HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING FOR CONFINED DELINQUENTS

R. Washburn, 1968

Published on demand by
UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS
Xerox University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Michigan, U.S.A.
University Microfilms Limited, High Wycombe, England

This is an authorized facsimile
and was produced by microfilm-xerography
in 1975 by
Xerox University Microfilms,
Ann Arbor, Michigan,
U.S.A.

THESIS

HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING FOR CONFINED DELINQUENTS

Submitted by

Richard Wallace Washburn

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

August, 1968

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

July 26, 19 68

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER OUR SUPERVISION BY Richard Wallace Washburn

ENTITLED Human Relations Training for Confined Delinquents

BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF Doctor of Philosophy.

Committee on Graduate Work

Douglas Gyogren — Glenn B. Cockerton

Robert W. Titley

Frank Wright — Wayne Vinsel

Adviser — Head of Department

Examination Satisfactory

Committee on Final Examination

Douglas Gyogren

Robert W. Titley

Glenn B. Cockerton — Frank Wright

Adviser

Permission to publish this thesis or any part of it must be obtained from the Dean of the Graduate School

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

HUMAN RELATIONS TRAINING FOR CONFINED DELINQUENTS

The present experiment was conducted to determine if human relations training techniques could be used to circumvent the resistance of delinquents to therapeutic treatment. The experimental treatment consisted of a one-week, instrumented, residential human relations training laboratory, specially constructed for use with confined male delinquents. The experimental Ss were compared with paired control Ss who spent an amount of time equivalent to the laboratory experience in a more conventional form of group counseling.

Hypothesis 1. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater decrease in antisocial interpretations given to social situations depicted by selected TAT cards than will conventional group counseling.

Hypothesis 2. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater improvement in interpersonal relationships with institution personnel and other boys as measured by a specially devised rating scale than will conventional counseling.

Hypothesis 3. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater improvement in attitudes related to

accessibility to group psychotherapy as measured by a self-report questionnaire than will conventional group counseling.

Hypothesis 4. Human relations training will result in more satisfactory participation in conventional group counseling as measured by a rating of transcribed counseling sessions than will an equivalent amount of time spent in conventional group counseling.

Only Hypothesis 1 was supported by the results of the analyses. These results appeared to be related to an increase in guardedness for the experimental Ss after the experimental treatment. Selected laboratory subgroup sessions received higher ratings than the pretreatment and post treatment counseling sessions for the experimental and control subgroups, suggesting that the experimental treatment was effective within the immediate setting of the laboratory.

Informal observations indicated that many Ss became involved in the project of setting up a cottage government and established relationships with the laboratory staff. Suggestions for further research and the practical use of human relations training with delinquents stressed the careful programming of concrete and social reinforcements.

Richard Wallace Washburn
Psychology Department
Colorado State University
Fort Collins, Colorado, 80521
August, 1968

Acknowledgements

I wish to thank the many people whose help and cooperation made this research possible. I am particularly grateful to Dr. Francis J. Vingoe, committee chairman, for his guidance during all phases of the experiment and to committee members Dr. Robert W. Titley, Dr. Douglas D. Sjogren, Dr. Burns B. Crookston, and Dr. Claude W. Gatewood for their many helpful suggestions.

I also wish to thank the staff of Lookout Mountain School for Boys: Mr. Malcolm Geddis, Director of LMSB, for allowing the study to be conducted at his institution; Mr. K. N. Jaitly, Director of Special Services, for arranging permission for the study; and Mr. William Graves, Group Life Supervisor, for making personnel and facilities available. Dr. Frank A. Knotts, psychological consultant to the school, deserves special thanks for his help in training the counselors.

Additional thanks should go to Mr. Leonard J. Donk and Mr. Max R. Uhlemann for their imaginative assistance in conducting the human relations laboratory and to my wife, Carrie, for her patient understanding while this research was in progress.

Table of Contents

Chapter | Page

List of Tables

Chapter I

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this research was to explore the application of human relations training techniques to the treatment of confined adolescent delinquents. The study was designed to test several hypotheses related to therapeutic change and to yield informal data concerning the effectiveness of various aspects of a residential, instrumented human relations laboratory.

Review of the Literature

Need for a New Approach to the Treatment of Delinquents

A recent analysis of a sample of investigations of correctional treatment and outcome (Bailey, 1960) demonstrated the need for further research in the treatment of delinquents. One hundred investigations, restricted to those based upon empirical data and involving the manipulation of interpersonal relations, were systematically selected as representative of the field of correctional research between 1940 and 1960. The analysis revealed that only 37% of the investigations in the sample demonstrated statistically significant improvement in the behavior of delinquents and that only 22% of the total sample utilized rigorous experimental controls. Bailey speculated that if a critical

evaluation were made of the experimental designs and statistical procedures used in the apparently successful treatment studies, the success rate would be even lower. Although few of the studies were explicitly based upon a theory of behavior, more of the investigations seemed to favor a "sickness" model of behavior disturbance to the relative neglect of group relations theory. According to the sickness model, delinquent behavior is a symptom of some underlying psychopathology and treatment does not involve, to any large extent, a consideration of social factors such as group identification or attitudes and values learned in interpersonal relationships. Bailey's conclusion is that evidence supporting the efficacy of correctional treatment is slight, inconsistent, and of questionable reliability. He does find encouragement, however, in the growing efforts to more explicitly relate treatment practice to behavioral science theory.

Bennis (1960), however, comments on the lack of application of small group research results to research in group psychotherapy. Chwast, Harari, and Delany (1961) remark that there is a paucity of data about the delinquent in the treatment situation, and they emphasize the need for empirical observation and systematic validation of experimental treatments.

Group and Social Factors in Delinquency

In several recent articles (Bryant, Dobbins, and Bass, 1963; McDavid and McCandless, 1962; Smith and Bassin, 1961) it is suggested that because delinquency is founded in social learning and development, and in view of the strong influence wielded by adolescent peer groups, the use of group therapy may have special advantages with delinquents. Even relatively short term group therapy may have some effect according to Chwast et al. (1961), Feder (1964), and Wolk and Reid (1964). Group meetings alone, however, do not seem to be a completely satisfactory solution to the problem of involving delinquents in treatment unless special provisions are made to deal with the delinquents' resistance to treatment.

Resistance

Resistance to treatment and negative transference (attitudes) toward the therapist and others in positions of authority are the most frequently mentioned problems encountered in group and individual counseling or psychotherapy with delinquent adolescents (Chwast et al., 1961; Gadpaille, 1959; Schwitzgebel, 1960; Slack, 1960; Slavson, 1965). According to Slavson (1965) and Gadpaille (1959), delinquents typically find it difficult to enter into close, warm relationships with adults in authority roles because

strong, pervasive feelings of inadequacy engender rigid defenses against seeking help and examining motives and feelings. Delinquents employ counterphobic attitudes of omnipotence in which they project blame upon persons and conditions in the environment in order to maintain their illusions of strength and adequacy. Efforts to examine feelings, attitudes, or conduct are perceived as criticism or disapproval.

The delinquent's inability to deal with his dependency needs has been postulated as a factor in delinquent behavior by Lenrow (1966) and Bandura and Walters (1959). Anti-social aggression occurs when dependency needs are aroused but cannot be expressed because the individual would feel vulnerable to rejection by others. A delinquent may solve this problem by meeting his dependency needs through membership in a gang whose aggressive activities serve to deny dependency. As a result of these defenses against feelings of dependency and inadequacy, much therapy time is initially spent dealing with resistive maneuvers such as testing the sincerity of the therapist.

The delinquent's generally lower-class cultural background is also an impediment to treatment (Slack, 1960). His unfamiliarity with doctors, psychotherapy, and commonly

recognized relationships between mental processes and behavior makes it difficult for him to identify with his therapist. Moreover, he is reluctant to invest himself in a process which he does not understand and which involves long-range, intangible goals. The delinquent also demonstrates poor capacity for understanding abstract concepts, low frustration tolerance, and little capacity for delay of gratification (Chwast, et al., 1961). He also finds it difficult to associate feelings with resulting actions (Silver, 1963). The crucial problem, then, seems to be one of motivation, involving the delinquent in a therapeutic relationship and keeping him in it despite both expressed and unconscious resistance. If somehow these negative attitudes toward the therapist and psychotherapeutic treatment could be circumvented until the delinquent becomes more familiar with psychological concepts, experiences some reward in understanding his behavior, and feels more adequate in dealing with his feelings, one would expect much less resistance to psychotherapeutic procedures.

Experimenter-Subject Psychotherapy

A radically new approach to the problem of resistance has been to abandon the conventional patient-therapist relationship and, instead, to hire the delinquent to participate as a subject in a self-exploration experiment

(Schwitzgebel, 1960; Slack, 1960). The delinquent is under no obligation to accept help and merely agrees to talk about himself as a part of his job and he may quit at any time. Although the role of the therapist is that of an experimenter, it does not prevent him from suggesting that the subject may get more benefits than money from participation in the experiment. Preliminary results with this technique indicate that positive relationships develop between the delinquent and the experimenter.

A similar technique devised by Stollak and Guerney (1964) suggests that attitudes toward therapists and psychotherapy may be changed without the use of reinforcement or the presence of the therapist. Delinquents were told only that they were participating in an experiment and were left alone in a room containing a tape recorder with the instructions to talk about themselves. Although they were given no concrete or verbal reinforcement for their participation, ten out of twelve subjects cooperated and developed positive attitudes toward the experimenter.

The element common to the techniques used by Slack (1960) and Stollak and Guerney (1964) appears to be an approach in which the delinquent is not forced into the role of a patient but is given instead an opportunity to

learn about himself and develop some degree of psychological sophistocation under nondemanding conditions. There is no explicit or implicit demand by the therapist that the delinquent admit that he needs help or that he reveal significant things about himself until he desires to do so. Consequently the delinquent is less likely to react with negative attitudes. The changes in behavior and attitudes reported by these studies need further verification, however, because of the small number of subjects used and the lack of formal measures of change.

Human Relations Training

Human relations training incorporates a number of principles which underlie the "experimenter-subject" forms of therapy outlined in the previous section and for this reason holds a great deal of promise for application to delinquent groups. Although not identical to psychotherapy, it is designed to produce some of the same changes in behavior and attitudes (Frank, 1964).

Participants in the training laboratories or workshops, as they are called, meet in small groups to study the process of their group's development and their own relationships to others in the group (Miles, 1960). This primary focus on group functioning is helpful in groups which are

initially unable or unwilling to discuss their own personal problems, feelings and attitudes (Bettis, Malamud, and Malamud, 1960). Once the participants are involved in the study of group process, however, a number of sub-goals are introduced which are concerned with changes in personal behavior and attitudes. The laboratory program is so arranged that these personal goals must be reached before the larger goal of understanding group process can be achieved. Bennis (1964) lists four important goals which are promoted by laboratory training:

Expanded consciousness and recognition of choice. Training laboratory participants are confronted with problems which cannot be solved by precedents, dependence upon authority, or traditional role patterns. The emphasis on awareness, sensitivity, and diagnosing interpersonal situations encourages the participant to think about his behavior and how he chooses to behave.

A spirit of inquiry. The laboratory promotes a scientific attitude of inquiry designed to expand the range of curiosity and experimental attitude to people and behavior.

Authenticity in interpersonal relations. Group development involves overcoming obstacles to clear, undistorted

communications through the communication of feelings and the evocation of valid feelings from others.

A collaborative conception of the authority relationship. Learning is accomplished through the requirements of the situation and is a collaborative venture between the trainer and participants.

These four goals identify two especially potent factors in overcoming resistance to change: (1) problems which cannot be solved without trying new behaviors rather than authoritative directives; and (2) the conception of authority as an agent which fosters and supports independence and responsibility. In effect, there is very little to oppose in either staff behavior or the requirement placed upon the participants.

The entire laboratory experience is designed to create a readiness for feedback under the assumption that ineffective social behavior can persist because an individual is unaware of its consequences or unwilling to recognize its consequences. The laboratory creates an opportunity for the individual to become aware of the effects of his behavior upon others by explicitly promoting an atmosphere of frankness. It is further assumed that when people feel

safe, liked, and respected, they will be willing to learn about their behavior and to try new ways of behaving (Rothaus and Johnson, 1963).

Lakin and Carson (1966) point out that laboratory training effects changes in attitudes in at least two ways: (1) by indirectly removing support for a pre-existing attitude; and (2) by generating discussion that leads to clearer and different conceptions of attitudes through group influences. In effect, the group sets up new norms and standards of frankness and self-disclosure. The individual's desire for approval from his peers may result in experimentation with self-disclosure with consequent interpersonal reward.

Comparison with Group Psychotherapy

Several basic differences between human relations training and group psychotherapy have important implications for the application of human relations training to adolescent delinquents. Human relations training is predominantly concerned with only those behaviors and attitudes which are manifested during the laboratory. This exclusive focus on here-and-now behavior stands in contrast to the exploration of past experiences and abstract concepts typical of conventional group therapy (Frank, 1964).

Horwitz (1964) points out that the human relations group is less concerned with transference feelings than the traditional therapy group. This seems to be a function of the roles given to group members and the trainer. In the laboratory setting a definite effort is made to avoid casting members and trainer into the role of patients and therapist (Frank, 1964). The labels of "training" and "laboratory" or "workshop" serve to emphasize that the participant is a learner rather than a patient. The trainer is an active participant who serves as a model of openness, demonstrating the freedom to express situationally produced feelings of discomfort, uncertainty, and helplessness. The trainer's activities, in effect, serve to reduce the distinction between leader and group member, and this results in less preoccupation with the trainer.

Investigations of the outcome of human relations training have indicated that it is neither more nor less effective than psychotherapy (Lakin and Carson, 1966).

Instrumented Human Relations Laboratories

A variation of human relations training which has extended its usefulness is the instrumented laboratory (Shepard, 1964; Morton, 1965; Rothaus et al., 1963). The instrumented laboratory makes extensive use of measuring

instruments such as rating scales to facilitate learning by directing the progress of the laboratory's development. The trainer meets periodically with all participants in a single group to provide orientation to each phase of the laboratory, to introduce and elaborate the concepts upon which the instruments are based, and to give instruction in methods of analyzing and interpreting data. The trainer may also serve as a consultant to training groups in the laboratory but ordinarily does not become directly involved in the decision-making process.

Many of the rating scales used in the laboratory are polar, with the high end of the scale implying or describing some desirable state of affairs. The participants use these scales to measure the progress and the behavior of their training groups at the end of many of their group meetings. Scores on the instruments are computed, discussed by the group, and posted on wall charts so that progress and change can be traced. The extensive use of behavior rating scales not only fosters an experimental atmosphere but develops skill and interest in observing the behavior of one's self and the behavior of others. Lecturettes are also used to present information concerning the instruments and important concepts or to clarify the nature of dynamics

occurring in group behavior at that time. Each day's activity is designed to provide learning experiences and concepts which can be used and amplified during subsequent meetings. Special activities such as role-playing salient aspects of group process are used to illustrate important characteristics of group functioning.

A dilemma-invention-feedback-generalization theory of learning underlies the organization of the laboratory (Morton, 1965). Small dilemmas are created by the laboratory staff such as delegating to the participants the responsibility for organizing the group's agenda. Dilemmas created by the groups in their attempts to cope with these unstructured situations follow naturally and provide the content for the group meetings and lecturettes. When habitual behavior patterns prove to be ineffective in meeting the demands of the dilemma situations, the participants are encouraged to experiment with their own behavior. The feedback concerning the effectiveness of the participants' old or new behavior is supplied by the other participants through their comments and behavior scale ratings. The close relationship between feedback and observable behavior provides a strong impetus for behavior change.

Morton (1965) and Rothaus et al. (1963) used instrumented laboratories with hospitalized psychiatric patients

and found that even a relatively chronic patient could assume the role of learner and take responsibility for his behavior. They also found the training to be effective with patients possessing only a fourth grade education.

Human Relations Training as a Preparation for Psychotherapy

Malamud and Machover (1965) have used a form of human relations training to prepare patients on a waiting list for psychotherapy to participate in group treatment. Malamud (1958) reports that a large number of the patients enter group psychotherapy after the training program and that few drop out. His research, however, included no control groups without training so definite conclusions cannot be drawn.

Derivation of Hypotheses

No research to date has utilized a human relations training approach as a means of preparing delinquent adolescents for psychotherapy or counseling. The justification for such an application in the present experiment was based upon the assumption that this treatment would circumvent resistance to attitude and behavior change. The characteristics of human relations training which were expected to minimize resistance were the following:

1. An initial treatment focus on group process generated by the task of setting up a group government, followed by a gradual shift in emphasis to a concern with behavior and attitude change.

2. An experimental setting and experimenter-subject relationship rather than conventional psychotherapeutic relationships.

3. A minimum of authoritative restrictions combined with the encouragement of independent behavior and responsibility for the group's behavior.

