1972

The Relationship between Level of Contractual Behavior and Subjects' Evaluation of Their Experience in a Contract Sensitivity Group

Harvey Hilbert Honig

Loyola University Chicago

Recommended Citation
http://ecommons.luc.edu/luc_theses/2575

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Loyola eCommons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master's Theses by an authorized administrator of Loyola eCommons. For more information, please contact ecommons@luc.edu.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 3.0 License.
Copyright © 1972 Harvey Hilbert Honig
THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LEVEL OF CONTRACTUAL BEHAVIOR AND SUBJECTS' EVALUATION OF THEIR EXPERIENCE IN A CONTRACT SENSITIVITY GROUP

by

HARVEY HONIG

A Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate School of Loyola University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the degree of Master of Arts
January, 1972
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his gratitude to Dr. Gerard Egan and Dr. John Shack for their guidance and direction in the preparation and execution of this manuscript.

He also wishes to acknowledge the valuable assistance of Mr. August Crivolio and Mrs. Judith Honig in the execution and evaluation of the research.
Life

Harvey Honig was born in Stornaway, Saskatchewan, Canada, May 14, 1938.

He received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from Concordia Senior College, Ft. Wayne, Indiana in June, 1959.

The author began his graduate studies at Loyola University in September, 1968.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey of the Literature</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Interjudge Agreement on Rating of Evaluation</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Subjects Listed by Rank Order and Assigned Groups</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Mean Rank Scores for Three Experience Groups on Three Secondary Questions</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Questions Asked of Subjects</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Semantic Rating Scale of Contract Behavior</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Basis for Tripartite Decision</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abstract

This exploratory study was designed to investigate the relationship between rated fulfillment of contract behavior and evaluation by subjects of their experience in a contract sensitivity group. Thirty-Two subjects in four groups were rated on contract behavior by other group members and themselves. They also turned in a written evaluation of their group experience. On the basis of this evaluation, the subjects were categorized by three judges into three groups: negative or neutral, positive, or very positive about the experience. The results indicated that there was a positive relationship between low ratings on contract behavior and neutral or negative evaluation of the experience. The results were discussed in terms of suggested explanations for the findings and suggestions for future research.
Introduction

This is a report of a research project and its results. However, this research does not entirely follow the classical research paradigm. There are assumptions underlying the research which cause it to diverge from that model, and thus need to be clarified.

First of all, it differs from the classical research paradigm in that it does not attempt to evaluate the major variables in terms of cause and effect. There is really no independent variable manipulated, and no dependent variable observed, but there is an examination of a relationship which I believe is interesting and important enough to warrant study and interpretation.

The rationale for this approach to personality data has been outlined by Maslow (1954). He suggests that for personality data we adopt a holistic-dynamic point of view, rather than a narrower view which has been very effective in the physical sciences, the view which he labels the general-atomistic. It is difficult to summarize his arguments without oversimplifying them, but this quotation can give an indication of Maslow's viewpoint:

It is particularly with personality data that the causality theory falls down most completely. It is easy to demonstrate that within any personality syndrome, relationship other than causal exists. That is to say, if we had to use causal
vocabulary we should have to say that every part of the syndrome is both a cause and an effect of every other part as well as of any grouping of these other parts, and that furthermore we should have to say that each part is both a cause and effect of the whole of which it is a part (p. 28, 29).

Maslow suggests the use of the concept of the syndrome, or an analysis of relationships, as more applicable to personality data. This research follows his suggestion in focusing on relationships. In speaking of therapy research, Meltzoff and Kornreich (1970) agree that research of this nature has had positive results in the initial, exploratory stages, but that more controlled research should then follow.

Secondly, instead of viewing subjectivity as something to be avoided, this research builds on subjective opinions, but also examines factors influencing subjective opinions through objective analysis. As Walker has stated (1970), there has recently been a rediscovery of the importance of the subject in research. He summarizes much of the recent research which has again led to an interest in subject variables. However, it is still unusual to ask subjects directly to express their evaluation of a procedure unless this is a part of the experimental manipulation, as in attitude research, and the experimenter is usually not interested in the evaluation per se. This is, of course, because opinions of individuals are notoriously subjective, as indicated by, for instance, popular articles on sensitivity training which utilize
"testimonial" interviews with selected participants. Many of these interviews may reflect opinions which the writer desires to express. Very few researchers, however, take an entire group of subjects and examine the variables which influence the evaluation of a process. This is one of the factors studies in this research. Although this is in some respects a departure from typical research procedure, it is a return to a method which, less systematically, was very important in the development of clinical psychology (Rychlak, 1968).

