2. I have learned new desired behaviors during the course.
   1  2  3  4

3. I have become more aware of my needs, strength and weaknesses.
   1  2  3  4

4. I felt this group was able to meet my expectations of the course.
   1  2  3  4

5. I was actively involved in the group experience during the course.
   1  2  3  4

6. The group members' reactions and feedback helped me to change in a positive way.
   1  2  3  4

7. I was attracted to the group.
   1  2  3  4

8. I was accepted by the group.
   1  2  3  4

9. I found the group experience helpful in general.
   1  2  3  4

10. The instructor was a good group instructor.
   1  2  3  4

11. The group instructor understood the students.
    1  2  3  4

12. The group instructor understood me.
    1  2  3  4

13. The instructor helped me understand myself and my needs.
    1  2  3  4

14. If you had the choice and this course was not required, would you take it again.
    1  2  3  4

Some of the suggestions which I would make for this course are:

Comments:
APPENDIX G

T-TESTS AND PEARSON CORRELATION CALCULATED INDIVIDUALLY FOR EACH GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Gr.1</th>
<th>Gr. 2</th>
<th>Gr. 3</th>
<th>Gr. 4</th>
<th>Gr. 5</th>
<th>Gr. 6</th>
<th>Gr.7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a) RAIA &gt; RBIB (t-test)</td>
<td>-0.67</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-0.53</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>-0.85</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b) RBIA &gt; RBIB (t-test)</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
<td>4.76**</td>
<td>2.5*</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>3.69**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c) IBRA &gt; RBIB (t-test)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>-1.43</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a) (Ch) RBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.79**</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>-.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b) (Ch) RBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.76**</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.60</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c) (Ch) IBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.32</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d) (Ch) IBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.36</td>
<td>-.43</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e) (CIR) RBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f) (CIR) RBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g) (CRI) IBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>.84**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h) (CRI) IBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>-.37</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a) (TOTSAT) RBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.73</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b) (TOTSAT) RBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c) (TOTSAT) IBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d) (TOTSAT) IBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.68</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### T-Tests and Pearson Correlation Calculated Individually for Each Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Gr. 1</th>
<th>Gr. 2</th>
<th>Gr. 3</th>
<th>Gr. 4</th>
<th>Gr. 5</th>
<th>Gr. 6</th>
<th>Gr. 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a) RART &gt; RBRT (t-test)</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>-0.91</td>
<td>-0.56</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b) RAIT &gt; RBIT (t-test)</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>-2.51*</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-3.8**</td>
<td>-0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c) IAIT &gt; IBIT (t-test)</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>-1.29</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-2.45*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d) IART &gt; IBRT (t-test)</td>
<td>-0.93</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### T-Tests and Pearson Correlation Calculated Individually for Each Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Gr. 8</th>
<th>Gr. 9</th>
<th>Gr. 10</th>
<th>Gr. 11</th>
<th>Gr. 12</th>
<th>Gr. 13</th>
<th>Gr. 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a) RAIA &gt; RBIB (t-test)</td>
<td>-2.70*</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-1.04</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
<td>-2.49*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b) RBIA &gt; RBIB (t-test)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>-0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c) IBRA &gt; RBIB (t-test)</td>
<td>-2.91*</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a) (Ch) RBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>-.35</td>
<td>-.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b) (Ch) RBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>-.45</td>
<td>-.39</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>-.61</td>
<td>-.71</td>
<td>-.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c) (Ch) IBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d) (Ch) IBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e) (CIR) RBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f) (CIR) RBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>-.62</td>
<td>-.38</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g) (CRI) IBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.29</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h) (CRI) IBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a) (TOTSAT) RBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b) (TOTSAT) RBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>-.67</td>
<td>.87**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c) (TOTSAT) IBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d) (TOTSAT) IBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.28</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G  (continued)

T-TESTS AND PEARSON CORRELATION CALCULATED INDIVIDUALLY FOR EACH GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Gr. 8</th>
<th>Gr. 9</th>
<th>Gr.10</th>
<th>Gr.11</th>
<th>Gr.12</th>
<th>Gr.13</th>
<th>Gr.14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a) RART&gt;RBRT (t-test)</td>
<td>-2.15</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>-1.38</td>
<td>-4.39**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b) RAIT&gt;RBIT (t-test)</td>
<td>-1.15</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>-0.42</td>
<td>-2.13</td>
<td>-1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c) IAIT&gt;IIBIT (t-test)</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>-0.47</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d) IART&gt;IBRT (t-test)</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>2.29*</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>3.75**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### T-Tests and Pearson Correlation Calculated Individually for Each Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Gr.15</th>
<th>Gr.16</th>
<th>Gr.17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1a) RAIA-RIBIB (t-test)</td>
<td>-5.23***</td>
<td>-1.56</td>
<td>-2.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1b) RBIA&gt;RIBIB (t-test)</td>
<td>-0.54</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1c) IBRA&gt;RIBIB (t-test)</td>
<td>-4.19**</td>
<td>-0.84</td>
<td>-3.8**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2a) (Ch) RBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>- .30</td>
<td>- .90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2b) (Ch) RBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>- .53</td>
<td>- .26</td>
<td>- .41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2c) (Ch) IBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>- .08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>- .56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2d) (Ch) IBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>- .14</td>
<td>- .13</td>
<td>- .90***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e) (CIR) RBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2f) (CIR) RBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2g) (CRI) IBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2h) (CRI) IBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a) (TOTSAT) RBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>- .45</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b) (TOTSAT) RBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>- .62</td>
<td>- .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3c) (TOTSAT) IBRT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>- .05</td>
<td>- .08</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3d) (TOTSAT) IBIT &gt; 0 (Pearson Corr.)</td>
<td>- .46</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX G (continued)