4. A utilization of peer pressure as the impetus for behavior change.

5. A focus on increasing social competence in immediate and concrete situations.

6. A utilization of lecturettes, rating scales, progress charts, and explicit verbal feedback.

A special one-week, residential human relations training laboratory was designed to incorporate these procedures into an intensive treatment experience. It was anticipated that the amount of cooperation and interest shown by the participants in the laboratory would have to be evaluated, to some extent, through the observations of the investigator. There were, however, a number of specific hypotheses which

could be formulated and tested to determine the effectiveness of human relations training techniques in promoting changes in the attitudes and behavior of confined delinquents. The hypotheses involve a comparison of the effect of the laboratory experience on the participants with the effect of a more conventional form of counseling on a comparable group of boys. In the present experiment, conventional group counseling was defined as a group of boys meeting once a week or more, with a counselor identified and acknowledged as the group leader, for the purpose of gaining a better understanding of their own behavior, both inside and outside the institution.

The human relations training laboratory was expected to be instrumental in effecting a change in the participants' attitudes toward social situations. As a result of gratifying interpersonal relationships during the training, the participants were expected to view social situations as involving less antisocial activity than before the training. The specific skills learned during the training program were also expected to generalize to other interpersonal situations and to improve relationships with institutional personnel and other boys outside the human relations workshop. It was anticipated that these skills would also generalize to other group counseling situations and increase

the effectiveness of participation in these groups. The generalization effect would be aided by the development of more favorable attitudes toward group therapeutic treatment as a result of rewarding experiences involving therapeutic change during the human relations laboratory. The following hypotheses were constructed to aid in testing the effectiveness of human relations techniques in promoting changes in behavior in several areas:

Attitudes toward Social Situations

Hypothesis 1. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater decrease in antisocial interpretations given to social situations depicted by selected TAT cards than will conventional group counseling.

Interpersonal Relationships

Hypothesis 2. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater improvement in interpersonal relationships with institution personnel and other boys as measured by a specially devised rating scale than will conventional counseling.

Accessibility to Group Psychotherapy

Hypothesis 3. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater improvement in attitudes related

to accessibility to group psychotherapy as measured by a self-report questionnaire than will conventional group counseling.

Facilitating Entry into Group Counseling

Hypothesis 4. Human relations training will result in more satisfactory participation in conventional group counseling as measured by a rating of transcribed counseling sessions than will an equivalent amount of time spent in conventional group counseling.

Chapter II

Method

Location of Experiment and Population

The experiment was conducted at the Lookout Mountain School for Boys (LMSB), located in Golden, Colorado. At the present time LMSB has approximately two hundred boys, eleven through eighteen years of age, who have been found delinquent by the courts. Most of the boys are committed for one or more offenses such as burglary, theft, shoplifting, car theft, joyriding, running away, and incorrigibility. Incarceration in LMSB is the first relatively long-term imprisonment most of the boys have experienced although some may have spent short periods of time in juvenile hall or local jails.

The boys participate in a program of work assignments along with vocational and educational training and live in cottages or dormitories, each containing about twenty-six boys. The living units are supervised from 4:00 p.m. to 8:00 a.m. by cottage counselors. However, only a few of these counselors, if any, have had any formal training in counseling and any informal counseling done by these men is voluntary.

The treatment staff consists of one part-time Ph.D. psychologist and one part-time psychiatrist who treat boys

undergoing a crisis and evaluate boys with special problems. The psychologist also conducts group counseling with incoming boys during their two- to three-week stay in the reception-orientation cottage. During this orientation program each boy is seen in group counseling for an average of about four meetings which, for the most part, deal with the initial problems of adjusting to the institution. The boys in the institution at large are also seen irregularly by their case workers and parole officers, primarily to deal with problems of adjustment and release.

Schedule of Testing and Treatment

The experiment, including the special training program for the institution's trainees who served as group counselors, was conducted over a fourteen-week period during the spring and summer of 1967. Table 1 shows the schedule of testing and treatment for the experimental and control groups. Also noted in the table are those points in the time schedule where important deviations in the procedure were necessary.

The first three weeks of the experiment were devoted to a training program for the counselor trainees. During week four the Ss were selected and pretreatment assessment was carried out, including the tape-recorded counseling

Table 1

Schedule of Testing and Treatment

Week	Activity	
1 - 3	Counselor Training Program	
4	Selection of Subjects and Pretreatment Assessment	
	Experimental Groups	Control Groups
5	Human Relations Laboratory	Control Counseling Sessions
6 - 7	Post Treatment Assessment	Control Counseling Sessions
8 -13	.....	Control Counseling Sessions Continued with One Counselor and Alternates
14	.....	Post Treatment Assessment

sessions. The experimental Ss spent week five in the human relations laboratory and during weeks six and seven the post treatment assessment procedure was carried out on this group only. The participation of the experimental Ss in the study ended at this time. The counseling sessions for the control groups began week five and continued until week thirteen. Note that from week eight to the end of the control counseling sessions, only one counselor met with each control subgroup and this was sometimes the alternate counselor. During week fourteen the post treatment assessment procedure was carried out with the control Ss.

Subjects

The forty-eight Ss participating in the study were among seventy residents of LMSB selected by the assistant supervisor of group life. He was instructed to select those boys between the ages of fourteen and sixteen whose period of confinement would insure their availability for the two- to three-month duration of the study. Because of the exploratory nature of the experiment and the elaborate arrangements needed for the experimental group, he was specifically instructed to exclude any boy who presented an exceptionally bad behavior problem.

The boys selected by the supervisor were then screened for intelligence level, reading level, and ability to write comprehensibly. Raven Progressive Matrices (Raven, 1958) scores and Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT) (Jastak, 1946) reading scores obtained by the institution's school were used for this purpose. Boys were accepted for the experiment if they met either one of the minimum requirements of an IQ of 80 or a reading level of 4.0, providing that they met the additional requirement of being able to make up a sentence and write it comprehensibly. This second requirement was included to eliminate those Ss without sufficient verbal ability to profit from counseling activities requiring written instructions.

The WRAT reading scores were judged to be the more valid and reliable indication of the Ss' general verbal ability and for this reason were used as the primary basis for assigning the Ss to the various experimental and control groups. The Ss were rank-ordered by reading level with rank order determined by IQ scores for those Ss with identical reading levels. Next the Ss were alternately assigned to each of two groups with minor adjustments being made by interchanging Ss so that each group had approximately the same mean IQ and reading level. One group was randomly

assigned to the experimental condition designated by the letter G, the other to the control treatment W. The groups were referred to by these arbitrary letters to mask the nature of the treatment assigned to each group. The Ss in both of these groups were then separately rank-ordered again by the same procedure and assigned alternately to each of six subgroups--GA, GB, GC, and WA, WB, and WC (three subgroups in each treatment condition). Again, minor adjustments were made so that each of the six subgroup pairs had approximately the same mean IQ and reading level. The treatment blocks were divided into these smaller subgroups, each containing eight members to facilitate the administration of the control and experimental treatments. Table 2 presents the mean and variance of the age, IQ, reading level, and length of incarceration for the various experimental and control subgroups. There was no significant difference between the means and variances of any of the groups with regard to any of the variables.

Counselor Training

Group counseling with the Ss was conducted during various phases of the experiment by six cottage counselor trainees at LMSB. Prior to entering the personnel training program at LMSB, none of these trainees had had any formal training or experience in psychological counseling.

Table 2

Mean and S.D. of the Age, IQ, Reading Level, and Length of Incarceration for the Experimental and Control Groups

Treatment Group	N	Age Mean	Age S.D.	IQ Mean	IQ S.D.	Reading Level Mean	Reading Level S.D.	Length of Incarceration (Days) Mean	Length of Incarceration (Days) S.D.
Experimental									
GA	8	15-3	.787	91	10.169	7.7	3.908	69	37.823
GB	8	15-4	.911	93	14.860	7.2	2.729	105	35.225
GC	8	15-5	1.067	93	10.296	7.1	2.632	109	86.748
Total	24	15-5	1.609	92	20.743	7.3	5.445	94	100.978
Control									
WA	8	15-6	.781	91	14.177	7.1	2.926	89	43.055
WB	8	15-0	.678	92	9.030	7.3	2.803	66	38.463
WC	8	15-9	1.273	94	14.400	7.3	2.953	60	34.923
Total	24	15-5	1.637	92	22.133	7.2	5.014	72	67.474

The ten-week cottage counselor training program is conducted by the State of Colorado Division of Youth Services and involves brief visits to different state agencies and instruction by their treatment staffs. In addition to these experiences the men met with each other in a training group to discuss their experiences and reactions to the program.

Beginning the fourth week of their training, the trainees were assigned for two days each week for three weeks to the experimenter and to the institution's consulting psychologist. For the first two meetings the trainees were given background information and theory about psychological counseling by the experimenter who was aided by the institution's consulting psychologist during the day-long training group meetings. During the next four training sessions the trainees held tape-recorded counseling sessions with boys in the detention unit who were not Ss in the experiment. The trainees worked in pairs with groups of six boys and after each session met for a critique of the counseling tapes. The counselors were encouraged to take an essentially non-directive approach with the boys while helping them express their feelings. The counselors spent a total of approximately five hours in supervised counseling

sessions with LMSB residents before the experiment began. Additional time was spent with the institution population during their training assignments and later during their regular work assignments. During the course of these assignments the counselors had informal contact with some of the Ss in the experiment outside of the regularly scheduled counseling meetings.

Following the training period the six counselors were randomly paired and each of the pairs randomly assigned to each experimental subgroup and its matched control group. One trainee in each pair was designated the group leader while the other member was instructed to observe and serve as an alternate counselor if needed.

Pretreatment Assessment

All Ss selected by the assistant supervisor of group life were tested in groups of ten to fifteen by the experimenter and an assistant who later served as a trainer in the human relations laboratory. The Ss were first given a series of seven Thematic Apperception Test cards (3BM, 6BM, 8BM, 13MF, 17BM, 18BM, and 20) which were used by Shelley and Johnson (1961) to measure the attitudes of delinquent boys toward others and toward their own role in society. According to these researchers the cards depict situations

which are most likely to elicit responses indicative of social attitudes. They reported no reliability or validity coefficients for the procedure but low scores indicative of the absence of antisocial attitudes were found to be significantly related to participation in a counseling program and to success on parole. The reliability of the instrument was also reported indirectly. The responses of the Ss in their experiment were scored by two raters whose scores agreed in all but one case.

The instructions and scoring criteria for this procedure are presented in Table A in the Appendix. The original instructions were modified slightly to facilitate group administration of the cards. Any S who could not write comprehensible sentences in response to the cards was not included in any further phases of the experiment. At this time all Ss were also given an "accessibility to group psychotherapy scale" devised for use with delinquents by Jacks (1964) which is reproduced in Table B of the Appendix. The scale was designed to measure attitudes related to satisfactory participation in group psychotherapy. The author of the scale reports that there is a significant correlation of .57 between scale scores and therapists' ratings made after twelve sessions of group psychotherapy.

The therapists' ratings were based upon observations of willingness to participate, awareness of emotional problems, level of anxiety, likelihood of participating actively, and ability to profit from treatment. No estimate of the scale's reliability was reported. Each item was read to the Ss, who were instructed to follow along on their own copies of the questionnaire and indicate by circling a letter, if they agreed or disagreed with each item.

The remainder of the pretreatment assessment procedure was carried out after the Ss had been selected and assigned to the experimental and control groups. A measure of interpersonal relationships and attitudes of the Ss was obtained by means of a scale developed by the experimenter. A copy of this scale is presented in Table C of the Appendix. The scale measured verbal and overt behavior related to institutional adjustment of boys in relation to staff and other boys. The responses to each of the items were scores on a scale ranging from one to six with the higher numbers indicating more favorable social attitudes.

In a preliminary validation study, fourteen boys were selected by the assistant supervisor of group life, seven evidencing good adjustment while seven were considered to have made an extremely poor adjustment to the institution.

These boys were then rated by four cottage counselors who supervised the boys but were not aware of the supervisor's judgment of adjustment. One counselor rated four good and four poor adjustment cases, one counselor rated two good and two poor adjustment cases, while two counselors rated one boy each: a good and a poor adjustment case. Mean scores based on the number of items rated were computed for each S and the two groups were compared by means of Wilcoxon's (1949) rank total test for unpaired replicates. The higher scores for the good adjustment group were significant at the .01 level.

Because homogeneity of content could not be assumed, the scoring procedure for the test was later modified. In the modified procedure the score for each S was the total rather than the mean score. Therefore, all items not observed by the raters were discarded, leaving seventeen items in the final form. Table 3 shows the results of a reanalysis of the data from the validation study. In the reanalysis, total scores were computed for the good and poor adjustment cases on the basis of the seventeen items remaining in the final form. These scores were compared by means of Wilcoxon's (1949) unpaired replicates rank total tests. The lower rank total shown in Table 3 is significant

Table 3

Mean Behavior and Attitude Rating Scale Scores for Groups of Boys with Good and Poor Institutional Adjustment

Good Adjustment		Poor Adjustment		Lower Rank Total
N	Mean	N	Mean	
7	71.43	7	53.57	32.00***

***p <.01

at the .01 level, indicating that the modified form of the scale also differentiated between good and poor institutional adjustment.

Each S in the experiment was rated with the final form of the instrument by one of his teachers at LMSB. The evaluation was carried out during the fourth week of the experiment along with the other assessment procedures.

Tape-recorded sessions before the experimental and control treatments was the fourth means of evaluation. The three control and three experimental subgroups met with pairs of cottage counselor trainees for an hour on each of two days. One member of each trainee pair served as the group leader while the other trainee recorded the order of participation of the group members.

Transcriptions were made of samples taken from the second of the two tape-recorded counseling sessions for the six subgroups. Five two-minute samples were systematically obtained from the tape recordings according to a schedule of time sampling. The first sample was taken four minutes from the beginning of the tape in order to allow time for the group to settle down. After each two-minute sample an additional two minutes were allowed to lapse before the next sample was taken. In order to obtain

meaningful samples the schedule was modified slightly whenever the sample interrupted a sentence or when the first portion of the sample was unintelligible because of extraneous noise or low volume. The total sample for each subgroup represented an accumulation of ten minutes of interaction between the counselor and group members. Because of the poor quality of many of the tape recordings, only the speeches of the counselors were routinely identified while the other members of the group were differentiated only by indicating with a new paragraph when one group member stopped speaking and another member began.

The transcribed counseling sessions were evaluated by means of an instrument constructed by the experimenter consisting of five items pertinent to effective group functioning. The instrument along with instructions for its use is presented in Table D in the Appendix. The items in the instrument were designed primarily to provide an objective description of the performance characteristics of the counseling sessions along several important dimensions. It was not assumed that the performance characteristics measured by the four items were independent. For each of four of the items in the instrument, a scale was constructed indicating nine points along the dimension under investigation by the item. The fifth item provided an opportunity

for the raters to indicate which of four degrees of counselor proficiency best characterized the total sample under consideration. Because of the descriptive nature of the items and the fact that they were to be used individually and not as part of a total score, only a small, informal pilot rating was conducted. Several predoctoral interns were asked to rate three transcribed sessions and report on any problems encountered in using the instrument. Since the pilot judges reported no major difficulties with the instructions or the items, no further refinement of the instrument was made.

Experimental Treatment

The twenty-four experimental Ss were removed from the school's regularly scheduled program of activities for a week and were isolated as much as possible in a cottage reserved for their exclusive use. These arrangements were made to minimize the distraction and counterpropaganda from the rest of the institution's population. The library, recreation room, and control room of the cottage were used as meeting places for the three experimental groups and the recreation room, the largest of the three, was also used for meetings of the entire laboratory. The Ss left the cottage only for the scheduled recreation activities,

meals, and occasional errands to the hospital or to see their case workers. At meal time the boys ate together in the main dining hall at tables reserved for them.

The experimental program lasted from 8:00 a.m. until approximately 4:00 p.m. each day and was conducted by the E assisted by two graduate students in counseling psychology. The two assistants were generally familiar with human relations training, and one of them had had considerable practicum experience in psychological counseling. The other assistant had just completed his first year in a graduate counseling program but had no difficulty following the lead of the more experienced trainers. When the laboratory staff was absent, the cottage was supervised by two regular cottage counselors on the evening and night shifts. These counselors were not formally involved in the human relations training program although it was necessary to enlist their cooperation in allowing the boys in the cottage to govern themselves as much as possible.

The experimental groups retained the same membership for the laboratory meetings as in the pretreatment meetings but were referred to as the red, green, and blue groups. These subgroups were randomly assigned to the E and the two assistants who met with the groups to lend assistance

in establishing direction and group discipline. The assistants were instructed to encourage the group members to take as much responsibility for conducting the meetings as possible.

The major laboratory activity was the project of setting up and maintining a cottage government to take responsibility for group discipline. All activities planned for the Ss were designed to further this goal either by giving them the tools necessary to solve problems through group discussion or by giving them the opportunity to take responsibility for their own self-discipline. A schedule of laboratory activities is presented in Table E of the Appendix and a verbatim record of the lecturettes and instructions used in the laboratory is presented in Table F. All lecturettes and instructions were presented to the Ss during the laboratory by the E. The following sections include descriptions of the laboratory procedures.

Day One. All Ss in the experimental group with the exception of two were moved into a cottage reserved for the human relations laboratory on the evening prior to the start of the program. The project was scheduled to begin at 8:00 a.m. on day one, but an hour delay occurred while the release of two Ss held in the detention unit was secured.