The general focus of this research is the area of sensitivity training. As Egan (1970) has stated, sensitivity training is a term widely used by many people to describe a variety of experiences. Following this usage, the term sensitivity training, as used in this study, refers to "a particular kind of laboratory learning in which personal and interpersonal issues are the direct focus of the group (p. 10)."

The specific focus of the research is the contract approach to sensitivity training, as developed and described by Egan (1970). His book explains the approach in detail, but, in essence, the contract approach to sensitivity training is one in which the members of the group mutually agree to engage in certain behaviors, such as openness, self-disclosure, positive confrontation, remaining in the here-and-now, etc., which are assumed to facilitate interpersonal growth.
The hypothesis of the study is that members who are assessed by other members of the group as fulfilling the contract more frequently will evaluate their sensitivity or laboratory experience more positively than those who are regarded as fulfilling the contract less frequently.

In addition to a study of this central hypothesis, the research will also look at the relationship between fulfillment of the contract and: (a) the report of changes in behavior as a result of the laboratory experience (b) the evaluation of the contract approach by the subject and (c) the subjects' reported attitude toward a sensitivity group before and after the experience, as reported after the experience. The hypothesis in each case is that there will be a positive relationship between ranked contract behavior and the variable under consideration. These variables will be related to the main hypothesis in the discussion section.
Egan (1970) provides a good introductory chapter outlining the background of the sensitivity group movement and placing it in the appropriate context, citing the appropriate literature. He points out that there is a fairly extensive literature on small-group laboratory learning, but this material has not yet made its way into the mainstream of psychological thinking. It is in this context that he then develops the contract group approach. An extensive general bibliography for the area is included.

Campbell and Dunnette (1968), House (1967), and others have provided recent reviews of the research in the general area of laboratory and sensitivity training. Much of the research on sensitivity training has attempted to evaluate the effectiveness of this approach. However, as in the case of therapy research, Campbell and Dunnette point out that it has been difficult to develop adequate criteria by which to measure effectiveness, and the outcomes of the studies have frequently been contaminated by uncontrolled variables which offer alternative explanations. After their survey of the research, Campbell and Dunnette recommend less focus on general studies of effectiveness and more emphasis on process and input variables. This would appear to parallel developments in therapy research, in which dissatisfaction with outcome studies led to a greater emphasis on process and
input variables (Frank, 1971).

A more recent and more complete review of the research is provided by Gibb (1970). This review is provided by one of the pioneers of the movement, and although he also is cognizant of the failure of the research to provide a clearcut verdict on the outcome of training, he understands the limitations and problems faced by researchers in this area. He states that the quantity and quality of research available is surprisingly high. As one who has himself participated in many research projects and observed the growth of a body of research, he summarizes some of the problems, such as the lack of overall direction and integration, design problems such as difficulty in obtaining adequate control groups, and problems of measurement.

Rather than evaluating outcome in global fashion, Gibb evaluates the research in terms of the six most frequently recurring objectives in the training literature; sensitivity, managing feelings, managing motivations, functional attitudes toward self, functional attitudes toward others, and interdependent behavior. He does find general support in the research for the effect of training when analyzed in terms of these variables.

Gibb also lists twelve categories of training on a continuum from therapy-related to more training-oriented groups, and cites the research applicable to each of these categories.
This section is less satisfactory in providing research results related to these categories.

The final, but important contribution of the review is a list of suggestions for practice in training and therapy deriving from the research results.

Bunker has perhaps developed the most effective method of assessing the results of sensitivity training. This approach has been somewhat equivocal in its results, although it has reported some evidence of support for the effectiveness of sensitivity training as measured by specific behavior changes reported by coworkers. In reviewing the research of Bunker and his followers, Phelan (1970) states that:

In summary, it appears that transfer of T group learning or change to the work setting does in fact occur. It occurs to a great enough extent that it is noticeable not only to the laboratory participant himself, but also to other people. It also seems to be fairly durable in many instances for a period of time of at least one year (p. 30).

More researchers recently have attempted to follow the recommendation of Campbell and Dunnette, although not necessarily as a result of their influence, and have attempted to focus on process and input variables. Friedman (1963) found that expectancies of individual members coming into the group play an important part in their evaluation of the group experience.

