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Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

A high level of interest in small group experiences of various kinds has characterized the past ten years in psychology, education and related disciplines (Rogers, 1970; Yalom, 1970). As a consequence, the skills necessary for functioning effectively as a group facilitator have increasingly been viewed as fundamental elements in the well-trained counseling psychologist's armamentarium (APGA, 1973; Egan, 1974). Carkhuff (1969) has detailed the advantages of the group setting as follows: a focus on inter-personal events, direct observation of communication styles between a number of individuals, utilization of group cohesion, and the experience of people sharing common difficulties.

The increasing investment of time, manpower, and financial resources in the training and utilization of group facilitators has not been accompanied by a proportional growth in experimental studies of group process and outcome. In a recent review of the group literature Yalom (1970) noted:

....there are many problems inherent in this research: the measurement of outcome itself is a methodological morass. The selection and measurement of the in-therapy variables is equally problematic; generally the accuracy of the measurement is directly proportional to the triviality of the variable (p. 4).

1
Recent reviews of available empirical studies of group counseling and psychotherapy (Bednar and Lawlis, 1971; Yalom, 1970) have, however, pointed to the importance of the initial phase of the group for ensuing process and outcome. During early sessions the group leader is faced with the task of setting up the type of climate wherein optimal client progress can occur. The literature to date suggests that such a climate is characterized particularly by high levels of group cohesiveness (Yalom, 1970; Goldstein, Heller, and Sechrest, 1966). Bednar and Lawlis (1971) summarize the leader's task as follows:

It is becoming increasingly clear that the most formidable task facing a group therapist is cultivating a group of unhappy, interpersonally tense ... individuals into a cohesive unit characterized by warm interpersonal relationships and mutual attempts at self-help (p. 828).

While a number of variables are likely to have an effect on the group's initial interactions, it seems clear that the behavior of the group's designated leader has a critical role in the initial folding of events (Bion, 1959; Yalom, 1970). Classic arguments for non-directive leader behavior (Bion, 1959; Foulkes, 1946) stress the importance of the group leader's disengagement from the dependency expectations of group members.

In the groups in which I am psychiatrist I am the most obvious person, by virtue of my position, in whom to vest a right to establish rules of procedure. I take advantage of this position to establish no rules of procedure and to put forward no agenda (Bion, 1959).
More recent proponents of this same position lean less toward analytic interpretations involving dependency and authority. Instead, the emphasis is shifted toward trusting the wisdom of the group, or not arbitrarily imposing one's preference on group members:

Partly because I do trust the group . . . I feel, "I don't have any idea what's going to happen here, but I feel that what's going to happen will be all right," and I think I tend to communicate nonverbally, "Well, none of us seem to know what's going to happen, but it doesn't seem to be something to worry about." I believe that my relaxation and lack of any desire to guide may have a freeing influence on others (Rogers, 1970).

The core of the stance articulated by Rogers seems to involve: (1) disclaiming knowledge about probable events in the group's development, (2) an attempt to identify with the group's members in their feelings about the group, and (3) a refusal to directly structure the events to follow. It is worth noting that the above quotation is taken from a widely distributed book on small group process. Individuals trained in this approach are currently engaged in group work throughout the country.

Two recent articles present conceptual frameworks for initiating group counseling which stress an alternative, highly directive role for the small group leader. Egan (1973) presents a two-phase model of human relations training: systematic training in basic relationship skills (phase I), followed by small group interaction using the skills just practiced (phase II). During phase one the group leader functions as a trainer in interpersonal skills. In phase two the leader's role is that of facilitator/model for the group members. Thus, the leader's role becomes less structured once group members are oriented and prepared for the task at hand.
In a similar vein Bednar, Melnick, and Kaul (1974) propose a highly structured initiation to group counseling. In their model participants receive: (1) cognitive information regarding the experience they are about to begin, (2) modeling of important member behavior, and (3) practice in behavior deemed critical for the success of the group. The authors base their approach on the deliberate facilitation of two desired group member behaviors, risk-taking and responsibility. Risk-taking behavior is facilitated by the leader's taking responsibility for the group's initial activities. As the members become oriented to and trained for the task, they can gradually assume more responsibility for self-direction.