CONTINUED

1 OF 4

After these two Ss had been released it was discovered that two additional boys not selected for the study were also assigned to the cottage. In order to avoid any negative reaction from the experimental Ss these two boys were allowed to remain, thus bringing the total number of boys in the cottage to twenty-six. The two extra boys participated in the laboratory program but were not tested either before or after the laboratory.

When all the Ss were finally assembled in the cottage, the E and his assistants introduced themselves and made it clear to the Ss that they could feel free to address the staff by their first names (the regular cottage counselors are always addressed as "Mister"). The Ss were then given a short talk to orient them to the nature of the project (See Table F, Section 1 in the Appendix for a verbatim record). The essential information given to them was that they would be working for the E for the entire week and in return would receive their choice of a package of candy or a package of cigarettes each day. These items were then distributed. The boys were told that they would be participating in an experiment in which they would be both subjects and experimenters. A brief explanation of what an experiment involved followed, emphasizing the importance

of trying out new ways of doing things and observing the results. The Ss were also told that they would be learning how to counsel others and themselves and that the major project of the laboratory would be to set up and conduct a cottage government. The meaning of laboratory and experimental group (E Group) was explained and the staff members were designated for each of the three E Groups.

Next on the schedule was a short film on human relations training ("The NTL Story") and prior to showing the movie the Ss were given a list of questions (Table F, Section 1) as a guide to use in watching the film. The purpose of this activity was to provide the Ss with information about the use of human relations groups and also to give them an exercise in attending to visually presented information. The film was followed by a short discussion based upon the questionnaire.

Next, after an hour of recreation, the Ss met with the three staff members in small groups for their E Group meetings. The Ss were instructed to discuss the kinds of rules that might be needed in the cottage and the kind of organization needed to make them work. The instructions for this task are presented in Table F, Section 2 of the Appendix. At the end of the hour-long meetings the Ss were gathered

again in the laboratory goup and instructed in the use of rating scales pertaining to group atmosphere which were then used by the Ss to evaluate their morning E Group meeting (Table F, Section 3 of the Appendix).

After lunch the Ss were given free time for a rest period followed by the first task of the afternoon, a lecturette on decision-making procedures and an exercise in listening to tape recordings of the morning meetings to identify decision-making procedures (Table F, Sections 4 and 5).

The afternoon activities ended with a recreation period and a general clean-up followed by a laboratory meeting attended by the evening cottage counselor (Table F, Section 6). Although most of the day's activities were successful in a limited way, the behavior of the Ss was so uncontrolled on several occasions that they were given an ultimatum by the experimenters. They were told that if they were not more cooperative the next day the whole project would be called off and they would be sent back to their regular school and work assignments.

It was assumed that the regular cottage counselor coming on duty had been briefed by his supervisor concerning the nature of the experiment but this was not the case. He

was at first reluctant to allow the cottage members to set up their own rules, but the staff helped the boys reach a compromise with the counselor which would allow them to experiment with a few rules.

Day Two. There were so many problems the first day in keeping the Ss on the laboratory schedule and maintaining their attention that the laboratory program was altered drastically. The lecturettes and instructions were simplified and shortened and a greater flexibility was exercised in the schedule so that the activities were presented when it appeared that the Ss would be receptive. The assistants were given a free hand to improvise ways of using the Ss' behavior as it occurred to promote learning experiences related to the goals of the laboratory.

The first activity of the day was to distribute the commissary and the Ss were allowed to help themselves. Following the distribution of commissary, a report left by the evening counselor was read aloud to the group. The report was generally favorable, indicating no serious trouble, so the Ss were praised for their efforts. This procedure was labeled "feedback" and used as an illustration of examining the results of an activity.

Before starting the morning E Group meetings, a brief review of the preceding day's activities was held (Table F, Section 7), covering the laboratory goals, content of the film, decision-making scales, and the results of the Ss' ratings of their E Group meetings. The E Groups were then instructed to discuss how the cottage government had worked so far and to make suggestions for improving its effectiveness (Table F, Section 8).

The morning recreation period was spent swimming in the pool and there was a great deal of horseplay among the Ss. Several Ss were snapped with wet towels but fortunately no serious injury resulted. This incident was noted and brought up for discussion later that morning.

The second project for the morning was preceded by ratings of their morning E Group meetings. The Ss then learned about different types of groups (bull sessions, mechanical and organic groups) and each E Group demonstrated one of these types of groups in front of the other members of the laboratory (Table F, Section 9). Those watching were required to identify the type of group being portrayed. The subject of dangerous horseplay was then brought up by the staff and several of the boys took turns playing the part of a counselor or that of a boy being disciplined.

After lunch and a rest period the laboratory was given a lecturette on task functions (Table F, Section 10). The Ss were instructed to use these task functions as much as possible in the E Group meetings which followed and to continue to discuss the cottage government (Table F, Section 11).

The day's activities ended with a recreation period and a cottage government meeting which included the evening counselor.

Day Three. Day three began with an appraisal of the previous day's activities, pointing out the positive and negative aspects of the Ss' behavior (Table F, Section 12). They were then allowed to distribute their own commissary, and a mad scramble ensued with the stronger Ss getting several items while the weaker Ss received none. The staff did not interfere and remained silent until they were through. Then the Ss were told very bluntly that if they wanted to live like animals in a jungle of their own making, the staff had no objections. If, however, they did not like this way of doing things then it would be up to them to experiment and find some solution to the problem. It was emphasized that the staff would continue to bring in only the correct amount of commissary and it was up to them to see that it

was distributed fairly. This delegation of responsibility was used with other activities during the remainder of the week. If the Ss wanted to start their recreation periods on time, it was up to them to get all the members of the cottage out of the dormitory for the group meeting. Lunch was handled the same way. The staff merely stated that the group would leave for the dining hall only when everyone was ready and quiet.

The first E Groups in the morning were again instructed to discuss the progress of the group government (Table F, Section 13). Midway through the group meetings it was necessary for everyone to leave the cottage while it was fumigated to destroy an infestation of body lice. The cottage could not be used for the rest of the day, so the laboratory was held outdoors and in the school building.

After a recreation period the laboratory met on the lawn and an attempt was made to review decision-making procedures, types of groups, and task functions, but people passing by were a major distraction. Each E Group selected an important concept which they had learned and illustrated it to the others in the laboratory. The threat of rain drove the laboratory into the school auditorium, which literally set the stage for an experience which developed

spontaneously. In the auditorium the stage happened to be lighted and the seat section darkened. Most of the Ss took regular seats but a few of the tougher Ss sat on the edge of the stage beside the staff. These Ss were then directly confronted by the staff with the question of why they set themselves apart from the other Ss. Rather than being in a prestigious position to observe, they now found themselves on stage being observed by the other laboratory members. Gradually, the other members of the laboratory were encouraged to challenge the authority which these Ss took upon themselves. As this drama developed for ten to fifteen minutes, the laboratory was on the verge of bringing into the open the very problem which had hindered the group's development, that of the subtle pressure and outright physical force exerted by the dominant Ss in the cottage. At this point, however, a class from the school entered the auditorium and the laboratory had to be moved to a classroom.

After lunch the laboratory viewed the film, "Eye of the Beholder." Although the film proved interesting and enjoyable, the Ss were not motivated to discuss it. The movie was followed by a lecturette on feedback and an exercise in giving each other feedback was attempted (Table F, Sections 14 and 15).

Following the afternoon recreation period the Ss returned to the cottage for clean-up and the cottage government meeting (Table F, Section 16). They were reminded at this time of the problem which had arisen of stealing commissary and other items from each other.

Day Four. The Ss were instructed to pass out the commissary themselves again. Various appeals to the staff to do it for them so that everyone would get his share were ignored. The distribution went more smoothly than the day before, but again a few members did not obtain their share. The E Group meetings that morning were concerned with ways in which the commissary could be distributed fairly (Table F, Section 17).

A second E Group meeting was held after the recreation period and the Ss were prepared for it by presenting again the lecturette on feedback (Table F, Sections 16 and 18) that the Ss had not been receptive to the day before. The E Groups were then instructed to discuss and give feedback to one another. At the end of the meeting the boys rated the sessions and one another on a new set of scales.

After lunch the membership of the E Groups was scrambled and the new groups were given the task of exchanging information about what they had been discussing during their

regular groups (Table F, Section 19). The day's activities ended with a meeting of the cottage government after the afternoon recreation period.

Day Five. As on the preceding days, the Ss were given the responsibility of distributing the commissary. Next, the E Groups were instructed to discuss whether or not the experiment had been a success (Table F, Section 20).

After recreation the laboratory met to solve the problem of several instances of theft of cigarettes. As a group they decided to search the entire cottage and a great deal of time was spent deciding upon the procedure to be used in conducting the search. Finally a committee was chosen by the Ss to conduct the search while the rest of the cottage remained in the recreation room. The staff intervened as little as possible and let the boys solve the problem by themselves. The missing cigarettes were finally found and the guilty S confessed. The laboratory was unable to agree on a punishment, so the S's apologies were accepted.

The Ss were allowed to have most of the afternoon free because they were tired and it was felt that they would not be receptive to any formal exercise. During the free time a fight broke out which was instigated by a S with particularly poor controls who had been a source of trouble all

week. When the group was convened for the last time the problem of disciplining this S was left up to the laboratory. The group finally decided to send the offender to the detention unit for a short time.

As a final activity to bring the laboratory to an end on a positive note, the three experimenters went around the group giving feedback to each participant. Each was given an appraisal of his good points as well as the areas in which he needed to change.

Control Treatment

After the initial two pretreatment tape-recorded counseling sessions, the control groups continued to meet with the counselor trainees from one to two hours a week for a total of ten hours over a nine-week period. This number of counseling sessions was approximately equivalent to the amount of time spent by the experimental Ss in small group meetings during the human relations laboratory. Initially the control groups met with the pairs of trainees assigned to them, but after the training program for the trainees came to an end, their work schedules usually prevented more than one member of each pair from being present to conduct the counseling sessions. In order to obtain enough hours of control counseling it was necessary to use both counselors

in each pair separately whenever possible. From the eighth week of the experiment to the final counseling session one of the primary counselors was permanently absert and the group sessions were conducted by the alternate counselor.

During the period of the control treatments the E had informal contact with the control Ss a number of times because it became necessary for him to pick up the Ss from the school or shop where they worked and take them to a central location to meet with the counselors. On two occasions the E held one counseling session each with two of the control groups when it was discovered after the Ss had been assembled that the trainee would be absent.

Since the counselor trainees were inexperienced in psychological counseling and the program was of short duration, the goals of the control treatment were necessarily limited. The primary goal was to establish a relationship with the Ss and help them verbalize their feelings. Little or no interpretation of dynamics was made or expected.

Post Treatment Assessment

During the week following the human relations laboratory the experimental treatment Ss were retested with the TAT cards and the Accessibility to Psychotherapy Scale was administered by the experimenter and assistant present during the pretreatment evaluation. During this third week

they also met again for two more one-hour tape-recorded sessions with the counselor trainee pairs. During week four the school personnel made a second rating of attitudes and behavior of the Ss, having had one week to observe them.

At the end of nine weeks, when the control group had accumulated ten hours of counseling with the trainees, two tape-recorded sessions were held. Unfortunately, in the case of two groups (WB and WC), the counselor who had acted as the leader in the pretreatment evaluation procedure was not available, and the second member of the pair conducted the tape-recorded meeting. For one of these groups (WC), however, the second trainee had met with the group since the third week of the control treatment. After each group had finished the two tape-recorded counseling sessions, the group members were tested as a group with the TAT cards and Accessibility to Group Psychotherapy Scale by the experimenter.

Due to a change in the schedule of classes in the school and vacation leaves by some of the teachers, many of the boys had to be evaluated by a teacher who had not made the initial pretreatment evaluation.

In the case of both experimental and control Ss the post treatment data was processed in the same manner as that obtained by the pretreatment assessment.

Chapter III

Results

In order to facilitate the interpretation of the results of this experiment, this chapter is organized into three major sections. The first two sections will contain a summary of the reactions of the experimental and control Ss to their respective experimental and control treatments and to the post treatment testing which followed. The third section will present the results of the statistical analysis performed on the data gathered before, during, and after the experimental and control treatments.

Reactions to the Experimental Treatment and Post Treatment Testing

It was expected that planning and instituting a cottage government would occupy the Ss for only a few days and that other vehicles for the group's development would have to be provided. This project, however, occupied the laboratory for the entire week. The development of the capacity for self-government proved to be the issue in all aspects of the experimental treatment. This issue of self-control and self-government was manifested in the Ss' attempts to conduct their laboratory and E Group meetings, their behavior during the recreation and free periods,

their relationships with each other such as when they were confronted with the problem of distributing commissary, and their relationships with the night counselor in regard to their behavior after the staff left for the day.

The motivation of the Ss as a group fluctuated from day to day and reflected the Ss' ambivalence toward taking responsibility for their behavior. On day one the Ss were inattentive, uncooperative, and the behavior of the laboratory came close to getting completely out of hand on several occasions. It was difficult to get the Ss together for the group activities and most of the Ss paid little attention to the lecturettes and instructions. They were able to discuss the idea of setting up a cottage government to a limited extent, however.

On day two the behavior of the laboratory was completely changed, on the surface at least, and the majority of the Ss were extremely cooperative. It was learned that the ultimatum presented by the staff to the effect that the project would be cancelled if their behavior did not improve had mobilized some of the Ss to accept the challenge of governing themselves. While the staff was gone for the night they persuaded the dissident members of the laboratory to cooperate with the staff if only to stay out of school

and receive free commissary. On a number of occasions on day two various Ss approached the staff to ask if they had noticed how much better the cottage was behaving. There was some question, however, as to the motivation of a minority of the Ss because it was discovered that while they were overtly cooperative they were also bullying weaker Ss and sniffing pepper to get "high" when the staff was not observing them. The staff learned about this behavior from the Ss who were attempting to organize the government.

The Ss became difficult to handle again on day three. Their restlessness and inattentiveness were further increased by the necessity of meeting outside the cottage because of the fumigation. Outside, on the grounds, they were distracted by other boys and by the frequent moves to find privacy or avoid rain showers.

By day four the Ss were again behaving well and giving the staff almost complete cooperation. This positive change in behavior was apparently the result of another attempt by a certain group of relatively intelligent, well motivated Ss to get the cottage to work together to save the experiment. The improved behavior was especially apparent in their more effective attempt to distribute their commissary and their concern with making the laboratory run smoothly.

When day five, the last day of the experiment, arrived, the Ss were tired and irritable. Many of the Ss were discouraged because they felt that the experiment had failed since some of the Ss had not given full cooperation. Other Ss were anxious to leave because they had been bullied by the uncooperative Ss, and the laboratory as a whole had been unable to afford them protection.

Although the laboratory was not entirely successful in solving the problems attendant upon governing itself, there were signs of positive changes in behavior during the course of the week. In their E Group meetings the Ss at first approached the problem of self-government by retaining most of the institution's rules for cottage life and by attempting to impose harsh penalties upon offenders. As the week progressed and the Ss were required to deal with the problems of stealing, fighting, and general discipline, they began to struggle with the basic question of coercion versus voluntary compliance and the question of why some individuals choose to misbehave. Other positive observations were that a number of the Ss began to form positive attachments to one or another of the staff. They seemed pleased to be able to call the staff members by their first names and to accompany them on errands. During the recreation periods

Ss would seek out the staff to talk about the experiment and to talk about themselves. On the last afternoon of the experiment the experimenters gave feedback to each S individually about his performance during the week. Some of the Ss waited nearly an hour and a half for their turn to receive feedback even though this was not required of them. It was also observed that a number of the Ss voluntarily gave up their commissary to other Ss who received none in order to keep the experiment from ending prematurely. Although the lecturettes and exercises did not work out as well as had been expected, some of the information about group functioning was learned and used spontaneously during the E Group and laboratory meetings.

When the Ss were given the post treatment test a week after the end of the experiment a marked increase in aloofness and reserve was noted even among the Ss who had been the most friendly and cooperative during the laboratory. The Ss asked a few questions about the absence of one of the staff and inquired if the staff planned to run the experiment again with another group of boys. In contrast to the behavior of the Ss during the pretreatment tests, there was much less horseplay during the post treatment testing.

Reactions to the Control Treatment and Post Treatment Testing

The control Ss were initially curious about the purpose of the counseling sessions, but after the novelty wore off they became bored with the group meetings. The Ss frequently had to sit and wait for the counselors to arrive for the sessions and they became angry and impatient over this. In addition, some of the Ss were frequently called away from entertaining activities in order to attend group meetings and they resented this. When the control Ss were given the post treatment battery of tests there were open expressions of anger and resentment.

Results of the Statistical Analyses

The results of the statistical analysis of the measurement data evaluating the various changes in attitudes and behavior of the Ss in the experimental and control groups are presented in connection with each of the four hypotheses under investigation. For the sake of convenience, all hypotheses in this section are stated positively. The .05 probability level was designated the criterion level of significance for all tests.