There are a number of studies that have attempted to focus on the effect of personal variables. Miles (1960) and
Bunker (1965) have indicated that the extent to which a person becomes involved in the group may in itself be predictive of later change. Harrison and Oshry (1965) found that people who were described prior to the group as being open to new ideas, open to the expression of feelings, and as avoiding externalizing blame for organizational problems were those who later showed the greatest change in the group and the greatest amount of application of learning.

There is little material in the literature, outside of that already cited, directly relating to the variables under study in this research. The contract group approach is still too new to have been extensively researched, although several studies are now under way. The evaluation of group experience developed by Bunker has attempted to provide ways of getting outside of the subjective evaluation of the group experience, while this research attempts to focus directly on the subjective experience of the participants.
Method

Subjects

The subjects were 32 students enrolled in a Laboratory in Interpersonal Relations, an undergraduate psychology course at Loyola University which operated as a sensitivity group. The group met twice a week for six weeks during the summer of 1970 for a total of twelve sessions, each lasting approximately three hours. Thus, there were approximately 36 hours of laboratory experience. The class was divided into four groups of seven to nine students.

Procedure

The students were all required to read a textbook written by the instructor (Egan, 1970), which presented an outline of sensitivity training, explained the contract approach, and outlined the specific modes of behavior called for by the contract. There were also three didactic lectures dealing with the same material, and students were exposed to some preliminary exercises used in sensitivity group experience. The students then met for the 36 hours of laboratory experience in the four groups. During the final session of the twelve sessions, they were administered the scale rating contract behavior (see Appendix I). Each member of the group filled out a rating sheet on the other members of his group, as well as a self-rating sheet. Thus, for each member of the group, there were approximately eight ratings of his contract behavior.
On the basis of the mean rating, each member was given a single rating score. Group means were then equalized through the use of a constant, since different anchor points were chosen by each group, and the scales supplied ordinal rather than interval data. After the groups were equalized, each of the total of 32 subjects was given a ranking from 1 to 32, with 1 as the lowest and 32 as the highest rating. After the laboratory experience was completed, each member of the class was asked to evaluate his experience by answering seven questions, devoting a short essay to each question (see Appendix II for instructions and questions). This was given as a class requirement. On the basis of these answers, the four questions of experimental interest were evaluated by three judges independently, and the subjects were categorized into groups. Group 1 included those subjects whose answers were judges as indicating a negative or neutral evaluation of their experience, Group 2 included those members who were somewhat more positive, and Group 3 included those subjects judged as very positive, or as giving specific reasons for their positive evaluation (see Appendix III for the criteria used in discriminating the subjects). The judges had no knowledge of the ratings of the subjects on contract behavior, and had no personal knowledge of the subjects or contact with them, except for one student with whom two of the judges were acquainted. Two of the judges were graduate students in clinical psychology, the other was a housewife. One student
had been through the laboratory experience and was acquainted with the literature, the other had a reading knowledge of the area, and the housewife had no personal or reading knowledge of the area. This range of exposure and experience provided an additional control factor.

This number of judges did not give enough of a range for a formal statistical test of interjudge reliability, but agreement was quite high; as Table 1 indicates.

Table 1
Interjudge Agreement on Rating of Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Ss</th>
<th>Percentage of Ss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All 3 judges agree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement of 2 out of 3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No agreement</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Ss</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was comparable agreement on the other questions. In those cases where one judge disagreed, the judgment of the other two was utilized. There was no observable difference in frequency of agreement among the three judges.
Results

In Table 2 the subjects are listed under the group to which they were assigned by the judges according to their judgment of how the subjects evaluated their group experience. The number according to which each subject is listed is the rank order from 1 to 32 on contract behavior, with 1 being the subject ranked lowest by other group members, and 32 being the subject ranked highest. Below each group is the total number and mean ranking of all subjects in each group.