Proponents of the use of structure in facilitating group development suggest that such a procedure helps to minimize interpersonal distress and discomfort. Additionally, structure can be used to provide members with a realistic set of expectations regarding group development and their role in it. Research (cf. Goldstein, 1962) has indicated that pre-treatment expectations influence process and outcome in counseling.

The purpose of the present study is to examine in a field setting the effects of high vs. low structure initiation in a personal growth group made up of college undergraduates. Level of initial structure will be varied and the effect on the following process and outcome dimensions will be measured: attrition, initial session anxiety level, patterns and depth of group interaction, development of group cohesion, member expressed preferences for modes of interacting, and satisfaction with the group experience.
Specifically, the study was designed to investigate empirically the following questions:

1. Does a high level of structure during initiation of group activities reduce member attrition from the group experience, when compared with a low level of initial structure?

2. Does high initial structure result in less initial session anxiety than low structure?

3. Does high structure enhance the development of group cohesion?

4. Does a high structure initiation result in a higher proportion of risk-taking behavior during group sessions, than low initial structure?

5. Do group members react more positively to a group experience initiated with high structure rather than the low structure?
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to expand upon the problem statement and brief literature overview presented in Chapter I, by examining the theoretical and empirical work underlying this study of the effects of initial structure on small group process and outcome. Two areas of social psychological theory and research serve as the conceptual anchors for the study: the literature regarding the social facilitation of behavior (Zajonc, 1965) and the analysis of individual problem-solving behavior within a group setting (Thibaut and Kelley, 1959). The empirical data directly relevant to an examination of the impact of degree of initial structure on group development will be integrated into these frameworks.

Briefly, the chapter is organized as follows:

I. Social facilitation.
   A. Theory and research regarding the initiation of small groups.
   B. Research on group cohesion.

II. Individual problem-solving within the small group setting.
   A. Research on preparing clients for group interaction.
   B. Research and theory regarding the teaching of interactive behavior.
   C. Research and theory regarding structure and its relevance for complex meaningful verbal learning.
SOCIAL FACILITATION

Social facilitation refers to the impact on individual behavior of the presence of others. What happens to individual behavior as a function of the presence of other persons, as an audience and/or as co-actors? Research reviewed by Zajonc (1965) supplies a tentative answer: "the emission of well learned responses is facilitated by the presence of others, while the acquisition of new responses is impaired" (p. 270). In a social situation, then, it would be predicted that the currently dominant response patterns of the individual would be facilitated by the presence of others, whereas new behaviors are likely to be interfered with.

What are the implications of this social facilitation phenomenon for the small group designed to foster psychological growth and interpersonal competencies? The social facilitation literature mentioned above suggests that in the absence of explicit instructions and role induction regarding group interactions (i.e. in an unstructured initiation) the behaviors most likely to occur are the members' dominant interpersonal responses—often the very behaviors which the members seek out group experiences in order to modify. A further implication of the social facilitation phenomenon is that if the group leader can induce new learning in the members, then the performance of the learned behaviors is likely to be enhanced by the presence of others.

Theory and Research Regarding the Initiation of Small Groups

The designated leader of a small group has at least two basic options regarding the initiation of the group: to allow the group members to discover and clarify for themselves the nature and purpose of their interaction
by implicitly reinforcing desired behaviors; or to instruct them explicitly regarding the nature of group development, their roles in it, and the predicted outcomes. The latter approach is characteristically rejected by persons working with small groups as being overly structured or likely to foster dependency on the leader (Bion, 1959; Rogers, 1970). Gordon (1955) takes the position that

A leader must also be led in that he is influenced by the behavior of the group to the extent that the group's norms, problems, and goals actually determine the kinds of contributions that will pattern the group's behavior (p. 51).

This approach to group leadership, typically labeled as non-directive or member-centered, is characteristic of many of the small group approaches which have been developed in recent years (Egan, 1973). On the basis of literature reviewed, it is the writer's judgment that the wide-spread acceptance of these "non-directive" or "group-centered" approached to small group leadership has two principal sources:

1. an enthusiastic and often unquestioning adherence to Rogerian rules regarding therapeutic interaction.

2. the articulation of models of "stages of group development" which are viewed as natural, invariant, and somehow independent of leader behavior. These models seem to suggest that group development takes place in vacuo, in a manner presumably determined by some underlying "natural" rules of interpersonal interaction and its sequential development.