Since all four of the hypotheses which were constructed to evaluate the results of this experiment were concerned

with the measurement of changes, the data selected for the analyses were the differences between pretreatment and post treatment scores. According to Harris (1963), however, the reliability of the difference scores and their correlation with initial scores must be considered when interpreting the results of the analyses of this type of data. Difference scores are less reliable than either of the two sets of scores from which they are determined. Moreover, the reliability of difference scores is inversely related to the degree of correlation between these two sets of scores. A final consideration to be noted is the spuriously high correlation between difference scores and initial scores due to shared errors of measurement.

Because the Ss were not randomly assigned to all subgroups in the experiment, it proved to be impossible to statistically remove differences between the pretreatment scores of the experimental and control subgroups. In addition, not enough information was available to correct the correlations between difference scores and the pretreatment scores. In order to evaluate the pretreatment differences which could not be controlled statistically, the pretreatment scores of the experimental subgroups were compared with the scores of the corresponding control subgroups by means

of a t test for correlated samples (Edwards, 1960). The means, standard deviations, and t values for the various comparisons of data from three instruments are shown in Table 4. There was only one significant difference between the experimental and control subgroups in pretreatment scores on the three assessment instruments. The difference between the mean TAT scores for GB and WB was significant at the .02 level.

A partially hierarchical model (Harter and Lum, 1955) was utilized to analyze the measures of change from pretreatment to post treatment testing as required by Hypotheses 1, 2, and 3. This model was selected as appropriate for the analysis of a combination of fixed and random variance. In the present design the experimental treatment was randomly assigned to a block of three subgroups, the control treatment to a block of three matching subgroups. Counselors were randomly assigned to each of the experimental and corresponding control subgroups. The Ss, however, were not randomly assigned to the six subgroups in the experiment. Instead, they were paired in the experimental and corresponding control subgroups by their assignment to subgroups on the basis of rank order. The random assignment of counselors and treatments to the paired subgroups created a nested effect.

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and t Values for Comparisons between Experimental and Control Subgroups of Pretreatment Scores on Three Instruments

Instrument	Subgroup	N	Experimental (G) Mean	Experimental (G) S.D.	Control (W) Mean	Control (W) S.D.	t
Thematic	A	7	3.00	2.268	3.57	2.321	0.385
Apperception	B	7	4.14	1.641	1.86	1.355	3.207**
Test	C	7	2.57	1.400	3.29	1.485	0.068
Behavior and	A	5	73.40	17.142	74.60	17.828	0.091
Attitude	B	5	77.80	11.409	80.60	13.139	2.258
Rating Scale	C	5	76.20	11.771	72.20	13.060	0.382
Accessibility	A	6	33.16	2.478	33.16	1.772	-----
To Group	B	6	35.33	2.134	34.67	2.867	0.331
Psychotherapy	C	6	35.17	1.462	33.17	2.582	1.857

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

In every case where a complete set of data for a S was not available, the data for the Ss in the same rank order position in the remaining experimental and control subgroups were not included in the analysis in order to maintain equal numbers of Ss in all of the subgroups. The following sections contain the results of the statistical analyses. Each of the hypotheses is formally restated to facilitate presentation of the results.

Hypothesis 1. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater decrease in antisocial interpretations given to social situations depicted by selected TAT cards than will conventional group counseling.

The responses of each S to the TAT cards were coded to disguise the identity of the treatment groups and the responses were then scored by two graduate students according to a relatively objective scoring system devised by Shelley and Johnson (1961). These scoring criteria are included in Table A of the Appendix. Disagreements between the two scorers were resolved by the judgment of a third graduate student.

Table 5 shows the net and mean change from pretreatment to post treatment scores for the various experimental and control subgroups. Since the scores were based upon the

Table 5

Net and Mean Change‡ from Pre to Post Treatment in Thematic Apperception Test Scores

	Experimental (G)			Control (W)		
Subgroup	N	Σ	$\bar{X}$	N	Σ	$\bar{X}$
A	7	-4.0	-0.57	7	+ 7.0	+1.00
B	7	-8.0	-1.14	7	+14.0	+2.00
C	7	+9.0	+1.29	7	+ 8.0	+1.14
Total	21	-3.0	-0.14	21	+29.0	+1.38

‡The correlation between change (difference) scores and pretreatment scores for the experimental treatment is -.62, significant at the .01 level. The correlation between change scores and pretreatment scores for the control treatment is -.06 and not significant.

number and seriousness of the antisocial themes given, positive signs indicate increased antisocial attitudes while negative signs indicate the reverse. It is evident from an inspection of Table 5 that the experimental Ss showed a decline in antisocial attitudes in two out of three groups while the control groups consistently increased in this respect. Table 5 also shows the correlation of the differences between pretreatment and post treatment scores with the pretreatment scores. The correlation between difference scores and pretreatment scores for the experimental Ss was -.62 and significant at the .01 level. The correlation between difference scores and pretreatment scores for the control Ss was -.06 and not significant. The results of the statistical analysis are presented in Table 6 and indicate that the overall difference between the changes for the experimental and control groups was significant at the .05 level of confidence and Hypothesis 1 was supported. None of the interactions was significant.

Hypothesis 2. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater improvement in interpersonal relationships with institution personnel and other boys as measured by a specially devised rating scale than will conventional counseling.

Table 6

Summary Table for Nested Analysis of Change in Thematic Apperception Test Scores

	df	MS	Error Term	F
Treatments	1	24.37	Pairs x Treatments (within groups)	5.94*
Counselor-Groups	2	3.87	Pairs (within groups)	1.31
Treatments x Counselor-Groups	2	9.45	Pairs x Treatments (within groups)	2.30
Pairs (within groups)	18	2.95		
Pairs x Treatments (within groups)	18	4.10		

*p <.05

A complete set of data was not available for the one S who was transferred and for two more Ss who were absent from class for most of the post treatment observation period and who were consequently rated on less than half of the items in the scale. The data for the Ss in these rank-order positions in all subgroups was discarded leaving a total of five Ss in each group.

The Ss were rated by their school teachers with a behavior and attitude rating scale containing twenty items, but only seventeen of these items were consistently rated for all of the Ss. The total of these seventeen items was tabulated for each of the Ss and submitted to analysis. Table 7 shows the net and mean change from pretreatment to post treatment in behavior and attitude rating scores. The ratings for two out of three experimental groups showed improvement while the ratings for two control groups showed a decline and one control group showed no net change. Although the overall change for the experimental groups was in the predicted direction, the results of the analysis, presented in Table 8, indicate no significant differences between the experimental and control treatments or the various interactions. Hypothesis 2, therefore, was not supported.

Table 7

Net and Mean Change from Pre to Post Treatment in Behavior and Attitude Rating Scale Scores

	Experimental (G)			Control (W)		
Subgroup	N	Σ	$\bar{X}$	N	Σ	$\bar{X}$
A	5	+ 4.0	+0.80	5	0.0	0.00
B	5	+18.0	+3.60	5	-20.0	-4.00
C	5	-19.0	-3.80	5	-19.0	-3.80
Total	15	+ 3.0	+0.20	15	-39.0	-2.60

Table 8

Summary Table for Nested Analysis of Change in Behavior and Attitude Rating Scale Scores

	df	MS	Error Term	F
Treatments	1	58.80	Pairs x Treatments (within groups)	0.15
Counselor-Groups	2	51.60	Pairs (within groups)	0.16
Treatments x Counselor-Groups	2	43.90	Pairs x Treatments (within groups)	0.11
Pairs (within groups)	12	313.88		
Pairs x Treatments (within groups)	12	391.28		

Hypothesis 3. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater improvement in attitudes related to accessibility to group psychotherapy as measured by a self-report questionnaire than will conventional group counseling.

Complete data were not available for the one Ss who was transferred and for an S whose questionnaire was lost. The data for the corresponding Ss in the other subgroups were discarded leaving a total of six Ss in each subgroup.

The Ss' responses to the questionnaire were assigned weighted scores according to a system devised by Jacks (1964), and total scores, rounded to whole numbers, were tabulated for each S. Table 9 shows the net and mean change from pretreatment to post treatment in accessibility to group psychotherapy scores. All three experimental subgroups and two out of three control subgroups show a change toward a more negative attitude toward group psychotherapy. The control treatment as a whole shows a slightly greater negative decline than the experimental treatment but as the results of the analysis shown in Table 10 indicate, the difference between the treatments was not significant and Hypothesis 3 was not supported. There was, however, a difference significant at the .05 level among the experimental and control subgroup pairs assigned to the various counselor

Table 9

Net and Mean Change from Pre to Post Treatment in Accessibility to Group Psychotherapy Scores

	Experimental (G)			Control (W)		
Subgroup	N	Σ	$\bar{X}$	N	Σ	$\bar{X}$
A	6	- 7.0	-1.17	6	- 8.0	-1.33
B	6	-12.0	-2.00	6	-17.0	-2.83
C	6	- 1.0	-0.17	6	+ 2.0	+0.33
Total	18	-20.0	-1.11	18	-23.0	-1.63

Table 10

Summary Table for Nested Analysis of Change in Accessibility to Group Psychotherapy Scores

	df	MS	Error Term	F
Treatments	1	0.25	Pairs x Treatments (within groups)	0.04
Counselor-Groups	2	18.77	Pairs (within groups)	5.92*
Treatments x Counselor-Groups	2	1.34	Pairs x Treatments (within groups)	0.20
Pairs (within groups)	15	3.17		
Pairs x Treatments (within groups)	15	6.64		

*p <.05

pairs. An inspection of Table 9 suggests that it is the combination of subgroups GB and WB which differ significantly from the other two experimental-control subgroup combinations.

Hypothesis 4. Human relations training will result in more satisfactory participation in conventional group counseling as measured by a rating of transcribed counseling sessions than will an equivalent amount of time spent in conventional group counseling.

The five two-minute samples for each experimental and control subgroup counseling session were combined into twelve separate transcriptions, six pretreatment and six post treatment sessions, as part of the procedure for testing Hypothesis 4. Six tape-recorded experimental subgroup meetings held during the human relations laboratory were also sampled and combined into three transcriptions, one for each subgroup, in order to provide extra information concerning the effectiveness of the experimental treatment. The samples from the laboratory were intentionally taken from meetings held at the same time by each of the three experimental subgroups on two particular days when the whole laboratory was well motivated. This was done to get an estimate of the level at which the laboratory groups functioned when they were at their best.

The fifteen transcriptions were coded to disguise the identity of the various subgroups and placed in such an order that transcriptions of the same subgroup were not consecutive. The transcriptions were then rated by five post-doctoral clinical interns. The judges were given written instructions concerning the use of the evaluation instrument. The instructions and scales are presented in Table D in the Appendix.

The results for each of the items in the evaluation instrument were analyzed separately by means of Wilcoxon's (1949) nonparametric rank total tests because of the lack of information regarding the distribution of ratings on the various scaled items. The rank total tests for unpaired replicates and for groups of unpaired replicates were used in order to allow comparisons between experimental and control subgroups. A rank total test for paired replicates would have been more appropriate since the scale values for the different groups were determined by the same raters and were therefore not independent. The paired replicates test, although more appropriate, requires that differences of zero between pairs be discarded. If the paired replicates test were used in the present experiment many comparisons could not be made because the exclusion of zero differences would

result in fewer than six pairs and make an analysis impossible. An inspection of the raw data suggests that although the unpaired replicates tests were statistically inappropriate, the results of the analyses do not appear to have grossly misrepresented the character of the relationships between the ratings for the various groups.

The results of the analysis of each of the five items in the evaluation instrument are presented in tables 11 through 15. These tables are set up in a standard manner to show the mean pretreatment and post treatment ratings and the net changes from pretreatment to post treatment for the various subgroups. Positive changes indicate changes toward a greater degree of cooperativeness, work orientation, openness, concern with ongoing process, and counselor proficiency, depending upon the item. Negative changes indicate changes toward resistance, bull session talk, guardedness, concern with past experiences, and lowered estimates of counselor proficiency. It should be noted that the analysis of the total treatment effects do not include data from subgroups GB and WB. The post treatment ratings for subgroup WB were judged to be unrepresentative as a result of utilizing the second member of the counseling team as group leader for the post treatment evaluation sessions.

Therefore, the data for this subgroup as well as for the matching experimental subgroup were excluded from the treatment totals in order to avoid biasing the comparison of the overall effects. This procedure will be discussed more fully in the next chapter.

Item 1 provided a measure of "Cooperation versus Resistant Attitude toward Group Counseling." Table 11 shows no significant differences between the overall treatment ratings of change measures. The differences between the pretreatment ratings for subgroups GB and WB, in favor of GB, the experimental group, however, was significant at the .01 level. The difference between the net positive changes for WB, the control subgroup, and the negative changes for GB was significant at the .02 level.

Item 2 measured "Bull Session versus Work Orientation." Table 12 shows none of the overall treatment ratings or changes in rating to be significant. The difference between the post treatment ratings for subgroups GB and WB, however, was significant at the .05 level indicating that WB received significantly higher ratings. The difference between the negative change for GB and the positive change for WB was also significant at the .05 level.

Table 11

The Means and Lower Rank Totals (LRT) for Item 1‡ Comparisons Between Treatment Subgroups for Pretreatment and Post Treatment Ratings and Net Change in Ratings from Pretreatment to Post Treatment

			Pretreatment		Post Treatment		Change from Pretreatment to Post Treatment	
Subgroup	Treatments	N Ratings	Mean Rating	LRT G vs. W	Mean Rating	LRT G vs. W	Net Change	LRT
A	G	5	4.8		4.4		- 2.0	
	W	5	4.2	26.0	2.0	20.0	-11.0	21.0
B	G	5	6.2		4.6	21.5	- 8.0	15.5**
	W	5	2.2	15.0***	6.2		+20.0	
C	G	5	4.6		4.0	27.5	- 3.0	
	W	5	4.0	27.0	3.2	27.5	- 4.0	27.0
Total A & C	G	10	4.7		4.2		- 5.0	
	W	10	4.1	53.0	2.6	47.5	-15.0	48.0

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

‡Cooperative versus Resistant Attitude Toward Group Counseling

Table 12

The Means and Lower Rank Totals (LRT) for Item 2‡ Comparisons Between Treatment Subgroups for Pretreatment and Post Treatment Ratings and Net Change in Ratings from Pretreatment to Post Treatment

Subgroup	Treatments	N Ratings	Pretreatment Mean Rating	Pretreatment LRT G vs. W	Post Treatment Mean Rating	Post Treatment LRT G vs. W	Change from Pretreatment to Post Treatment Net Change	Change from Pretreatment to Post Treatment LRT
A	G	5	5.0		2.6		-12.0	21.5
	W	5	2.8	19.5	2.2	23.5	- 3.0	
B	G	5	4.4		3.2	18.0*	- 6.0	17.0*
	W	5	1.8	19.0	6.0		+21.0	
C	G	5	3.6		3.0		-3.0	25.0
	W	5	2.4	24.5	2.2	24.5	- 1.0	
Total A & C	G	10	4.3		2.8		-15.0	46.5
	W	10	2.6	44.0	2.2	48.0	- 4.0	

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

‡Bull Session versus Work Orientation

Item 3 was a measure of the degree of "Openness versus Guardedness" displayed in the group counseling sessions. The data in Table 13 indicates that again, only the differences between GB and WB were significant. The pretreatment ratings for GB were higher than for WB and were significantly different at the .02 level. The difference between the negative change for GB and the positive change for WB was also significant at the .01 level.

Table 14 presents the results of the analysis of Item 4, "Concern with Ongoing Process versus Past Experiences." Consistent with the results for the other items, none of the overall treatment comparisons were significant. The difference between the negative change for GB and the positive change for WB was significant at the .01 level while pretreatment and post treatment ratings for these subgroups were not significantly different, although the lower rank totals in both comparisons were close to significance.

The results of the analysis of the ratings on the first four items indicate no significant differences between the various comparisons of overall ratings. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was not supported. There were, however, a number of significant differences between the ratings for subgroups GB and WB on the four items.

Table 13

The Means and Lower Rank Totals (LRT) for Item 3‡ Comparisons Between Treatment Subgroups for Pretreatment and Post Treatment Ratings and Net Change in Ratings from Pretreatment to Post Treatment

Subgroup	Treatments	N Ratings	Pretreatment Mean Rating	Pretreatment LRT G vs. W	Post Treatment Mean Rating	Post Treatment LRT G vs. W	Change from Pretreatment to Post Treatment Net Change	Change from Pretreatment to Post Treatment LRT
A	G	5	5.0		4.4		- 3.0	
	W	5	3.8	24.0	3.4	24.5	- 2.0	27.0
B	G	5	6.6		4.6	20.5	-10.0	15.0***
	W	5	2.6	15.5**	6.4		+19.0	
C	G	5	4.2	27.0	4.6		+ 2.0	
	W	5	4.4		3.4	24.5	- 5.0	20.0
Total A & C	G	10	4.6		4.5		- 1.0	
	W	10	4.1	52.0	3.4	49.0	- 7.0	47.0

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

‡Openness versus Guardedness (willingness to expose feelings and ideas to potential criticism)

Table 14

The Means and Lower Rank Totals (LRT) for Item 4‡ Comparisons Between Treatment Subgroups for Pretreatment and Post Treatment Ratings and Net Change in Ratings from Pretreatment to Post Treatment

			Pretreatment		Post Treatment		Change from Pretreatment to Post Treatment	
Subgroup	Treatments	N Ratings	Mean Rating	LRT G vs. W	Mean Rating	LRT G vs. W	Net Change	LRT
A	G	5	5.4		2.8		-13.0	24.0
	W	5	3.4	20.0	2.0	20.0	- 7.0	
B	G	5	5.4		3.2	18.5	-11.0	15.0***
	W	5	2.0	18.0	5.4		+17.0	
C	G	5	3.4		2.4	24.0	- 5.0	22.5
	W	5	2.2	24.0	3.8		+ 8.0	
Total A & C	G	10	4.4		2.6		-18.0	46.5
	W	10	2.8	44.0	2.9	51.0	+ 1.0	

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

‡Concern with Ongoing Process versus Past Experiences

The analysis of ratings of counselor proficiency, Item 5, is presented in Table 15. The only significant differences are between subgroups GB and WB. Subgroup WB was given a higher rating during the post treatment assessment which was significant at the .02 level, and the difference between the negative changes for GB and the positive changes for WB was significant at the .01 level.