Table 2

Subjects Listed by Rank Order and Assigned Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group 1 (Negative or Neutral)</th>
<th>Group 2 (Positive)</th>
<th>Group 3 (Very Positive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ss 4, 3, 2, 1, 5, 12.</td>
<td>Ss 14, 11, 29,</td>
<td>Ss 26, 6, 8,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 6</td>
<td>32, 10, 20,</td>
<td>16, 23, 13,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M = 4.5</td>
<td>30, 25, 7,</td>
<td>31, 27, 24,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15, 19, 22,</td>
<td>28.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9, 18, 21,</td>
<td>N = 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H = 15, p. &lt; .001</td>
<td>17.</td>
<td>M = 20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N = 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M = 19.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship between rank order on the contract behavior scale and the quality of experience category assigned by the judges was calculated by means of the Kruskal-Wallis One...
Way Analysis of Variance. Siegel (1956) explains the rationale underlying this analysis, and suggests it as the procedure used when comparing groups using ordinal data. The analysis performed indicates that the groups are not from the same population ($H = 15$, $p. < .001$), and supports the hypothesis that subjects rated higher in contract behavior by other members of the group rate their experience more positively than subjects rated low on contract behavior. A comparison of the group means indicates that the difference lies between Group 1 and combined Groups 2 and 3, simply on the basis of inspection, and that there is no significant difference between Groups 2 and 3. In viewing the table, it can be observed that the five subjects ranked lowest in contract behavior were all categorized in Group 1 by the judges.

On the other three questions which the subjects were asked to evaluate (questions 1, 5, and 6, in Appendix I), none of the groups were significantly different, although there were progressive increases on the mean ratings from Group 1 to Group 3 on each of the three questions. Table 3 reports the mean rank scores for each of the three groups for these three questions, and gives the $H$ scores calculated according to the Kruskal-Wallis Analysis of Variance.
### Table 3
Mean Rank Scores for 3 Experience Groups on 3 Secondary Questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question 1 (Change)</th>
<th>Question 5 (Contract)</th>
<th>Question 6 (Attitude)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=6, M=13.5</td>
<td>N=7, M=13</td>
<td>N=7, M=11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=12, M=14.6</td>
<td>N=16, M=16.7</td>
<td>N=13, M=17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=14, M=19.4</td>
<td>N=9, M=18.8</td>
<td>N=12, M=18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H=1.4, n.s.</td>
<td>H=.95, n.s.</td>
<td>H=2.14, n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, all three of these questions appear to show some relationship to the variable of rated contract behavior, but it is not significant enough in any of the cases to eliminate the possibility of chance variability.
Discussion

The most obvious statement to be made on the basis of the results reported is that people who are rated low on contract behavior in a contract sensitivity group tend to evaluate their experience significantly less positively than those who are rated higher on contract behavior. Thus, the hypothesis of the study was supported. The obverse of this statement also holds true, perhaps more accurately, that people who describe their experience of a contract sensitivity group in neutral or negative terms tend to be those members of the group who are viewed by other members of the group as those who have complied least successfully with behaviors called for by the contract.

The fact that the results can be stated in this manner again emphasizes that they cannot be interpreted meaningfully in terms of a cause-effect relationship. As stated in the introduction, however, this research is viewed in holistic-dynamic rather than cause-effect terms.

If the purpose of this research would have been primarily theoretical, this would be a serious deficiency. However, in clinical research the concern is with practical relationships as well as cause-effect relationships. It is important to simply observe that in conducting contract sensitivity groups this relationship obtains. Thus, prospective group members can be told with a high degree of statistical probability that they are more likely to evaluate the group
experience as satisfactory if they live up to the terms of the contract. What is likely to happen can be stated, although not definitely why it happens.

This research would also appear to offer some support for the effectiveness of contract behavior, although this cannot be stated as conclusively. It would appear that the contract is at least somehow tied to or related to the way group members perceive their experience, and thus that it might be concluded a contract does make some difference.

After these statements are made, the question of why this relationship obtains is still important, and must be asked, even though it cannot be answered definitively.

On the first level of interpretation, the most likely reason for the lesser satisfaction expressed by those rated low in contract behavior is that the rewards of the group experience were not as great or as immediate for them. This in turn raises the question of why not engaging in contract behavior made the experience less satisfactory for them.

One likely hypothesis, fitting in with learning theory and supported by the work of Lazarus (1966) with his groups, is that people who were rated high in contract behavior were positively reinforced by the other members of the group for engaging in behavior called for by the contract. The group experience would, in this view, be seen as an operant situation, and in keeping with studies of operant conditioning, those who
engaged in behavior that was reinforced found the activity more satisfying. Conversely, those who did not engage as frequently in behavior called for by the contract were not reinforced as frequently by other group members, and therefore found the experience less satisfying. If this explanation is valid, it would also be assumed that the behaviors which were reinforced by other members of the group were learned by these members, at least in the specific situation. According to this view, one advantage of the contract would be to give high visibility to those behaviors that are to be reinforced by the group, and increase the likelihood that other members would reinforce those behaviors when they are performed.