Bennis and Shepard (1956) suggest for example, that early sessions are characterized by attempts to ward off anxiety and to search for structure or a common goal. This phase is followed by a period of "dealing with the leader," and finally members begin to engage in interdependent relational
and problem-solving behaviors. In this model, which is considered by many to be basic knowledge for small group leaders (cf. Bradford, Gibb, and Benne, 1964), the initial phase of group interaction is typically described as a period of "milling around." This period is viewed as one in which the members, while searching for structure for the group experience, exhibit their characteristic interpersonal styles and act out authority conflicts with the non-directive leadership. Lifton (1972) notes that

Typically, groups start by expressing their concern over unclear boundaries (Are we supposed to ... ?). From the very beginning, groups will need to test out the leader's reaction to their needs. The earliest needs to appear in the group will be those of dependency-independency, love-hostility, and the need for acceptance by both the leader and the group (p. 165).

It may be that the "milling around" period characteristic of many approaches to initiating small group interaction, actually constitutes a period of implicit attempts to structure member expectations and behavior in certain ways viewed as desirable by the group's leader(s). What is "typical" in terms of group development is more likely to be a function of group task composition, and initial leader behavior, rather than a manifestation of some natural sequence of group development. Data reviewed by Shaw (1971) gives an indication of differences in stages of group development as a function of the group's task. His comparison of patterns of group development in problem-solving groups of college students and sensitivity-training groups made up of graduate students and professional persons in a
training situation, indicates that a lengthier "milling around" or orientation period was required for the T-groups. Because of the greater task specificity in the problem-solving groups, members were able to engage in task-relevant behavior more quickly than were their counterparts.

Two studies indicate the importance of the groups' initial sessions with respect to attrition. Yalom (1966) and Johnson (1963) report dropout rates in adult therapy groups of thirty-three and twenty-five per cent, respectively, indicating that from one-third to one-fourth of the total membership of the therapy groups terminated during the first quarter of the group's sessions. While these studies do provide empirical data regarding the magnitude of dropout rates, they are limited in that they did not attempt to relate the observed attrition rate to leader behavior, member characteristics, or any of a number of other potentially significant variables.

Theorists and researchers who have investigated small group process agree that the capacity of a group with whom an individual becomes identified to influence his or her behavior can be substantial (Zimbardo and Ebbesen, 1970). Group norms, defined as expected modes of behavior and belief, seemingly become important referents for the behavior of individual members. How and by whom are these norms communicated? Psathas and Hardert (1966) studied the leader's role in norm formation in seven training (T) groups. The groups were made up of normal adults voluntarily participating in a T-group experience. The data consisted of analyses of tape recordings of group's initial sessions, observer's notes, and member recall of important leader interventions. The findings indicated that leader interventions contained implicit messages regarding norms varied from group to group.
The investigators identified eleven different "norm categories" which were fostered by the leaders in their study. These norms concerned, among other things, expression of feelings, experimentation with behavior, and group decision-making. A drawback to the study's design was that the raters used were not blind to the study's hypotheses.

Yalom (1970) used sociometric analyses to study interactive patterns in adult outpatient psychotherapy groups. He found that patterns of interaction tended to be established in the initial sessions and to remain present in later sessions. As an example, groups in which problems were typically presented to the leader rather than to the group as a whole tended to show this pattern early in their development.

What effects does the behavior of the leader have on interaction patterns in the group? Salzberg (1967) studied the effects of leader presence or absence from in-patient group therapy sessions with adult males. Observers rated the comments of group members as spontaneous (not following directly from a previous statement or question), non-spontaneous (following directly from a previous statement or question), and as either relevant (pertinent to the problems of the speaker or someone in the group) or irrelevant (not pertinent to the problems of the speaker or someone in the group). The results indicated that the percentage of spontaneous comments declined with the leader present (82.4% absent vs. 61.7% present), but the percentage of relevant comments rose when the leader was present (56.5% absent vs. 75.8% present). These data again suggest the importance of the leader's impact on patterns of group interaction and on group norm-formation. It should be noted that the original study was conducted on one group only, and that no replication has been reported to date.
In reviewing studies relating to the initiation of group counseling and psychotherapy, Bednar, Melnick, and Kaul (1974) note that:

the predictable consequence of placing anxious and socially inept clients in an ambiguous group environment is enhanced anxiety and the manifestation of inappropriate behavior patterns. It is little wonder, then, that the initial group sessions are characterized by high dropout rates, intense levels of subjective distress, avoidance of interpersonal communication, and tenuous group development (p. 32).