**T-TESTS AND PEARSON CORRELATION CALCULATED INDIVIDUALLY FOR EACH GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Gr.15</th>
<th>Gr.16</th>
<th>Gr.17</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a) RART &gt; RBRT (t-test)</td>
<td>-1.77</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td>-1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4b) RAIT &gt; RBIT (t-test)</td>
<td>-2.79*</td>
<td>-0.52</td>
<td>-1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4c) IAIT &gt; IBIT (t-test)</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4d) IART &gt; IBRT (t-test)</td>
<td>-0.58</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>-0.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p<.05  
** p<.01  
*** p<.001
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## Appendix H

### Mean of Variables per Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group 1</th>
<th>Group 2</th>
<th>Group 3</th>
<th>Group 4</th>
<th>Group 5</th>
<th>Group 6</th>
<th>Group 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBIB</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBRA</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBIA</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRA</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIA</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIA</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMA</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>-4.43</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-9.00</td>
<td>-6.20</td>
<td>-5.50</td>
<td>-4.87</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>-7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>-8.00</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>-2.50</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSAT</td>
<td>24.80</td>
<td>25.43</td>
<td>22.06</td>
<td>20.30</td>
<td>23.12</td>
<td>22.71</td>
<td>23.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSAT</td>
<td>23.80</td>
<td>24.14</td>
<td>18.66</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>23.60</td>
<td>21.57</td>
<td>23.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTSAT</td>
<td>48.60</td>
<td>49.57</td>
<td>40.73</td>
<td>42.10</td>
<td>46.62</td>
<td>44.28</td>
<td>46.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBRT</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRT</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RART</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IART</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBIT</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIT</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIT</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAIT</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>19.10</td>
<td>19.57</td>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>18.90</td>
<td>29.00</td>
<td>19.28</td>
<td>27.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H (continued)

#### Mean of Variables per Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group 8</th>
<th>Group 9</th>
<th>Group 10</th>
<th>Group 11</th>
<th>Group 12</th>
<th>Group 13</th>
<th>Group 14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBIB</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBRA</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBIA</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRA</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIA</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIA</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMA</td>
<td>13.50</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>-8.83</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>10.63</td>
<td>14.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>-1.12</td>
<td>-4.30</td>
<td>-5.57</td>
<td>-2.66</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>-1.18</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>-4.50</td>
<td>-2.71</td>
<td>-7.08</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>10.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSAT</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>22.43</td>
<td>21.91</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>24.36</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTSAT</td>
<td>44.75</td>
<td>42.30</td>
<td>46.57</td>
<td>47.08</td>
<td>50.16</td>
<td>49.27</td>
<td>51.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBRT</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRT</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RART</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IART</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBIT</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIT</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIT</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAIT</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>28.43</td>
<td>20.25</td>
<td>26.16</td>
<td>19.09</td>
<td>42.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix H (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Group 15</th>
<th>Group 16</th>
<th>Group 17</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RBIB</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBRA</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBIA</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRA</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIA</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIA</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMA</td>
<td>19.20</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>15.25</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMA</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
<td>-4.12</td>
<td>-2.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMA</td>
<td>16.30</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INSAT</td>
<td>27.10</td>
<td>22.72</td>
<td>27.50</td>
<td>24.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRSAT</td>
<td>24.30</td>
<td>21.00</td>
<td>26.00</td>
<td>22.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTSAT</td>
<td>51.40</td>
<td>43.72</td>
<td>53.50</td>
<td>46.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBRT</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBRT</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RART</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IART</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RBIT</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBIT</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAIT</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IAIT</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>40.70</td>
<td>18.72</td>
<td>21.87</td>
<td>24.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BMA = Ch = Change from pre to post

DMA = CIR = Change of Ideal in direction of Real

CMA = CRI = Change of Real in direction of Ideal

EXSAT = TOTSAT = Total satisfaction with course
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