An alternative explanation, based on cognitive dissonance theory, would be that those members of the group rated low on contract behavior simply invested less of themselves in the sensitivity group experience, and therefore did not need to structure the experience cognitively in a more positive light to justify their investment. Conversely, this explanation would suggest that those rated high in contract behavior invested more of themselves, and had a greater need to justify the effort cognitively, thus needing to evaluate the experience more positively.

It cannot be stated on the basis of this research in what way the two explanations may be operative, or even whether either of them applies. Perhaps both factors are the variance,
or there may be some kind of interactional effect. However, if the difference in evaluation was due to a need to justify the investment, the literature on dissonance would suggest that this would also affect the evaluation of the contract group approach.

The answers to the question about the contract group approach would suggest that although cognitive dissonance may account for some of the difference in attitudes toward the experience, the relationship does not account for all of the variance, since there is much less difference between the groups on this question. Also, since the evaluation expresses an attitude, the literature on attitude formation would apply. We can ask which of these two explanations has received the most support in other studies on attitude formation. The survey by Kiesler, Collins, and Miller (1969) indicates that both theories have received experimental support, but would tend to give greater weight to the explanation based on learning theory.

An additional alternative explanation to be considered is the possibility that members who were rated less positively on contract behavior were less oriented toward other people. In other words, instead of their more negative or neutral evaluation of the group experience being a result of their failure to engage in behaviors called for by the contract, both factors could be considered a result of a prior, subject-related variable. This interpretation could also be evaluated with additional research which would divide the subjects on such group vs. individual
dimensions as the intraversion-extraversion or social desirability scales, and examine the relationship between these dimensions and the evaluation of the group experience.

In discussing the results of the other essays tabulated in the results section, the answers to the question about change indicate that while there was a significant relationship between evaluation of the experience and rating of contract behavior, there was not a significant relationship between self-observed changes in behavior and rating of contract behavior. This may mean that the learning that took place in the group has not yet carried over into daily life to the same extent as it did in the laboratory situation. The essays seem to support this, although at this point this is simply an impression rather than the results of objective ratings. However, many students stated that although new ways of behaving learned in the group were possible within the group setting, they were more difficult to carry out in the campus or home situation, where prior behavior patterns had been established. At the same time, there was a positive, linear relationship, although it was well below the level of significance, and there may be a lag between adoption of new attitudes and their effect on new behaviors.

Another possible explanation, or partial explanation, is suggested by the curvilinear shape of the ratings in the group judged lowest in reported change scores. In this group there is a tendency for both the members ranked lowest in
contract behavior and those ranked highest in contract behavior to be included. This could suggest that those ranked lowest in contract behavior failed to note change because there was little learning from the experience, while those from the top of the rating scale failed to note extensive change because they were already behaving in ways consonant with the behaviors called for by the contract. Again, some impressionistic support for this is given by the essays, but additional research on larger numbers of members taken from the low and high end of the spectrum could be done to see if this relationship holds up consistently and could be rated objectively.

In regard to the answers to the evaluation of the contract approach, in addition to the fact that they diminish the likelihood that cognitive dissonance accounts for all of the variance in evaluation, they also indicate that the students are operating within an existentialist orientation, in which the nature of the experience itself is more important than theoretical concerns. This may be in part a result of the group attitudes encouraged by this type of learning, in which experience is stressed over cognitive or theoretical values.

In regard to the attitude scores, these are, of course, tentative results because they are not before and after scores, but attitudes recalled after the experience. They tend, nevertheless, to indicate that students approach the experience with more skepticism than the population as a whole. In the
light of the findings of Friedman (1963), this could suggest that students are more resistant subjects, and derive less benefit. The studies of McGuire (Kiesler et al., 1969) might suggest that since many of the students appeared to change their attitudes and overcame initial resistance, the change in this group, although delayed, might be more permanent and more effective. Many of the students appeared from the essays to learn more confidence in their own subjective evaluation. This, again, could be a fruitful area for research - to study those students who report initial resistance to the experience and subsequent positive evaluation and follow it up over a period of time to find out if delayed learning occurs more frequently than with a control group.

Another follow-up study suggested by this research would be to follow Phelan's (1970) attempt to study reported transfer of learning, but instead of comparing group members with a control group, to compare those rated high and low on contract behavior on the basis of changes reported by others at intervals after the conclusion of the group experience.