Research on Group Cohesion

Reviewers of the empirical and clinical evidence available regarding group therapy (Yalom, 1970; Bednar and Lawlis, 1971) suggest that group cohesion—the degree of "groupness", solidarity, or mutual attraction found within a group—may be the single most critical variable influencing group process and outcome. Yalom (1970) draws a parallel between cohesion in the small group and the quality of the therapeutic relationship in one-to-one counseling in terms of impact on client goal-attainment. One might infer from these reviews that under conditions of high group cohesion, the presence of others can support and reinforce the individual in his or her pursuit of desired goals. In other words, a positive social facilitation effect may occur. It should be noted that in the social facilitation literature referred to above (Zajonc, 1965), mere presence of other individuals was the independent variable—the type, tone or quality of that presence was not investigated.

Several empirical studies tend to support these assertions regarding group cohesion.
In a post hoc analysis of group therapy, Dickoff and Lakin (1963) interviewed twenty-eight former group therapy patients regarding their experiences in group. They elicited comments from the former group members as to what, if anything, it was about the group that they had found to be personally helpful. These comments were then categorized by two judges as to content. The authors reported that over half of those interviewed stated that the primary source of help for them was the support they received from the other members. Their data also indicated that those who labelled their group experience as positive rather than negative or neutral, were more likely to have felt accepted by their fellow members, perceived similarities among the members of the group, and referred to specific individuals when asked about their group experience. The results of this study may have been affected by the fact that all twenty-eight persons had been members of groups with the same group leaders, and should be interpreted accordingly. The study also relied heavily on former members' subjective retrospective views regarding their group experience. No attempt was made to validate member perceptions by comparing them with recordings or other records of group events.

Another study of group therapy patients conducted by Yalom, Tinklenberg, and Gilula (cf. Yalom, 1970) employed a more elaborate research design than the Dickoff and Lakin study, and yielded results consistent with the findings just mentioned. Subjects for the study were well-educated, middle-socioeconomic status outpatients who had been nominated by a number of group therapists as "successful" patients. All subjects had been in group therapy for a minimum of eight months. The investigators conducted a psychiatric evaluation of each nominated patient to ensure the validity of their being labelled as successful patients.
The evaluation focused on four factors: symptoms, current functioning, interpersonal relationships, and self-concept. A final check involved the former patients' self-assessments along the same four dimensions.

The final population (n = 20) was given a Q-sort consisting of sixty-four items relating to twelve possible "curative" factors in group psychotherapy, e.g., altruism, catharsis, insight. The results obtained indicated that group cohesion was highly ranked in the former group members' assessments of what had been helpful to them in the group experience. Again, the study is post hoc in nature.

Clark and Culbert (1965) studied the relationship between the number of mutually supportive relationships of which group members were a part (using the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 1962) as a measure) and improvement in interpersonal functioning (using the Walker, Rablen, and Rogers (1960) rating scale as a measure). The subjects consisted of eleven normal adult members of a T-group which met for a total of sixty-four hours. The investigators found a significant relationship between the membership in mutually supportive relationships and improvement in interpersonal functioning. Once again, this study is limited by a one-group design. In addition no information was cited relevant to member selection for the group.

Yalom and his associates (1967) examined improvement with respect to symptoms, quality of relationships, and general functioning, and found significant correlations between these measures of outcome and group cohesion in five outpatient therapy groups.
They also found that members who experienced high cohesiveness with the group at the sixth and twelfth meetings missed significantly fewer sessions during the course of the group. Yalom and Rand (1966) studied the level of cohesiveness in five adult outpatient therapy groups and found that the members who had the least sense of cohesion within the group were less satisfied with the group experience and tended to terminate prematurely.

Goldstein, Heller, and Sechrest (1966) reviewed group dynamics research with a variety of subject populations, and listed several "typically replicated findings" regarding group cohesion. These findings indicate that members of high vs. low cohesive groups tend to: (1) be more open to interpersonal influence by fellow members, (2) be less threatened by expressions of hostility, (3) value group goals more highly, (4) experience greater reduction in anxiety, (5) absent themselves less frequently from group meetings, and (6) participate more actively in group sessions.