An additional analysis pertinent to Hypothesis 4 but not a direct test of this hypothesis was conducted with the five-item assessment of the experimental group meetings held during the human relations laboratory. The analysis was a comparison of the laboratory ratings of each experimental subgroup with the pretreatment and post treatment ratings of the same group and with the pretreatment and post treatment ratings of the appropriate control group. Table 16 shows the mean laboratory ratings and the mean pretreatment and post treatment ratings for the experimental and control groups. With one exception, the lower rank total shown in Table 16 was for the subgroup being compared with the laboratory rating. As Table 16 shows, the mean ratings for the laboratory sessions are higher in all the comparisons but one, although the differences between the laboratory and pretreatment and post treatment ratings are not significant in all cases.

Table 15

The Means and Lower Rank Totals (LRT) for Item 5‡ Comparisons Between Treatment Subgroups for Pretreatment and Post Treatment Ratings and Net Change in Ratings from Pretreatment to Post Treatment

			Pretreatment		Post Treatment		Change from Pretreatment to Post Treatment	
Subgroup	Treatments	N Ratings	Mean Rating	LRT G vs. W	Mean Rating	LRT G vs. W	Net Change	LRT
A	G	5	2.0		1.4		- 3.0	
	W	5	1.6	23.5	1.2	27.0	- 2.0	23.5
B	G	5	1.4		1.2	16.0**	- 1.0	15.0***
	W	5	1.0	22.5	2.8		+ 9.0	
C	G	5	1.6		1.2	24.0	- 2.0	22.0
	W	5	1.4	25.0	2.6		+ 3.0	
Total A & C	G	10	1.8		1.3	52.0	- 5.0	53.5
	W	10	1.5	48.5	1.6		+ 1.0	

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

‡Estimate of Counselor Proficiency

Table 16

Means and Lower Rank Totals for Comparisons Between Experimental Subgroup Laboratory Ratings and Pretreatment and Post Treatment Ratings for Experimental and Control Subgroups

Item	Subgroup	Mean and LRT	Laboratory Ratings	Experimental Groups		Control Groups	
				Pre-treatment	Post Treatment	Pre-treatment	Post Treatment
1.	A	Mean	7.8	4.8	4.4	4.2	2.0
		LRT		18.0*	16.0**	15.5**	15.0***
	B	Mean	6.4	6.2	4.6	2.2	6.2
		LRT		27.0	21.0	15.5**	26.0
	C	Mean	8.0	4.6	4.0	4.0	3.2
		LRT		16.0**	19.0	15.0***	15.0***
2.	A	Mean	8.0	5.0	2.6	2.8	2.2
		LRT		18.0*	15.0***	15.0***	15.0***
	B	Mean	7.0	4.4	3.2	1.8	6.0
		LRT		18.5	15.0***	15.0***	22.5
	C	Mean	8.0	3.6	3.0	2.4	2.2
		LRT		15.0***	15.0***	15.0***	15.0***

(Continued on next page)

Table 16 Continued

Item	Subgroup	Mean and LRT	Laboratory Ratings	Experimental Groups Pre-treatment	Experimental Groups Post Treatment	Control Groups Pre-treatment	Control Groups Post Treatment
3.	A	Mean	6.0	5.0	4.4	3.8	3.4
		LRT		23.0	22.0	20.0	18.0*
	B	Mean	6.0	6.6‡	4.6	2.6	6.4‡
		LRT		28.0‡	22.5	18.0*	29.5‡
	C	Mean	7.2	4.2	4.6	4.4	3.4
		LRT		17.5*	20.0	17.5*	16.0**
4.	A	Mean	6.8	5.4	2.8	3.4	2.0
		LRT		22.5	16.5*	17.5*	16.0**
	B	Mean	6.6	5.4	3.2	2.0	5.4
		LRT		22.5	18.5	16.0**	22.5
	C	Mean	7.4	3.4	2.4	2.2	3.8
		LRT		16.5**	15.5**	15.0***	18.0*

(Continued on next page)

Table 16 Continued

Item	Subgroup	Mean and LRT	Laboratory Ratings	Experimental Groups Pre-treatment	Experimental Groups Post Treatment	Control Groups Pre-treatment	Control Groups Post Treatment
5.	A	Mean	3.4	2.0	1.4	1.6	1.2
		LRT		18.0*	16.5**	16.5**	15.5**
	B	Mean	3.2	1.4	1.2	1.0	2.8
		LRT		15.0***	15.0***	15.0***	23.5
	C	Mean	3.6	1.6	1.2	1.4	2.0
		LRT		15.0***	15.0***	15.0***	19.5

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

‡Higher rank total

Chapter IV

Discussion

The results of the statistical analysis in the present experiment are most meaningful when interpreted within the context provided by the observational data obtained from the treatment and post treatment experiences of the experimental and control Ss. Each hypothesis will be discussed in this fashion and the final section of this chapter will include an informal evaluation of various aspects of the experimental treatment along with a discussion of the implications of this research for practical application and further research.

Discussion of Hypotheses

On the basis of the results of the statistical analysis, Hypothesis 1 was accepted. It should not go without note that the significance of these results may be influenced to a large extent by possible regression effects. The analysis of pretreatment scores revealed a significant difference between the scores for subgroup GB, which were higher than those for the other experimental groups, and the scores for WB, which were lower than the scores for its companion groups. The combination of the decrease in score for the experimental subgroup from an unusually high initial score

and the increase in score for the control subgroup from an unusually low initial score may represent a regression effect having a biasing influence on the analysis of the change scores. The correlation of -.62 between change scores and initial scores for the experimental Ss (See Table 5) is consistent with regression effects but no relationship between change scores and initial scores was found for the control Ss. Although regression effects cannot be conclusively demonstrated, the nature of the pretreatment scores and the questionable reliability of change scores suggests that the results of the analysis contained in this section be interpreted with caution.

With the acknowledgement that the significance of the difference between the experimental and control treatments should be accepted with caution, an interpretation of the obtained results is offered. It is possible that after the experimental treatment, the Ss actually did perceive social situations and relationships between people as involving less hostile and aggressive interaction. Perhaps a more parsimonious explanation, however, might be that after the experimental treatment the Ss attempted to appear less delinquent. The observations during the post treatment testing session that the Ss were reserved in their interactions

CONTINUED

2 OF 4

with the staff suggest that a concern with appearing less delinquent might be a manifestation of their guardedness. An alternative and related explanation might be that many of the Ss were trying to disassociate themselves from the aggression and antisocial activity that created unpleasant tensions during the human relations laboratory. There is no apparent reason why the results for experimental subgroup CC, in contrast to the other experimental subgroups, should show an increase in antisocial themes. Apparently this group reacted negatively to some aspect of the laboratory experience. The increase in number and seriousness of antisocial fantasies elicited by the TAT cards from the control Ss may have been due to their angry mood at the end of the control treatment which appeared to be associated with their counseling experiences.

Although the results of the statistical analysis indicated that Hypothesis 2 could not be accepted, the changes in attitudes and behaviors observed by the teachers were generally congruent with the hypothesis. The experimental group as a whole changed slightly toward better relationships with those in their environment while the control group showed a rather large overall change toward less favorable relationships. The magnitude of the change for

control subgroup WB does not seem out of proportion as in the case of the TAT scores, so the possibility of excessive influence on the overall analysis seems less pertinent in this instance. And as in the case of the TAT evaluation, no explanation can be offered as to why the results for experimental subgroup GC are not consistent with those for the other experimental subgroups. The reason that the difference between the experimental and control group ratings did not attain significance may be due in part to the inadequacies of the measuring instrument. Although the instrument functioned well for the small validation study, the large amount of variance within the subgroups suggests that the instrument needs to be further refined. Part of the variance was undoubtedly related to the fact that in a few cases different teachers made the pretreatment and post treatment assessments of some control Ss. In addition, the pairing procedure would be expected to remove less variance in the case of ratings of the Ss by judges than where the actual responses of the Ss were involved.

In the case of Hypothesis 3, both the experimental and control treatments appeared to promote attitudes slightly less favorable to effective participation in group psychotherapy. The explanation for the less favorable attitudes

may have been an increase in the negative reaction to the pathology-oriented questions. The decline in scores indicates that items which were answered in such a way as to acknowledge pathology on the first administration were answered in a more guarded and defensive fashion when the questionnaire was presented the second time. For example, experimental Ss who were guarded and control Ss who were angry and defensive would be unlikely to endorse an item such as "Any man who commits a crime proves that he needs psychiatric treatment." For slightly different reasons, then, both treatment groups may have been hesitant to endorse the items admitting of pathology which were scored as more favorable to group psychotherapy participation. The negative change, though consistent for all groups, was slight and does not represent a massive rejection of group treatment. On the other hand, the results of this assessment procedure did not lend support to Hypothesis 3.

The discussion of the ratings of the transcribed counseling sessions must take into consideration a deviation in procedure which appears to have had important consequences in at least one case. In the method chapter it was noted that after the third week of the experiment only one counselor met with each of the control subgroups and a change

in leadership was necessary in one instance (subgroup WC). Also recorded was the fact that it was necessary to use the alternate counselor during the tape-recorded post treatment sessions for subgroup WB. An inspection of Tables 11 through 15 indicates that a number of changes in rating from pretreatment to post treatment for subgroup WB are significant across all five items rated and that the significance of the results appears to be primarily a function of the extremely high post treatment ratings. In contrast to the WB comparisons, none of the results for the other subgroups was significant. Table 15, it will be noted, shows the proficiency rating for the alternate counselor to be significantly higher than for the primary counselor. It seems likely, therefore, that the high post treatment ratings on the other four items are primarily the result of the change in subgroup leader and not a developmental change in the group's functioning. Observations made during the control treatment suggest that the primary counselor had a poor relationship with this particular subgroup. The change in counselor may therefore have been doubly effective in increasing the level of the subgroup's functioning. Because the post treatment ratings appeared to be so strongly biased by this situational factor, the data for this subgroup along

with the data from the matching subgroup were excluded from the analysis of the overall treatment effects. Although the counselor utilized during the post treatment sessions for group WC was not the leader during the pretreatment series, the data necessarily had to be included to make any overall analysis possible. In addition, the data from this subgroup did not appear to differ markedly from that of the intact subgroup (WA) and so some degree of comparability was assumed.

Hypothesis 4 was not supported by the pretreatment and post treatment ratings for the subgroups retained in the analysis nor by the overall ratings when the treatment subgroups are combined. None of the comparisons between treatment subgroups of pretreatment and post treatment ratings or changes in ratings from pretreatment to post treatment revealed differences which were significant. An inspection of Table 17 reveals that the mean pretreatment and post treatment ratings for all subgroups on all items fall predominantly on the negative end of the item scales. The overall changes from pretreatment to post treatment on all items were for the most part small and in the direction of lower ratings. An item-by-item inspection of the nonsignificant overall changes in mean ratings from pretreatment to post

Table 17

Mean Ratings of Pretreatment and Post Treatment Counseling Sessions and Mean Changes in Ratings from Pretreatment to Post Treatment for the Experimental and Control Groups

Item	Subgroup	Treatment Groups	Mean Pretreatment Ratings	Mean Post Treatment Ratings	Mean Difference
1.	A	G	4.8	4.4	-0.4
		W	4.2	2.0	-2.2
	C	G	4.6	4.0	-0.6
		W	4.0	3.2	-0.8
	Total A & C	G	4.7	4.2	-0.5
		W	4.1	2.6	-1.5
2.	A	G	5.0	2.6	-2.4
		W	2.8	2.2	-0.6
	C	G	3.6	3.0	-0.6
		W	2.4	2.2	-0.2
	Total A & C	G	4.3	2.8	-1.5
		W	2.6	2.2	-0.4

(Continued on next page)

Table 17 Continued

Item	Subgroup	Treatment Groups	Mean Pretreatment Ratings	Mean Post Treatment Ratings	Mean Difference
3.	A	G	5.0	4.4	-0.6
		W	3.8	3.4	-0.4
	C	G	4.2	4.6	+0.4
		W	4.4	3.4	-1.0
	Total A & C	G	4.6	4.5	-0.1
		W	4.1	3.4	-0.7
4.	A	G	5.4	2.8	-2.6
		W	3.4	2.0	-1.4
	C	G	3.4	2.4	-1.0
		W	2.2	3.8	+1.6
	Total A & C	G	4.4	2.6	-1.8
		W	2.8	2.9	+0.1

(Continued on next page)

Table 17 Continued

Item	Subgroup	Treatment Groups	Mean Pretreatment Ratings	Mean Post Treatment Ratings	Mean Difference
5.	A	G	2.0	1.4	-0.6
		W	1.6	1.2	-0.4
	C	G	1.6	1.2	-0.4
		W	1.4	2.0	+0.6
	Total A & C	G	1.8	1.3	-0.5
		W	1.5	1.6	+0.1

treatment shows three changes greater than one point on the item scales which merit discussion. The overall ratings for the control treatment changed one and one-half scale points toward a more resistant attitude. This change, although not significant, is consistent with the angry feelings of the control Ss toward the counseling sessions. The ratings for the experimental treatment show a change on one and one-half scale points away from a work orientation and almost two points away from a concern with ongoing process. These changes could be interpreted as consistent with the experimental Ss' reaction to the experimental treatment. The changes on these two scales suggest that the experimental Ss avoided the work orientation of the laboratory experience but with less anger than the control Ss' reaction to the counseling sessions.

As mentioned in the results section the ratings on all five items for the experimental subgroups were higher for the laboratory sessions than for the pretreatment and post treatment ratings with the exception of one pretreatment rating for subgroup GB on item 3. These laboratory ratings were also higher than the pretreatment and post treatment ratings for the matching control subgroups. The laboratory ratings are not significantly higher in all cases, however.

Table 18 is a simplification of Table 16 and shows the pattern of significant differences between the laboratory ratings and the ratings for the various corresponding sessions. The post treatment results for control subgroup WC were not included for the reasons outlined in a previous section. Each asterisk indicates that the differences between that particular set of subgroup ratings and the laboratory ratings were significant at the .05 level or higher, in favor of the laboratory ratings. An inspection of Table 18 reveals that for Item 1, the laboratory ratings for GA and GC were in general significantly higher than the comparison subgroup ratings. Subgroup GB laboratory ratings were only significantly greater than the control group's pretreatment ratings. With one exception in connection with subgroup B, the pretreatment comparison, the laboratory ratings on Item 2 were significantly greater than all comparison subgroup ratings. The laboratory ratings on Item 3, however, show no consistent pattern of significant differences except for GC laboratory ratings which are significantly greater than all comparison ratings except GC post treatment. The ratings for Item 4, in general, are higher than for the comparison ratings with the exception of GB where, again, only the comparison with the control pretreatment rating is

Table 18

Pattern of Significant Comparisons Between Laboratory Ratings and Pretreatment and Post Treatment Ratings

Item	Subgroup	Experimental Group (G)		Control Group (W)	
		Pretreatment Comparison	Post Treatment Comparison	Pretreatment Comparison	Post Treatment Comparison
1.	A	*	*	*	*
	B			*	
	C	*		*	*
2.	A	*	*	*	*
	B		*	*	
	C	*	*	*	*
3.	A				*
	B			*	
	C	*		*	*
4.	A		*	*	*
	B			*	
	C	*	*	*	*
5.	A	*	*	*	*
	B	*	*	*	
	C	*	*	*	

*Lower Rank Total Significant at the .05 level or Higher

significant. With one exception, the comparison with the post treatment rating for control subgroup C, all laboratory ratings on Item 5 are significantly higher than the comparison ratings.

The pattern of significant differences presented in Table 18 suggests two important observations. The first is that the results for subgroup GB appear to be somewhat atypical in comparison to the other groups. Table 16 indicates that the laboratory ratings for GB are lower than for the other groups while the pretreatment ratings for the subgroup tend to be higher than for the other subgroups. No explanation can be offered for the deviation of this group except perhaps the possibility that when a group responds strongly to a negative experience it also tends to respond strongly in the other direction to a positive experience. The second observation is that when the results for subgroups GB and WB are disregarded, the pattern of significant differences in Table 18 suggests that the laboratory ratings are clearly superior to all comparison ratings with the exception of those for Item 3, openness versus guardedness. Although scattered differences are significant, there is a strong suggestion that the experimental Ss, in general, were not significantly more open during the laboratory sessions

than they and the control Ss were during the pretreatment and post treatments. This difference among the items implies that the laboratory experience may have promoted changes toward more effective group interaction which were restricted to the immediate situation while more extensive personality reorganization related to openness and trust did not have time to develop completely. This hypothesis might aid in the explanation of why significant changes in attitudes and behavior were not clearly demonstrated on the other assessment instruments. Beginning attempts to relate with others more openly coupled with the experimenters' leaving at the close of the laboratory could be expected to produce a negative reaction to the laboratory experience.