The above comments underscore the lack of explanatory neatness of lack of closure inherent in this type of exploratory research. It is difficult to make definitive statements isolating a single factor as the one relevant variable. Although this is a handicap as far as theoretical neatness and scientific exactitude is concerned, perhaps is truer to the demands of
research at this stage for this area of study, and more true to the existential situation, in which it is more probable that several variables are interacting. It may be more important for our knowledge at this stage to observe the interaction of these variables than to isolate them, although the research must not stop at this stage. Meltzoff and Kornreich (1970) report this kind of progression in therapy research, from exploratory to more controlled studies, and regard each of these approaches as valid within their context. This research provides some of the exploratory data which suggests attitudes to current practice and offers suggestions for more controlled research.
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APPENDIX I
Now that the formal group experience has ended, you are asked to evaluate what has taken place. Please write a paper by answering the following questions. You do not have to answer them at great length, but please take as much space as you need to give an adequate answer. Please answer all the questions, and please number the questions as you answer them. If you have remarks that do not fit into any of the categories, please list these remarks at the end.

You will also be given sheets on which you are asked to rate your fellow group members. These ratings are for an essential research project. Please do not look upon this task as your being forced to judge (in a quite negative way) people you have come to love. You may best serve their interests by being as honest as possible in your ratings. These ratings will be seen only by the research team. None of them knows who you are. Please put your name on both the questions and on the ratings so that these can all be integrated.

Thanks very much for your cooperation.

Please evaluate your experience by answering the following questions:

1. Do you feel changed in yourself or in your relations to others? If so, what has changed?

2. Was your experience positive, negative, or neutral? Why?

3. How could your experience have been better--both on your part and on the part of others.

4. How do you feel you lived up to the contract?

5. How do you feel about the contract in general--e.g., entering an experience structured by such a contract. What did you like and not like about it?

6. To the best of your ability try to discuss what your attitude towards this type of experience was before you came to the group. Discuss how you feel about such a group experience now.

7. Do you feel that others in the group got more or less from the group experience than you did.

Thanks again.
Please circle the appropriate number on the following scales:

1. To what extent did you take an active part in the group rather than just observe passively?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   very little  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

2. To what extent did you try new ways of behaving or expressing yourself?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   very little  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

3. To what extent were you open about yourself and engage in some kind of self-disclosure?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   very little  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

4. To what extent did you try to get at other persons' messages rather than just hearing their words?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   very little  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

5. To what extent did you use language as an honest expression of yourself rather than engage in cliches?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   very little  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10

6. To what extent did you openly and honestly express your feelings rather than just talk about ideas?

   1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
   very little  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10
7. To what extent did you speak directly to individuals rather than to people in general?

| Very little | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Very much | 10 |

8. To what extent did you speak about the present rather than about the past or future?

| Very little | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Very much | 10 |

9. To what extent did you confront others and invite them to self-examination?

| Very little | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Very much | 10 |

10. To what extent did you respond growthfully and positively to criticism or confrontation rather than being defensive or resentful about it?

| Very little | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Very much | 10 |

11. To what extent did you give support and acceptance to others?

| Very little | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Very much | 10 |

12. To what extent did you respond positively to the support and acceptance of others?

| Very little | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | Very much | 10 |
13. To what extent were you your real self rather than artificial or put-on?

\[
\begin{array}{cccccccccc}
1 \quad & 2 \quad & 3 \quad & 4 \quad & 5 \quad & 6 \quad & 7 \quad & 8 \quad & 9 \quad & 10 \\
\text{very little} & & & & & & & \text{very much} \\
\end{array}
\]

NAME ____________________________

DATE ________________
APPENDIX III
Basis for Tripartite Decision

A. Do you feel changed
1. Little negative, neutral, mildly positive without specifying
2. Somewhat positive to very positive, but with no concrete elaborations. Distinguish between glowing reports and those that sound sincere, concrete. Not much change because already like wanted to be
3. Feel definite change, specified in concrete ways, having important effects on life. Impression of genuine conviction.

B. Evaluation of experience
1. Negative, neutral, faint praise
2. Somewhat positive to very positive, but rather general, superficial
3. Positive to very positive, with definite reasons for positive evaluation, some evidence of thoughtfulness in writing the evaluation

C. Evaluation of contract
1. Negative, neutral, faint praise
2. Somewhat positive to very positive--general terms--little thought
3. Positive to very positive, specific ways in which contract helped, impression of thoughtfulness in writing the evaluation

D. Attitude
1. Negative, neutral, mildly positive before and after. Positive before, negative or neutral after
2. Positive before, positive after
3. Negative or neutral, mildly positive before, positive after
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