Fiedler and Meuwese (1962) studied the effect of group cohesion on leader's abilities to contribute to group tasks in four different types of task groups: tank crews (2), aircraft crews, antiaircraft crews (2), and a creativity "brainstorming" group. They correlated standardized leader ability scores, e.g., Army General Qualifications Test and a variation of the Miller analogies, with group performance in cohesive and non-cohesive groups. Their findings consisted of six positive correlations (3 significant beyond the .05 level) between leader ability and performance in cohesive groups, and four negative plus two small (.20) positive correlations between leader ability and group performance in non-cohesive groups.
The overall pattern of results suggests that the leader's potential contribution to overall group effectiveness is enhanced in cohesive groups. While the groups involved were clearly different from counseling groups, the importance of cohesion and group function in such groups coupled with the clear pattern of results across divergent task groups, indicates the potency of the group cohesion phenomenon.

If we accept the proposition that group cohesion can have a significant impact on group development and outcome, an important question arises: what effect can initial structure provided by the leader have on the development of group cohesion?

Schacter, Ellertson, McBride and Gregory (1960) found significant differences in group cohesion among a group of twenty-five college women as a function of prior descriptions of fellow group members. The "high cohesive" instructions stressed similarities of group members; "low cohesive" instructions indicated no particular reasons for group members to expect similarities between themselves and their group. The dependent measure consisted of post-group ratings of attractiveness of fellow members.

Yalom and Rand (1966) found that groups in which members saw themselves as being similar were significantly more cohesive than groups whose members perceived each other as having different concerns in a study of adult therapy groups. Cohesion was measured via member ratings of desire for future interaction with fellow members. The authors suggest that group leaders can enhance cohesion by helping members to focus on the commonalities in their experiences.
Bednar, Melnick and Kaul (1974) suggest that high structure in the early sessions frees clients to engage in the behaviors necessary for positive group interaction more readily, by releasing them from the responsibility of deciding what to do as well as whether to do it. The authors argue that these structured situations can foster interaction, mutual attraction (defined as perceived similarity), and out of this a sense of group cohesion is born. They suggest further that the group cohesion thus generated can provide a supportive climate for further group development, with the need for structure from the leader decreasing concomitantly. In summary, the authors suggest the following relationship between group-cohesion and desired in-group behavior: structure will support such activities until group cohesion is generated to support and reinforce the desired behaviors.

The social facilitation literature reviewed above indicates that the small group leader is faced with the likelihood that in the absence of specific structure, the predicted social facilitation effect would be the emission by the members of their characteristic interpersonal behaviors. Since members typically seek out group experience in order to change these typical patterns, the group leader must seek to foster the expansion of interpersonal behavioral repertoires rather than reliance on current behavioral tendencies.

The literature reviewed above regarding attrition rates indicates that unstructured initial sessions may increase member anxiety and interpersonal discomfort, leading to high levels of attrition in early sessions. The data on norm formation in groups indicates that whatever happens in early sessions will likely become a recurrent pattern in the life of the group, and that the leader has significant impact on this process of norm information.
Finally, the literature on group cohesion suggests that cohesive group climate may be critical to the development of a well-functioning group, and that leader interventions can affect the development of such cohesion.

A conclusion which might be drawn from the literature reviewed above can be stated as follows: initial structure provides a vehicle through which the group leader may engage in the proactive management of group events, in order to minimize predictably deleterious group events while maximizing positive group development.

The specific hypotheses below are derived from the above review and will be empirically tested in the present study:

1. High initial structure in group activities will result in higher attendance rates per session than will low initial structure.
2. High initial structure will result in lower levels of anxiety for group members, measured midway through the first session, than will low structure initiation.
3. High initial structure will result in higher levels of group cohesion after three sessions than will low initial structure.

INDIVIDUAL PROBLEM-SOLVING IN THE SMALL GROUP SETTING

One way of conceiving of small group interaction focusing on personal and interpersonal growth, is as a situation in which individual problem-solving occurs in a social situation. In a review of empirical studies investigating the conditions necessary for individual problem-solving in such situations, Thibaut and Kelley (1959) identify three sets of critical variables: understanding the task, having a behavioral repertoire adequate to its solution, and grasping the relationship between one's behavior and successful task accomplishment. These three dimensions will provide a framework for an examination of literature relevant to the impact of structure on group de-
A striking parallel between the empirical social psychological analysis proposed by Thibaut and Kelley and the necessary components of structure in the group counseling endeavor proposed by Bednar et al (1974) is outlined below.