In contrast to the pretreatment and post treatment ratings, the laboratory ratings consistently fall on the favorable end of the item scales. The laboratory sessions, then, are definitely characterized as cooperative, work-oriented, relatively open, and concerned with ongoing process.

A factor related to Item 5 ratings, which has not as yet been discussed, is the degree of proficiency displayed by the laboratory staff and by the counselors during the various transcribed sessions. Table 17 shows that the proficiency ratings for the institution counselors ranged from fair to poor while the ratings for the experimenters ranged

from good to excellent. This difference in proficiency is a confounding variable which complicated the comparison of the laboratory sessions with the counseling sessions. While some of the superiority in rated proficiency for the laboratory staff is undoubtedly related to their greater knowledge and counseling skill, particularly in comparison with the very small amount of training received by the institution's counselors, there are several other mitigating factors to be considered. First, the experimenters were not professional counselors but graduate students with a limited amount of practical experience with delinquents. In addition, the laboratory staff were to some extent following a prescribed procedure in which they did not act as traditional group leaders. Instead, the experimenters created dilemmas and then acted as observers and set limits on the laboratory's behavior--a role which was an important ingredient of the experimental treatment itself.

Because the sample for the experimental sessions was purposely selected from group meetings held on the two days when motivation and cooperation were optimal, it can be argued that the differences between the laboratory and counseling ratings are entirely an artifact of the selection procedure for the samples. It is admitted that samples could have

been taken from laboratory sessions that probably would not have been rated any higher than the pretreatment and post treatment samples. Although a conclusive rebuttal to the selectivity argument cannot be documented, there is evidence that the laboratory ratings selected do demonstrate valid treatment effects and that despite the restriction of sampling to the last counseling sessions, the comparison ratings are representative of group functioning in the more traditional type of counseling group. The laboratory samples were selected from sessions held at the same hour by all three experimental subgroups, and it is significant that the ratings for all samples are uniformly high. The five comparison samples taken from the post treatment sessions of both experimental and control, on the other hand, consistently received lower ratings. If the differences were entirely a function of the sessions selected for sampling it would be expected that the ratings for at least one of the five sessions would equal or surpass the laboratory ratings. Additional evidence against the argument of selectivity is the high ratings obtained by the control subgroup which were excluded from the analysis of the overall data. In this case, where the ratings obtained were approximately equivalent to the laboratory ratings, it was assumed that

the introduction of the alternate counselor had an exaggerated and transitory effect. This example was cited to demonstrate that the final counseling sessions could vary in the character of their functioning, with the implication that lower ratings for the unbiased subgroups were not merely a function of selecting the samples from the last counseling sessions.

A final consideration is the possibility that the ratings of counselor and laboratory staff proficiency are not independent of the level of group functioning. Estimates of counselor proficiency may depend to some extent on the level of the performance characteristics of the subgroups. Some evidence for this can be observed in the Item 5 ratings presented in Table 16. The overall ratings for counselor proficiency associated with the experimental subgroups shows a half-point decline on a four-point scale. The proficiency associated with the control sessions, though, shows a tiny increase. In both cases, however, the proficiency ratings are for the same counselor or counselors.

The data presented thus far have been concerned with two general issues: the effect of a human relations training experience on attitudes and interpersonal relationships outside the experimental laboratory and differences in the

level of functioning in human relations groups versus traditionally oriented groups. The experimental treatment was found to have produced only a significant reduction in the antisocial fantasy elicited by selected TAT cards. Three other hypotheses concerned with predicted treatment effects were not supported.

The analysis of supplementary measurements of group functioning during the experimental treatment and comparisons with group functioning in pretreatment and post treatment counseling sessions suggests that the experimental treatment program was effective within the immediate setting of the laboratory. A more definite conclusion is precluded by the contaminating effects of using different personnel for the experimental treatment and the special selection of the laboratory sessions for rating. Added support for the effectiveness of human relations training techniques in improving the group functioning of delinquents is provided by the discussion of the informal observation data presented in the following section.

Discussion of Informal, Observational Data

As the observations reported in the previous chapter indicate, the experimental laboratory program was a qualified success in terms of circumventing resistance by involving

the Ss in problem-solving activities and in providing an opportunity for them to form relationships with the experimenters. Although some aspects of the laboratory program met with a less-than-hoped-for degree of success, the rationale upon which the experimental treatment was based proved to be generally sound. The rationale and special features of the experimental treatment will be discussed and evaluated in this final section.

The greatest amount of difficulty was experienced with the instrumented portions of the laboratory and the initial rigid schedule of activities. The original lecturettes and instructions devised for the laboratory were too long and complex to be readily understood by the Ss, particularly when their motivation was low. The revisions made after the first day resulted in some degree of improvement in the Ss' attention and understanding. On days when the Ss were well motivated they used and referred to the information related to types of groups and decision-making procedures which was discussed in the lecturettes. The use of rating scales which were designed to help the Ss evaluate their group's effectiveness was not particularly successful. In retrospect, this appears to be because effective group functioning was important to the Ss only to the extent that they were

concerned with pleasing the laboratory staff. Other issues more important to the laboratory overshadowed attempts to give feedback from the results of the ratings. In the morning when the results of the ratings of the previous day's groups were presented the Ss were usually more concerned with going to their small group meetings to discuss the distribution of the commissary than they were in the results of the ratings. It is also possible that many of the boys did not get a clear understanding of the purpose of the scales because of the confusion and lack of attention when the scales were first explained.

The usefulness of the exercises which were designed to illustrate such things as observation, decision-making procedures, types of groups, and feedback varied from excellent to poor. Film viewing and listening to tape recordings of group sessions were not satisfactory as exercises in observing and identifying because of the poor quality of the tape recordings and the relatively uninteresting films. More importantly, however, the Ss lacked any real incentive for these activities. Other exercises such as regrouping the Ss into new subgroups for one session to exchange information and giving individual feedback to the Ss at the end of the laboratory worked well. The regrouping exercise, in

particular, was interesting because the Ss were forced to cope with new patterns of dominance in the restructured groups. The regular subgroup meetings were well received by the Ss and the beginnings of group cohesiveness began to develop over the course of the week. The small groups also seemed to facilitate the development of relationships with the staff members who were assigned to these groups. Allowing the Ss to address the staff by their first names was also found to be effective in encouraging the Ss to relate more openly. This informal relationship between the staff and the Ss did not precipitate any discipline problems or lack of respect. The large number of Ss in the laboratory meetings, however, created a distraction which prevented this unit from functioning very effectively. The most successful features of the laboratory, however, were those involving dilemmas, delegation of responsibility, and the improvised use of situations which developed spontaneously. The greatest involvement of the Ss was associated with the problem of setting up a cottage government to regulate themselves and in connection with the dilemma created by the staff when the Ss were given the task of distributing their own commissary. A number of Ss found these tasks challenging enough to persist in attempting to organize the cottage into

a self-governing group despite physical punishment, abuse, and lack of cooperation from some of the other Ss. Role-playing of various parts in the conflicts which emerged as a result of the group's recreational activity proved to be especially interesting to many of the boys as was the confrontation of the tougher boys in the auditorium. In both instances the ongoing activity of the Ss was used in such a way as to explore the consequences of behavioral alternatives.

There were several aspects of the laboratory experience where more fortunate circumstances or more astute management might have produced a more effective program. An important variable was the large number of Ss in the laboratory which only aggravated the overstimulation which occurred when the Ss were restless and uncooperative. In retrospect, there were too many Ss in the laboratory even before an administrative mistake added two more Ss. The laboratory would have functioned much more smoothly with eighteen rather than twenty-six Ss. The larger number of Ss had to be used, however, because the institution was crowded and the experimental cottage had to be filled. A second variable which could not be controlled completely was the degree of isolation provided for the laboratory. Activities were frequently interrupted

by messengers who arrived to pick up Ss for appointments with their social workers or the doctor. Other interruptions were caused by boys who came to the windows of the cottage to ask for cigarettes or to pass information to the Ss. To some extent these outside contacts created morale problems because they reminded the Ss of allegiances and rivalries with boys who were not in the laboratory. They were also a disrupting influence because they told the Ss they were being "brainwashed" and supported the assertions of some of the Ss that they were only participating in order to get the commissary. More complete isolation in the present experiment was not feasible because of the current institutional procedures.

The laboratory program might have been made more comprehensive by involving the night counselors in the project. There was no time to brief these counselors before the experiment and it had been assumed that this had been done by their supervisor. This was not the case, however, and there was friction between the Ss who were given responsibility for their behavior during the day and the night counselors who were uncertain of how far they should go to accommodate the experiment. A full briefing, if not some training in human relations training, might have led to a significant improvement in the overall program.

If the experimental program were to be modified either for immediate use or for further research, the most important change would be an extensive use of behavior-shaping procedures according to reinforcement principles. It is quite possible that many of the attention and motivation problems encountered during the laboratory might have been minimized if the behavior of the Ss had been brought under the control of reinforcement. For example, the Ss might have been more likely to attend to the lecturettes and other exercises if reinforcement had been made contingent upon their applying this information to their group meetings. Greater freedom could have been made contingent upon the development of plausible plans for self-government and the successful handling of lower levels of responsibility. In the present experiment, concrete reinforcement was used inefficiently and too much reliance was placed upon the reinforcing value of the staff members. The experiment worked as well as it did, however, because the staff members did have some social reinforcement value. A more effective technique would have been to shape the Ss' behavior by reinforcing them for the acquisition of skills important for effective group functioning and self-government. In addition, gradual transition to a greater reliance on social reinforcement supplied by the experimenters could be effected.

Despite the lack of conclusive evidence presented here that a residential human relations training laboratory produces any lasting effects on attitudes and behavior, the positive response of the Ss to various parts of the program suggests that the development of treatment programs along these lines for confined delinquents may prove to be fruitful.

Chapter V

Summary

Resistance to therapeutic treatment is a frequently mentioned obstacle to effective group counseling and psychotherapy with delinquents. The present experiment was conducted to determine if human relations training techniques could be used to circumvent this resistance. The experimental treatment consisted of a one-week, instrumented, residential human relations training laboratory, utilizing some features of experimenter-subject psychotherapy, and specially constructed for use with twenty-four confined male delinquents. During the laboratory the Ss spent most of their time in meetings of the entire laboratory and in small subgroup meetings. This experimental treatment program incorporated the following characteristics of human relations training which were expected to minimize resistance to group treatment:

1. An initial treatment focus on group process generated by the task of setting up a group government, followed by a gradual shift in emphasis to a concern with behavior and attitude change.

2. An experimental setting and experimenter-subject relationships rather than conventional psychotherapeutic relationships.

3. A minimum of authoritative restrictions combined with the encouragement of independent behavior and responsibility for the group's behavior.

4. A utilization of peer pressure as the impetus for behavior change.

5. A focus on increasing social competence in immediate and concrete situations.

6. A utilization of lecturettes, rating scales, progress charts, and explicit verbal feedback.

The effects of the experimental treatment were assessed by comparing the experimental Ss with twenty-four paired control Ss on a number of measures. The control Ss spent an amount of time approximately equivalent to the laboratory experience in a more conventional form of group counseling sessions. Four hypotheses were constructed to aid in testing the effectiveness of human relations techniques in promoting changes in behavior in several areas.

Hypothesis 1. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater decrease in antisocial interpretations given to social situations depicted by selected TAT cards than will conventional group counseling.

Hypothesis 2. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater improvement in interpersonal

relationships with institution personnel and other boys as measured by a specially devised rating scale than will conventional counseling.

Hypothesis 3. The experimental treatment will result in a significantly greater improvement in attitudes related to accessibility to group psychotherapy as measured by a self report questionnaire than will conventional group counseling.

Hypothesis 4. Human relations training will result in more satisfactory participation in conventional group counseling as measured by a rating of transcribed counseling sessions than will an equivalent amount of time spent in conventional group counseling.

The first three hypotheses were investigated with a mixed-model analysis of variance of changes from pretreatment testing to post treatment testing for the experimental and control Ss. Only Hypothesis 1 was supported by the results of the analysis. Although the instability of change measures and certain inadequacies in experimental design raise questions as to the significance of the results, the decrease in antisocial interpretations for the experimental Ss was congruent with an increase in guardedness after the experimental treatment. It was speculated that this increase

in guardedness was in part a reaction to the loss of relationships which were formed by the Ss with the laboratory staff.

Hypothesis 4, which deals with ratings of transcribed counseling sessions was assessed with a nonparametric rank totals test. The changes in group functioning from pretreatment to post treatment for the experimental subgroups did not differ significantly from the changes for the control subgroups and Hypothesis 4 was not accepted. An additional analysis compared selected experimental subgroup sessions held during the laboratory with the pretreatment and post treatment sessions for the experimental and control subgroups. The laboratory sessions received significantly higher ratings than the comparison ratings suggesting that the experimental treatment was effective within the immediate setting of the laboratory. The nonrandom selection of laboratory sessions for rating and the necessity for using a statistical test which was not entirely suited for the data, however, severely limited the interpretation of this result.

Informal observations made during the experimental treatment revealed that a number of Ss became very involved in the project of setting up a cottage government and did

establish relationships with the laboratory staff. In general these observations justified the rationale upon which the laboratory experience was based even though the statistical analyses failed to conclusively demonstrate that the experimental treatment was effective outside the laboratory setting. The discussion recognized the inefficiency with which reinforcement was dispensed during the experimental treatment. Suggestions for further research and the practical application of human relations training with delinquents stressed the careful programming of concrete and social reinforcements.

References

Bailey, W. C. Correctional outcome: An evaluation of 100 reports. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1966, 57, 153-160.

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. Adolescent aggression. New York: Ronald, 1959.

Bennis, W. G. Goals and meta-goals of laboratory training. In W. G. Bennis, E. H. Schein, D. E. Berlew, and F. I. Steele (Eds.), Interpersonal dynamics: Essays and readings on human interaction. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey, 1964, 692-698.

Bennis, W. G. A critique of group theory research. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1960, 1, 63-77.

Bettis, M. C., Malamud, D. I., & Malamud, Rachel F. Deepening a group's insight into human relations: A compilation of aids. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1949, 5, 114-122.

Byrant, H. A., Dobbins, D. A., & Bass, B. M. Group effectiveness, coercion, change and coalescence among delinquents compared to nondelinquents. Journal of Social Psychology, 1963, 61, 167-177.

Chwast, J., Harari, C., & Delany, L. Experimental techniques in group psychotherapy with delinquents. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1961, 52, 156-165.

Edwards, A. L. Experimental design in psychological research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Feder, B. Limited goals in short-term group psychotherapy with institutionalized delinquent adolescent boys. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1962, 12, 503-507.

Frank, J. D. Training and therapy. In L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb and K. D. Benne (Eds.), T-Group theory and laboratory method, New York: Wiley, 1964, 442-451.

Gadpaille, W. J. Observations on the sequence of resistances in groups of adolescent delinquents. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1959, 9, 275-286.

Harris, C. W. Problems in measuring change. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1963.

Harter, H. L., & Lum, M. D. Partially hierarchical models in the analysis of variance. Wright Air Development Center Technical Report No. 55-33, March, 1955, Aeronautical Research Laboratory, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Ohio.

Horwitz, L. Transference in training groups and therapy groups. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1964, 14, 202-213.

Jacks, I. Accessibility to group psychotherapy of incarcerated adolescent offenders, Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1964, 55, 100-106.

Jastak, J. Wide Range Achievement Test (manual). Wilmington: G. L. Story, 1946.

Lakin, M., & Carson, R. C. A therapeutic vehicle in search of a theory of therapy. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1966, 2, 27-40.

Lenrow, P. B. A framework for planning behavior change in juvenile offenders. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1966, 2, 287-303.

Malamud, D. I. A workshop in self-understanding designed to prepare patients for psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1958, 12, 771-786.

Malamud, D. I., & Machover, S. Toward self-understanding: Group techniques in self-confrontation. Springfield, Ill.: Thomas, 1965.

McDavid, J. W., & McCandless, B. R. Psychological theory, research and juvenile delinquency. Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and Police Science, 1962, 53, 1-14.

Miles, M. B. Human relations training: Process and outcome. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 301-306.

Morton, R. B. The uses of the laboratory method in a psychiatric hospital. In E. H. Schein and W. G. Bennis (Eds.), Personal and organizational change through group methods. New York: Wiley, 1965, 114-151.

Raven, J. C. Guide to using the Coloured Progressive Matrices (1947), Sets A, Ab, B. London: Lewis, 1958 (United States distributor: Psychological Corporation).

Rickard, H. C. Selected group psychotherapy evaluation studies. Journal of General Psychology, 1962, 67, 35-50.

Rothaus, P., & Johnson, D. L. Group participation training for psychiatric patients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 11, 230-239.

Schwitzgebel, R. A new approach to understanding delinquency. Federal Probation, 1960, 24, 31-35.

Shelley, E. L. V., & Johnson, W. F. Evaluating an organized counseling service for youthful offenders. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 351-354.

Shepard, H. A. Explorations in observant participation. In L. P. Bradford, J. R. Gibb and K. D. Benne (Eds.), T-Group theory and laboratory method. New York: Wiley, 1964, 379-394.

Silver, A. W. Delinquents in group therapy. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 1963, 33, 754-756.

Slack, C. W. Experimenter-subject psychotherapy: A new method of introducing intensive office treatment to unreachable cases. Mental Hygiene, 1960, 44, 283-256.

Slavson, S. R. Reclaiming the delinquent by para-analytic group psychotherapy and the inversion technique. New York: Free Press, 1965.

Smith, A. B., & Bassin, A. Application of small group therapy to crime and delinquency. Journal of Social Therapy, 1961, 7, 76-85.

Stollak, G. E., & Guerney, B. Exploration of personal problems by juvenile delinquents under conditions of minimal reinforcement. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1964, 20, 279-283.

Wilcoxon, F. Some rapid approximate statistical procedures. New York: American Cyanamid, 1949.

Wolk, J. L., & Reid, R. A study of group psychotherapy results with youthful offenders in detention. Group Psychotherapy, 1964, 17, 56-60.

Appendix

Table A

Administration Instructions and Scoring Criteria for Thematic Apperception Test (TAT) Attitude Assessment

Instructions

"I am going to show you some pictures. For each picture write down what you think is happening in the picture (what the picture is about)."

Scoring Criteria

Themes Scored Two Points:

- Serious assault (with or without weapon)
- Breaking and entering
- Armed robbery or holdup
- Escape from the law
- Deviated sex act
- Prostitution
- Immorality
- Fighting
- Shooting someone
- Forging
- Suicide
- Adultery
- Threat
- Arrest
- Murder
- Rape

Themes Scored One Point:

- Parole or probation situation
- Drunkenness
- Stealing
- Escape (other than from the law)
- Gambling
- Court trial
- Defrauding

Table B

Accessibility to Group Psychotherapy Scale (Jacks, 1964)

1. It is easier to "do a bit" in prison if you keep in touch with your family.
2. If I find something valuable lying in the street, my conscience would bother me if I didn't return it.
3. Whenever I go on a trip, I like to bring souvenirs home to my family.
4. Any man who commits a crime proves that he needs psychiatric treatment.
5. The advantage to psychiatric treatment is that it teaches a man how to go straight.
6. Every person alive has something wrong with him mentally, which could be helped by psychiatric treatment.
7. Most people feel a lot worse inside themselves than they ever show on the outside to other people.
8. I guess I am a pretty nervous person.
9. I missed some pretty good jobs because I felt too "shook up" to go for an interview.
10. I worry too much about small things.
11. I'm the kind of person who likes to stick to a problem until I've figured it out, even if it takes all night.
12. If anyone stands around watching me work, even doing the easiest things makes me go to pieces.
13. It never hurts to talk over one's troubles with the psychologist.
14. For a long time now, I've been trying to figure out what makes me get into trouble and wind up in these places.

15. I think it would do me good to talk over my problems with a psychologist.

16. Many times I have wanted to see the psychologist, but got cold feet at the last minute.

17. When I receive visits from my family in here, I feel ashamed to have them see me like this.

18. Although I know it's wrong to break the law, something in me makes me do it.

19. I'm glad I got caught, otherwise I might have gotten into a lot more serious trouble.

20. When I get out of here, I'm sure I'll be able to go straight.

21. When I make up my mind to do something, I usually get it done.

22. Talking before an audience is something I could never do without getting "all shook up."

23. If my home life had been better, I probably would not have gotten into trouble.

24. The hardest thing for me to do is to admit that I'm wrong in an argument.

25. I'm glad that I was picked to get psychological treatment.

26. Even though I doubt that there's anything seriously wrong with me, I guess I could be helped by receiving psychiatric treatment.

27. Whenever I feel tense or worried about something, my stomach gets upset.

28. I have diarrhea at least once a month.

29. If I had not had any brothers (or sisters), I would have gotten along better with my folks.

30. My brothers (or sisters) were treated better than me by my parents.

31. It's easier to discuss very personal problems if others with the same kind of problems are in the discussion also.

32. A man would be a fool to admit doing things that might get him into trouble.

33. I don't think that I would like the life that most people lead on the outside.

34. I wish I could be as normal as everybody else.

35. Sometimes my life seems so hopeless, I feel like crying inside.

36. Guys who get scared or cry make me feel disgusted with them.

37. Prisons nowadays do more to help the inmates than they used to.

38. When I was in school, I used to feel stupid and less capable than the other kids.

39. I can honestly say that I never hurt anyone on purpose.

40. I'd rather stay poor than get rich by cheating somebody else.

41. I've tried to help other people solve their problems by using psychology.

42. I've tried to psychoanalyze myself, and I believe I now understand myself better.

43. I read books on psychology whenever I can.

44. I'd be ashamed to have my buddies know that I was seeing a psychologist.

45. If I thought it would help me to stay out of trouble in the future, I'd be willing to finish up my time in here.

46. I'd rather talk to the psychologist privately about my problems, than discuss them in front of a group of other inmates.

47. I wish I understood why I do things that get me into trouble.

48. Most girls are true to their boyfriends, while the boys are in prison.

49. It's going to be hard to face the neighbors when I get out of here.

50. I wish I had more self-confidence.

51. Most of the time I feel depressed, down in the dumps.

52. If my parents had taken better care of me when I was younger, I probably would not be here now.

53. When a man makes up his mind to do something, he should first figure out if it will hurt anyone.

54. I enjoy sitting around with a group of guys and having a bull session.

55. Whenever I get into a club or a crowd, I like to take charge of things.

56. It's easier for me to do a favor than to ask someone to do me a favor.

57. Most people have the same kind of problems as everyone else.

58. Whenever I start to worry about anything, I get an upset stomach.

59. It's easier for me to talk about personal matters in a group than to one person in private.

60. It's hard for me to act natural when I'm in a group.

61. I've been responsible for a lot of the trouble I've been in.

62. If I could get rid of the bad habits which I have acquired in my life, I would have a better life.

63. It's been a long time since I stopped and thought about my future life.

64. It takes me a long time to get going on a new task.

65. I try to get out of responsibilities because of a fear that I won't measure up.

66. I become tired more easily when I'm doing something that makes me anxious.

67. So much of my life consists of playing various parts, that the "real me" seems never to come out.

68. It's easier to promise to do things better than to actually do them better.

69. I criticize and resent the success of other people out of bitterness regarding my own lack of success.

70. Whenever I come into some new situation, I get panicky and worry about whether I will be able to do what's expected.

71. I frequently say things to people, especially important people, just to be agreeable, because of a fear of making them dislike me.

72. I prefer going on doing the same old things, because new things or new places frighten me.

73. I keep from getting too close to people, because I fear that getting close would result in their hurting me.

74. I do my best work on jobs where someone else is likely to get the credit or blame for the outcome.

75. Whenever I get started on something that may do me some good, I seem to do something to spoil it.

76. I feel more tense in some situations than in others.

77. I sometimes give reasons for my actions, which I know are not the real reasons.

78. Some of my ideas are so strange, that it would embarrass me to mention them to another person.

79. I'm afraid to admit even to myself some of the things I sometimes think about.

80. I feel disgusted every time I "jerk off."

81. A man's friends usually understand him better than his family does.

82. How far a man goes in life depends pretty much on himself.

83. I enjoy discussions in which each person has a different idea or opinion on a subject.

Table C

Attitude and Behavior Rating Scale

1. Argues with staff members.
2. Accepts suggestions for improving his work.
3. Asks questions about his work.
4. Asks for information or opinions from staff.
*5. Shows resentment when called down for something.
6. Argues or fights with other boys.
*7. Shows a willingness to talk out differences with staff member.
8. Willing to do as he is asked.
9. Seems to be planning trouble or is up to something.
*10. Expresses genuinely positive feelings toward others by giving praise or approval.
11. Shows above-average interest in his work.
*12. Is influenced by others to break rules.
13. Actively stirs up trouble among other boys.
*14. Takes responsibility for his actions.
15. Openly rebellious to staff member.
*16. Admits mistakes at work, school, or living quarters.
*17. Has favorable influence on other boys because of positive behavior and attitudes.
18. Is a likable person.
19. Thinks before he acts.

20. Cooperates with staff member.

21. Resists pressure from other boys to break rules.

22. Concerned with his own rehabilitation.

*23. Pressures other boys for favors, sex, or commissary, etc.

*24. Tries to manipulate staff member to obtain favors.

25. Works against institution rules and policies.

*26. Talks sincerely about feelings and ideas that are really important to him.

*27. Puts on a good front but actually is resisting rehabilitation.

28. Is dependable.

*Scores for these items were not included in the analyses.

Table D

Instructions and Scales for Rating
Group Counseling Sessions

Instructions for Rating

Each of the lettered sets of pages consists of a transcribed sample taken from a group counseling session with a counselor and eight confined male adolescent delinquents. There are fifteen sets of lettered pages which are samples from fifteen different counseling sessions held by a number of different counseling groups. All samples contain five excerpts, each lasting approximately two minutes. The verbalizations of the group leader are designated by the letter "T" while the contributions of the rest of the group are not designated by member. Using the accompanying rating scales, evaluate the overall character of each of the counseling samples. Do not rate each of the five excerpts separately but make your evaluation on the basis of your impression gained from the entire sample.

Rating Scales

1. Cooperative vs. Resistant Attitude Toward Group Counseling

   9 Completely cooperative
   8 Almost completely cooperative
   7 Moderately cooperative
   6 Slightly more cooperative than resistant
   5 As much cooperative as resistant
   4 Slightly more resistant than cooperative
   3 Moderately resistant
   2 Almost completely resistant
   1 Completely resistant

2. Bull Session vs. Work Orientation

   9 Completely work-oriented
   8 Almost completely work-oriented
   7 Moderately work-oriented
   6 Slightly more work-oriented than bull session
   5 As much work-oriented as bull session
   4 Slightly more bull session than work-oriented
   3 Moderate degree of bull session
   2 Almost completely bull session
   1 Completely bull session

3. Openness vs. Guardedness (degree of willingness to expose feelings and ideas to potential criticism)

   9 Completely open
   8 Almost completely open
   7 Moderately open
   6 Slightly more open than guarded
   5 As much open as guarded
   4 Slightly more guarded than open
   3 Moderately guarded
   2 Almost completely guarded
   1 Completely guarded

4. Concern with Ongoing Process vs. Past Experiences

   9 Completely concerned with process
   8 Almost completely concerned with process
   7 Moderately concerned with process
   6 Slightly more concerned with process than with past experiences

5 As much concerned with process as with past experiences
4 Slightly more concerned with past experiences than with process
3 Moderately concerned with past experiences
2 Almost completely concerned with past experiences
1 Completely concerned with past experiences

5. Estimate the counselor's proficiency using the following scale:

4 Excellent
3 Good
2 Fair
1 Poor

Table E

Schedule of Laboratory Activities

	Day One
8:00 a.m. - 9:45 a.m.	Start of project delayed until two Ss were released from detention unit.
9:45 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	Introduction to the laboratory, distribution of commissary, movie and discussion.
9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Recreation (baseball).
11:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon	E Group meeting (tape recorded).
12:00 noon - 12:30 p.m.	Workshop meeting (introduction to decision-making scales, groups rated their morning meetings).
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	Rest period.
1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	E Group meeting (tape listening exercise).
2:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.	Recreation (baseball).
3:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.	Clean-up.
3:45 p.m. - 4:30 p.m.	Workshop meeting.
	Day Two
8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.	Workshop meeting (distribution of commissary, review of goals, film, and decision-making scales).
8:30 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	E Group meeting (tape recorded and transcribed).
9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Recreation (swimming).

11:00 a.m. - 12:45 p.m.	Workshop meeting (discussion and demonstration of types of groups, role playing).
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	Rest period.
1:30 p.m. - 1:45 p.m.	Workshop meeting (discussion of task functions).
1:45 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	E Group meeting.
2:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.	Recreation (baseball and basketball).
3:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.	Clean-up.
3:45 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.	Workshop meeting.

Day Three

8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.	Workshop meeting (distribution of commissary, review of decision-making procedures, types of groups and task functions).
8:30 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	E Group meeting.
9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Recreation (baseball and basketball).
11:00 a.m. - 11:45 a.m.	Workshop meeting outdoors (demonstrations of types of groups, decision-making procedures and/or task functions).
11:45 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.	Workshop meeting in auditorium (confrontation between laboratory and uncooperative Ss).
1:00 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	Workshop meeting in auditorium (movie, discussion, and attempted feedback exercise).
2:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.	Recreation (swimming and roller skating).

CONTINUED

3 OF 4

3:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.	Clean-up.
3:45 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.	Workshop meeting.

Day Four

8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.	Workshop meeting (distribution of commissary, and discussion).
8:30 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	E Group meeting (tape recorded and transcribed).
9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Recreation (baseball and basketball).
11:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m.	Workshop meeting (discussion of feedback).
11:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.	E Group meeting.
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	Rest period.
1:30 p.m. - 2:30 p.m.	E Group meeting (exchange of members).
2:30 p.m. - 3:30 p.m.	Recreation (swimming).
3:30 p.m. - 3:45 p.m.	Clean-up.
3:45 p.m. - 4:15 p.m.	Workshop meeting.

Day Five

8:00 a.m. - 8:30 a.m.	Workshop meeting (distribution of commissary and discussion).
8:30 a.m. - 9:30 a.m.	E Group meeting.
9:30 a.m. - 11:00 a.m.	Recreation (swimming and roller skating).
11:00 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.	Workshop meeting (search for stolen commissary).
1:00 p.m. - 1:30 p.m.	Rest period.

1:30 p.m. -	3:00 p.m.	Recreation (baseball).
3:00 p.m. -	3:30 p.m.	Clean-up.
3:30 p.m. -	4:30 p.m.	Workshop meeting (staff gave feedback).

Table F

Verbatim Record of Laboratory Lecturettes and Instructions

Day One

Section 1

"For the next week you are going to be in an experiment. But this experiment will be much different from any that you may have heard about because you are going to be the experimenters as well as the subjects. Because it is sometimes hard to sit in meetings for a long time without a smoke, everyone will get a pack of cigarettes (or candy if you don't smoke) each day as my way of paying you for helping me out.

"The experiment has to do with counseling. I want you to learn something about counseling yourselves and each other. We will be working together some of the time in this large group, which is called a laboratory, and some of the time in eight-man groups. You will find your name listed under one of the groups on this sheet that I am going to pass out.

"The red group will meet in the library, the blue group in that corner of this room, and the green group will meet in the next room. You will be meeting with the people

in your group most of the time but we will also meet here in this large group before and after some of the meetings.

"As I said before, all of you are going to be both subjects and experimenters and at the same time both counselors and counselees for one another. Myself, Mr. Uhlemann, and Mr. Donk will be sitting in on the groups, but we are not going to act as leaders for the group. It will be up to you to get your own group moving and doing things. To get back to the idea of experimenting, the two most important things about an experiment are: number one, doing something; and number two, carefully observing what happens. Most of the time we go about this backwards. For example, if our car breaks down we look to see if we can find out what has broken down and sometimes it's hard to figure out just what isn't working right because we don't know what to look for or maybe we can't remember just how it's supposed to work. In an experiment we go about things in a different way. We do some particular thing on purpose and know beforehand we are going to look carefully to see what the result is. An example of this might be to do something to our car when it is running all right to see if we can get it to run better.

"While we are here we can experiment in three ways: the whole workshop can try something, and we can all see what happens; your small group can do something as a group that we can evaluate; and each of you as an individual can try some new way of doing things like not losing your temper and then observing how others in your group react. Again, the most important thing is to know what you are doing in order to observe and evaluate the results. Sometimes you will observe an improvement and then you would keep doing things the new way, while at other times things may get worse and then the smart thing will be to try something new. Actually this doing something and observing is really simple and really useful, but it's funny how some people never catch on that it's smart to stop once in a while and consider the results of what they do. Groups sometimes sit and argue for hours and hours without getting anywhere, without stopping to figure out ways of helping the group to run more smoothly. Some guys go AWOL time after time and don't seem to realize that it doesn't get them anywhere.

"One way in which the laboratory can experiment is to set up some kind of a government to regulate things here in the cottage. Some people think that the guys here on the

hill wouldn't be able to run a cottage right if it were up to them to do it for themselves. I think they are wrong. I think you guys can make your own rules and live by them without getting into trouble. There are a couple of rules that the institution has that you will have to have, but it will be up to you to enforce them as well as any other rules you make. The institution rules are (1) no smoking in the dorms because of the fire hazard, (2) no fighting because someone might get hurt and it's really not a very good solution to a problem, and (3) the 10:00 p.m. lights out, which is the institution's policy. Although these are institution rules, the laboratory will have the first chance to enforce them. The cottage counselor will not interfere with any activity that goes on unless it is clear that things are getting out of control and the laboratory either cannot or will not control it. There is one more rule that I have, though, and that is: I want you to observe how well your government is working and to change it yourselves if it isn't working right. A lot of you guys have complained that the hill isn't a good place because of the fights and the guys that pressure. This is your chance to do something about it yourselves. If this experimental government works extremely well this week, it is just possible that some of

the ideas for a government may become standard procedure. Are there any questions about the experiment?