Elements necessary for successful problem solving in groups (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959)

1. Understanding of task
2. Adequate behavioral repertoire
3. Knowledge of the relationship between (1) and (2)

Components of structure in group counseling (Bednar, Melnick, and Kaul, 1974)

1. Cognitive learning about the task
2. Vicarious learning of key behaviors
3. Practice of the behavior in a structured task setting

These two analyses, though differing in origin and intent, seem to the writer to suggest very similar views of the mechanism of successful learning and performance within small groups.

Research on Preparing Clients for Group Interaction

Several relevant studies have been reported regarding the effects of pre-group instruction and training on subsequent member performance and satisfaction. Yalom, Houts, Newell, and Rand (1967) prepared sixty prospective adult outpatient group therapy members for their groups by means either of (a) a thirty-minute preparatory session focussing on group development, necessary member behavior, and potential outcomes of group treatment; or (b) a thirty-minute history-taking interview. Six groups were formed, three each of persons prepared for the groups and those who were merely interviewed. An assessment of the groups as they developed, using the Hill Interaction Matrix (Hill, 1965), revealed that the prepared groups engaged in significantly more...
personal interaction with each other than did the unprepared groups. This finding was true at both the second and twelfth meetings of the respective groups.

Truax (1968) used audio samples of positive client behavior in group therapy to prepare groups of hospitalized mental patients and of juvenile offenders for group therapy. Of the four groups of ten members formed from each of the populations, two were prepared via the audio tapes and two were not. The investigator administered five Q-sort self-concept measures and found statistically significant Q-sort changes in three of the five Q-sorts for the pretrained groups; the remaining two were positive but not significant. Unprepared groups regressed on four of the five measures.

Goldstein, Heller and Sechrest (1966) reviewed studies in the area of small group interaction and concluded that clarification of role expectations and group goals is essential for positive group development.

**Research and Theory Regarding the Teaching of Interactive Behavior**

With respect to the second component of successful group participation, an adequate behavioral repertoire, several findings will be cited from a growing body of literature dealing with feasibility of directly teaching interactive behaviors. Research with college students by Hauer (1973), Ivey (1973) and Kagan (1972) indicates that specified interpersonal skills such as attending, empathy, and process observation can be taught systematically. Skill learning is typically assessed by rating pre-training -- post training changes in participants' skills in delivering the target response.
Egan (1975) has recently elaborated a developmental approach to counseling based on stage-specific skills to be learned by the counselor and then taught to the client. Several other authors (Brammer, 1973; Patterson 1975) have articulated similar skill-based approaches. These approaches are based on the premise that important interpersonal behaviors can be taught via specific instructional strategies. Such approaches may be subsumed under the rubric of micro-training (Ivey, 1969), an instructional strategy consisting of the following steps:

1. A verbal explanation of the "target" behavior,
2. Modeling of the behavior performed to criterion.
3. Practice of the behavior by the learners.
4. Feedback relative to practice attempts.

It may be noted that the Bednar et al. (1974) paradigm outlined above is one example of a micro-training format.

Research and Theory Regarding Structure and Learning

With regard to the third component of successful problem-solving in group, i.e., understanding how one's behavior relates to the group task, little relevant evidence is available in the group literature. As mentioned above several pre-group instructional programs (Yalom, 1970; Truax et al., 1968) have included definitions and/or modeling of desired member behavior. These instructional programs have been associated with significant gains for group members thus prepared, when compared with control groups.
In a related finding from the area of instructional theory Ausubel (1959) in his work on advance organizers has demonstrated that learning is enhanced when subsumptive frameworks are available to the learner. It is the writer's suggestion that a leader's structured introduction and preparation of group members for the interaction to come by explaining facts about group development and their roles in it, as well as by giving members the opportunity to practice necessary behaviors, gives members a subsumptive framework within to integrate the complex learning to be undertaken.

In summary, the theory and research reviewed above seems to suggest several conclusions relative to the potential role of structure in group development. Positive effects on member behaviors within the group as well as on outcome can be enhanced by means of structured learning by the members about group development and their role in it. Evidence is also available that key interpersonal behaviors such as empathy and self-disclosure can be successfully taught. It is also suggested that initial structure may serve as an advanced organizer to enhance the learning of those in the group.

The following hypotheses are derived from the theory and research reviewed above and will be empirically tested by the present study.

(4) High structure initiation will result in a greater frequency of risk-taking behaviors by members during the group sessions than will low structure initiation.

(5) High structure initiation will result in greater expressed member preference for risk-taking interaction upon termination of the group, than will low structure initiation.

(6) High structure initiation will result in more favorable evaluation of the group experience upon termination than will low structure initiation.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

Group members

The groups were composed of forty-eight undergraduate students at the Ohio State University who had solicited information regarding a small group experience designed to enhance interpersonal growth which had been advertised by the experimenter (see Appendix). Twenty-five of these students were female, twenty-three male. The mean age of the students was 20 years and their mean number of quarters at the University was 5.5

Every student participating in the study experienced the following sequence of events.

1) Contact was made by telephone with the experimenter in response to an advertisement for the groups (see Appendix). Questions about the experience were answered briefly and arrangements for an individual meeting between prospective member and experimenter were made.

2) All participants were screened by the experimenter in his office at the Ohio State University Counseling and Consultation Service. A brief introduction was given regarding the purpose, format, and length of the groups (see Appendix). Students were informed that research on "group development" would be going on which would require their consent. The intended uses of tapes of the sessions and instruments to be administered were explained. The experimenter then answered questions and asked interested persons to fill out a personal data form and sign an agreement to participate in research (see Appendix). After it had been determined that each participant was available for a high and a low structured group, each was assigned by a coin flip to one of the conditions. No group was allowed to exceed twelve members.
Participants were then given the names of their group facilitators and directions as to the location and starting time of their group. The students had no additional contact with the experimenter prior to the completion of data collection. As a result of this screening interview one student was refused entry to the study due to the experimenter's judgement that the individual demonstrated signs of personal instability. This student was referred to a counselor.

3) Students reported for the group sessions weekly for a total of five two-hour sessions. All additional administration of questionnaires and instruments took place during the regularly scheduled group times.

4) Students who did not return to the group after session one were contacted by telephone and a standard follow up interview was conducted by the experimenter (see Appendix).

Group facilitators

Group leaders for the study were eight master's degree students enrolled in the Education Special Services program at the Ohio State University. They had recently completed an introductory graduate course on small group dynamics and leadership, and were selected for participation in the study by the course instructors on the basis of interest and aptitudes demonstrated during that experience. Five of the group facilitators were women, three were men.

The group facilitators in the study experienced the following sequence of events:

1) Completion of a graduate course in small group dynamics and leadership.

2) Selected students were approached by the experimenter about participation in the study. They were informed as to the time frame of the study, the participants, and their roles. The nature of the research was described as being "in the area of group process". The experimenter then explained the importance of refraining from any further elaboration on the research plan until the data were gathered, at which time a complete briefing about the study was planned for the group facilitators.
3) Two leaders conducted each group. Male-female leader pairings were made in three of the four groups. The pairs of group leaders were then randomly assigned to either high or low structured conditions. Leaders were informed of the available times and location for the groups, and specific assignments were scheduled for the four group leaders in the low structure condition.

4) Separate two-hour training sessions were held, one dealing with the high structure initiation, the other with low structure initiation.

   (a) **High structure training session.** During this session the experimenter presented the high structure initiation by giving the standard introduction (see Appendix A) and taking the participants through the structured exercises (see Appendix B). Questions about the initial session were answered and the leaders were given the opportunity to review the structure of the session and their role in it in detail.

   (b) **Low structure training session.** During this training session the leaders were given a standard introduction and a set of guidelines for member-centered interaction (see Appendix C). The introduction was modeled for them by the experimenter who then attempted to answer any questions posed by the group leaders.

5) Group leaders met with their groups for two hours weekly over a period of five weeks. They carried out their assigned initiatory roles during the first session. In addition, the facilitators pairs met weekly with the experimenter and an Ohio State faculty member trained in group process. These sessions were designed to provide the leaders with assistance and support in analyzing previous sessions and planning for group development, and feedback regarding their performance. High and low structure pairs were supervised separately. After the initial session the group leaders were free to conduct their sessions in whatever manner they, with the consultation of their supervisors, felt most appropriate. No attempt to systematically structure subsequent sessions was made by the experimenter.