"You have all had some experience in group counseling last week, so do you think counseling can help you get out of here quicker and make it less likely that you will come back?

"Sometimes when people work together in groups it is useful to set up goals for the group to work for if everyone in the group agrees on the goals. I would like to suggest a few goals that you might think about a little.

1. To learn about counseling oneself and others.
2. To learn how to set up and run a cottage government.
3. To learn how to experiment and observe results.

"The first thing we are going to do this morning is to get some practice in observation. In a few minutes we will go over to the school auditorium and see a film about how groups such as the one we have here work. As you watch the film I want you to see if you can find the answers to some questions listed on this sheet.

1. What is the purpose of a training laboratory?
2. What different groups use training laboratories?
3. What is a T Group and how does it work?
4. What are the goals of a training laboratory?"

Section 2

"In a few minutes you will be on your own to meet in your groups, but first I want everyone to be sure how to run

the tape recorders. Each group will have its own tape recorder, and each group will be responsible for making a tape recording of its meeting and writing on the box the name of the group (red, blue, or green), the side of the tape used, the date and time of the meeting. These meetings are recorded for two reasons: first, so that I can see how the experiment is going; and second, so that you can listen to your own meeting at any time you want to observe the results of something you have done. Here is how the tape recorders work.

"In your first Experimental Group meeting (or E group for short) which will last until about 11:30, I want you to talk about the kinds of rules that might be needed in the cottage and the kind of organization needed to make them work. The staff member that sits in on your meeting will not be the leader or counselor so you can run your meeting in any way you like. Later on we will get together so that you can pool your ideas with the rest of the people in the lab before setting up the government for the lab. Are there any questions?

"Break up into the three groups listed on the roster sheet and go to your meeting places."

Section 3

"Earlier this morning I mentioned that the most important things about an experiment were doing something and then observing the results of what we have done. In your E Groups this morning you did something: you talked about a government for the cottage or maybe your group was mainly concerned with what you were supposed to be doing here or what this laboratory was all about. What were some of your groups like?

"It is necessary to know what we have done; what our group was like before we can try something new to see if it works better. The next step is to observe and there are some tools that we can use to help us do this. We have three scales which can be used to measure how your group operated. The first scale has to do with group atmosphere. The scale has words that describe the general activity of the group.

Group Atmosphere Scale

Rewarding. The first word describes a group in which the guys have worked together well and have accomplished the task they set out for themselves and the whole group feels they have done a good job.

Sluggish. Sometimes a group will try hard to get down to business but just can't seem to get going. This type of meeting is called sluggish.

Competitive. When some guys are mostly out to win arguments and some win while others lose, the group is competitive.

Play. This happens when the group avoids getting down to business and goofs off so much that nothing gets done. A bull session is an example of play.

Work. When the group takes its work seriously and tries to get something done we have a work atmosphere. It is possible for other conditions to be present also, so a group may fight and still work hard.

Fight. Sometimes a group can't agree on anything--what should be talked about, what should be decided, or what to do. A lot of arguments and disagreements would make a fight atmosphere.

"Now circle the words that describe the atmosphere of your group. You may need to use more than one word to get a good description. Does anyone have any questions about how to do it or the meanings of any of the words?

"Now look at the other two scales. These scales are a little different because only one answer is possible. The scales also measure what your group was like but in a slightly different way. This time the scales measure how you feel about the group or what you are getting from the group. Answer scales two, three, and four by circling the number in front of the sentence that tells how you think and feel about the group.

"The numbers beside the statements make up a scale. The high numbers stand for a high degree of satisfaction, the low numbers for dissatisfaction, and the numbers in between stand for a group that falls in between satisfied and dissatisfied. People feel differently about their

groups and pick different numbers, but if the group meeting was fairly good most people would pick the higher numbers. If the group meeting was bad most of the scores would be low. Even though members tend to pick high or low numbers depending upon how the meeting went, usually not everyone picks exactly the same number. When we find the average we divide the total score up equally among the members and get the most likely score that would have occurred if everyone had picked the same number.

"We can now take this average number and find its place on the scale and this will tell us how the members generally felt about the group. Does anyone have any questions about how to find the average or what it means?

"Now that you have rated your group meeting on these scales the next question is, 'What can we do with these ratings?' The ratings will be posted on this chart and put up on that wall. During the week we will use these and other scales again. You can then see the progress of the group and you may get some ideas about how you can experiment and improve your meetings."

Section 4

"This morning you got some experience with meeting in both large and small groups and you probably got some idea

of some of the problems people run into when they work in groups. What sort of problems did you have? This afternoon I want to take up the subject of what goes on in group meetings so that we can get some ideas about experimenting with what we do in groups.

"What you talk about in your experimental group can be concerned with either content or process and of course it is possible for a group to talk about both. Content is the 'what' of the group discussion--the topic you are talking about. In this case it is the problem of setting up a government. Process concerns 'how' the group is working together. When we talk about process we talk about how a group goes about doing things: what sort of organization they set up to run their meetings, and what procedures they use to make group decisions. Process is concerned only with what goes on in the group meetings, things that happen here and now.

"When a group spends some time talking about the process used by a group in a meeting, it is moving in the direction of analyzing its process, one of the important things in experimenting. When procedures used by the group are identified and discussed, questions about the results of these procedures come up.

"A question you may have at this point is, 'Why should a group spend its time analyzing its process?' Groups who are not concerned about their process may do all right, but those who put their process in a test tube for observation learn to perform better. When a group begins to evaluate its process, it sometimes discovers reasons why the group can't make decisions or communicate well with one another, or why a particular member doesn't get along with the others in the group.

"In other words, process analysis involves all the procedures by which a bunch of guys change into a real group or team. It also has a lot to do with how well the group will learn to work together.

"One way in which we analyze process is to look at the methods we use to make decisions. Some methods aren't too good sometimes because a decision is made without the group even realizing it has made a decision. To study decision-making methods we have a new scale, the Plop to Agreement Scale. This scale contains some of the actual procedures attempted in group decision-making. Some of the methods are good and lead to decisions that represent the thinking of the whole group while other methods interfere with the group's work.

"Each of you has been given a copy of the scale, so if you will follow along on it with me, we'll go over the meaning of each of the procedures."

Decision-Making Scales

Plop. This is a procedure often used by groups without realizing it. A plop is the result any time a suggestion is made by a group member and meets with no response of any kind from the others in the group.

One-man decisions. This happens when one guy makes a suggestion and then goes and talks about something without finding out whether the others in the group want to talk about it. This can get the group off the topic. Often a group can be pressured into doing something which none of the group members really want to do simply because of the way in which a one-man decision is made.

Topic jump. When groups avoid their main problem (for example, setting a government) by jumping from topic to topic, they usually waste a lot of time. Topic jumps are very often one-man decisions.

Handclasp. The handclasp results when one member gives agreement to a suggestion made by another. It often leads to results like the one caused by the one-man decision. The group may be led to action by two strong members rather than on the basis of any real group agreement.

Minority support. This is another procedure similar to the handclasp. In this case a minority of the group members force a decision or suggestion into group action which the majority of the group does not support but can't stop because of the force with which the decision is pushed. When the whole group finally realizes what has happened, they probably won't go along with what the few members want.

Majority support. Many groups make the mistake of thinking that simply because a majority support a decision then everyone will go along with it. This is not usually the case. Many times the few members who disagree will do something to mess up what most of the group wants to do.

Suggestion making. This is a procedure where the group produces as many different ideas as it can as quickly as it can before evaluating them. By thinking of a large number of different ideas the group has increased the number of suggestions from which to choose.

Thought and feeling agreement. Groups which really try to avoid the problems of the plop, one-man decision, and minority or majority support often try to include every member in the final decision. This is done by refusing to accept a decision not supported by all members whenever possible. When all members have contributed to the decision, they are more satisfied with it than with any other possible solution. This is a compromise decision in which everyone wins a little. Decisions reached in this way are most likely to receive support from all the group members.

Section 5

"From now until 2:30 I want you to listen to the tape of the meeting you held this morning and try to identify the different kinds of decision-making methods that were used. Stop the tape each time someone thinks he has heard a particular method being used and try to get group agreement as to which method it is. Keep a record of the number of times each method occurs on the sheet that I passed out."

Section 6

"For the last few minutes this afternoon I want you to work together on your own in this large group to set up a cottage government. The only two things I ask are that your government use the cottage rules I mentioned this morning and that you observe how this meeting goes and how the government works out tonight so that we can evaluate the results

tomorrow. Remember that you've got to get together with the counselor and get him to agree with whatever you decide."

Day Two

Section 7

"For the first thing this morning I want to review some of the things we did yesterday. First I outlined some goals that we might have as a group.

1. To learn about counseling oneself and others.
2. To learn how to set up and run a cottage government.
3. To learn how to experiment and observe results.

"What have you learned and what progress has been made toward each of these goals?

"Next we saw a film on the NTL. What do you remember about the film?

1. How does a T Group work?
2. What are the goals of a T Group?
   a. To improve ability to listen and observe.
   b. To achieve better understanding of oneself and groups.
   c. To find ideas for application outside the lab.

"Next we had group meetings and then rated them on scales. What was the purpose of the scales? (The ratings of previous day's sessions were posted and explained.) Then we looked at some ways a group might make decisions." (Ss were asked questions about decision-making procedures.)

Section 8

"This morning I want you to discuss how well the cottage government worked last night and how well the laboratory meeting that we held yesterday afternoon worked out. As a group, make a list of the things that could be done to improve the laboratory meetings and government. I also want you to make some observations on how you go about holding your meeting and to experiment with new ways of holding your meeting."

Section 9

"On this sheet that I am going to pass out there are three different groups listed and the way in which each operates. Follow along as I read them.

Types of Groups

Mechanical

1. Goal of group meeting is decided in advance by a leader.
2. Decisions are made by mechanical means such as voting.
3. Chairman or leader is a person elected or appointed for the meeting.
4. Functions such as summarizing, testing for workability, or calling for a vote are performed by the leader.
5. Meeting is governed by a set of rules.
6. Members get permission to speak.

Bull

1. The whole group does not share a goal.
2. The group does not make decisions.

3. There is no chairman or leader.
4. Functions such as summarizing, testing for workability, testing for agreement, or taking a vote are not used.
5. Group members are out to win their own points.
6. Members speak when they can get a word in.

Organic

1. Group decides on its own goal.
2. Decisions are made by agreement.
3. Role of chairman or leader is carried out by many members.
4. Functions such as summarizing, testing for workability, and testing for agreement are performed by many members.
5. Members take responsibility for working toward a goal without being directed by a leader.
6. Members take turns speaking without getting permission from a leader and encourage one another to share feelings and ideas.

"I want each group to take a turn meeting for fifteen minutes while the other two groups observe. Each group will have different instructions for its meeting; after the demonstration group is finished, the two groups which are observing will guess which type of meeting the group held: mechanical, bull session, or organic." (Instructions for each group printed on a separate handout.)

Red Group

Feel free to talk about anything you like when you like. Interrupt other members, relate funny stories or jokes, abandon the topic. In other words, let your discussion be a bull session.

Blue Group

Appoint a chairman at the beginning of the meeting and use parliamentary procedures to select a topic and throughout

the discussion. You should speak only when recognized by the chairman and gain recognition by raising your hand. The chairman should deal with anyone who doesn't follow the procedure and keep the group on the topic at all times.

Green Group

Your group is to select its topic. There will be no chairman; control should be the responsibility of every group member. Every group member should supply task functions as the need arises and break to analyze process at any time. Feel free to give feedback when any member's behavior is inappropriate or blocks the group's action. Avoid using any mechanical organization (like going around the group) to make people participate. Members should talk whenever they have a contribution to make.

Section 10

"Here is a list of things that need to be done by a group if it wants to do a good job in getting its task done well.

Task Function Scale

Stating a problem. One function is to present a problem or state an issue for the group to discuss. In an experimental group, which starts without a leader, it is necessary for someone to state an issue or present a problem or idea so that the group can get started.

Giving suggestions about procedure. The next function is concerned with giving suggestions as to how the group should proceed. Experimental groups always have this question of whether they are proceeding in the best way or whether some other way might accomplish more. This is a function that should be performed by all members of the group.

Asking for information. Asking questions is a very important activity in a group because it stirs up thinking. It is only when all the questions are asked by one person that the group is likely to depend upon this person too much. If this person does not think to ask the important questions the group may not make the best decisions. Here is another function that should be shared by all members.

Summarizing. Summarizing is also very important. A member, after listening and participating, may give a really good summary that makes it clear to the others what things have been discussed and the decision which has resulted.

Testing for workability. The next function is concerned with testing for workability or getting the group to do this. For example, the group may consider discussing some course of action that is entirely unrealistic because the institution would never go along with it or perhaps because the group knows very little about the subject. The group needs for someone to point out these things and keep the group on the track of what is possible.

Testing for agreement. This function involves taking responsibility for finding out if a group is in agreement. If a member is talking and it looks as though the others may agree, he may say, 'It looks as though we are moving toward an agreement. I wonder if we are in agreement on this point.' This encourages the others to make it clear just what they think or feel about the issue. This is another group function that can be shared by all group members. A group must be careful that testing for agreement doesn't turn into a demand for minority or majority support.

Standard setting. Once a group has made a decision to talk about a topic the group must follow up this decision unless the group as a whole decides to go on to something else. Otherwise the group may find itself jumping around from topic to topic without getting anywhere. Standard setting as a means of staying on the topic doesn't have to be the responsibility of one person--it can be done by anyone who sees that the group is beginning to stray from the topic."

Section 11

"In your E Group meeting this afternoon, discuss the progress of the cottage government and try to use these task functions as much as possible."

Day Three

Section 12

"Before we go to the E Groups this morning to discuss the laboratory government, I want to review again the things we have taken up in the past two days. (Questions were asked to get the participants to remember and explain the various decision-making procedures, types of groups, and task functions.)

"There is one more thing I'd like to mention that you might discuss in your E Groups. Yesterday the group as a whole did an extremely good job in governing yourselves. At the same time, a couple of things happened in the morning and after lunch that could have got some guys into E company (the disciplinary unit) for a month and the rest of the group on restriction for a good long time. In your E Groups this morning try to work out some way of handling situations like these."

Section 13

"Get together in your E Groups again for five minutes and pick one item that we have talked about in the last two days. Each group will have ten minutes to demonstrate to the others in a group meeting the one item they have picked. The other two groups will try to guess which item was

selected. You can demonstrate anything that you would like except for a bull session. Now take five minutes to pick your item and to decide how to demonstrate it. You can use the materials on the handout to give you some ideas."

Section 14

"We all see things and one another in different ways. The film that you are going to see, 'The Eye of the Beholder,' is about a situation in which a number of people see the same thing, but in different ways. After the film we can talk about how this applies to what has been happening in the laboratory."

Section 15

"When we analyze what went on in the group or in the cottage that made people feel that yesterday we had a good group or that today things are not going well, we have the chance to get some feedback. By feedback I mean knowledge of what the results are when you do something. Measuring different things that go on in groups and finding a difference from group meeting to group meeting can be a chance to learn, if the scores are used as a basis for trying something different.

"Giving and getting feedback in a group can be a real problem itself. If someone tells us something we don't like to hear about ourselves, we begin to be defensive. We say,

'You don't understand,' we argue back, or we change the subject. We talk about anything but ourselves. This is being defensive. When someone starts giving us information that gets close to our sensitive self we start getting defensive. This is one of the real problems you will have in your groups. Any time we are faced with accepting information with which we are not comfortable we become tense. We're uncomfortable because this means we may have to change and it's a lot easier to stay the way we are even if we don't like ourselves that much. This is the way we all feel. When we receive information which is threatening to us we become defensive, because we don't know what we can do to change ourselves and we're not sure of the reasons of the person that is giving the information to us.

"How we see giving or receiving help depends upon whether we are doing the giving or receiving. You saw in 'The Eye of the Beholder' how different the behavior of the artist looked when it was seen from the eyes of the guy himself, the artist, as compared to how it was seen through the eyes of the taxi driver. What does this have to do with the laboratory? Well, maybe you can give us some feedback. How do you see me, Len and Max? How do you see John T? Everyone thinks he's kind of simple, but is he? (Discussion

elicited after questions.) For the next few minutes meet with one other person and exchange some feedback with him. Try to be honest with yourself and with him.

Section 16

"In this last meeting today try to work out a way to distribute the commissary fairly when it is brought in tomorrow."

Day Four

Section 17

"In your E Groups this morning discuss the ways in which the cottage government could be improved, especially the distribution of commissary."

Section 18

(Lecturette on feedback presented again and E Group meetings were devoted to giving feedback. See Section 15.)

Section 19

(Members of E Groups were temporarily exchanged.) "In these new groups, exchange information about what your regular E Groups have been talking about."

Day Five

Section 20

"In your E Groups this morning I want you to discuss whether or not you think the experiment has been a success."

END