6) Upon completion of the groups, the facilitators were given a detailed briefing regarding the background of the study, its hypotheses, and the experimental design.
The setting

All sessions were held in a small carpeted conference room at the Ohio State University Human Performance Center. A single location was chosen so that the physical properties of different rooms would not contribute systematic variance to the study. Excellent recording facilities were available at the location chosen, and all sessions could be recorded unobtrusively in the research control room of the laboratory.

The independent variable

The independent variable in the present study was the degree of structure provided by the group leaders during the initial session. A detailed account of high structure and low structure initial sessions follows.

**High structure initiation**

In high structure initiation the following sequence of events took place:

1) The leaders began by introducing themselves to the group members and then conducted a "Structured Introduction" (see Appendix A). Members were given copies of the introduction and asked to read them over while one of the leaders read the material aloud. The material covered in the introduction dealt with the goals of group interaction, the behaviors expected from the group members, and a clarification of the leader's role. After the reading, the leader's answered any questions posed by the members.

2) The group leaders distributed copies of the "Skills-training Exercises" to all group members (see Appendix B). The steps in this micro-training format were discussed (i.e., explanation, modeling, and feedback), as well as the roles necessary for practice of the skills (i.e., helper, helpee, observer). The leaders then spent the remainder of the session taking their members through the four-step sequence for each of the four exercises: offering support, self-disclosure, giving and receiving feedback, and observing group interaction.
Low structure initiation

In the low structure initiation the following events took place:

The leaders began by introducing themselves to the group members. A standard "Non-specific Introduction to Group Interaction" (see Appendix C) was delivered orally by one of the group leaders, who then opened the floor for discussion by the members of the concerns in the remainder of the session was to reflect back for the members the feeling and content of their statement of concerns. The "Guidelines for Member-centered Interaction" (see Appendix D) provided to the leaders during their training session were to be followed by them during the initial session.

Dependent variables

The dependent measures in the present study were attendance (the number of sessions attended by each group member), initial session anxiety (a standardized measure of the amount of anxiety experienced by individual members midway through session one), level of risk-taking behavior (a standardized measure of the group's ability to engage in immediate dialogue about personal, relationship, and group issues), group cohesion (a measure of members' perception of the group's attractiveness for them), members' self-report of preferred modes of interaction (a structured instrument to elicit member statements regarding their typical interactive styles) and member satisfaction with the group experience (assessed via a questionnaire.) The variables and their measurement are elaborated on below.

Audio recordings were made of all sessions. As a check on the experimental procedure, members were asked to fill out a "perceived structure" rating scale (see Appendix E) at the end of session one.
The dependent measure of hypothesis one (attendance) consisted of the mean number of members attending each group session. Attendance forms were distributed to the leaders weekly and signed by the attending members.

The dependent measure for hypothesis two (level of anxiety) was the Anxiety Differential (Alexander and Husek, 1962), a verbal-response measure of situational anxiety. The test authors report a reliability coefficient of .65 in the original sample of 250 male college students. In an additional reliability study with a sample of over 150 male and female college students, split-half reliability of .68 was reported by the authors.

With respect to the instrument's validity, several studies have been reported. Alexander and Husek (1963) reported data demonstrating significant predictive validity for the instrument with respect to bodily-harm and test-taking anxiety in college students. Evidence of the current validity of the instrument reported in the same study indicating significant (beyond the .001 level) correlations of the Anxiety Differential with the anxiety factor of the Nowlis-Green checklist, a standardized measure of momentary moods (Green and Nowlis, 1957). Finally, the authors have reported data indicating that response set bias has relatively little effect on the instrument's utility. Specifically, a correlation of .29 with the Edwards Social Desirability scale (Edwards, 1957) was reported in research with college students. The Anxiety Differential questionnaire (see Appendix F) was administered by the group leaders after one hour of interaction, i.e., midway through session one, in an attempt to assess in-session anxiety during the initial meeting.
The dependent measure for hypothesis three (risk-taking behavior) was the Hill Interaction Matrix-Form G (Hill, 1973), a set of systematically arranged categories for the description of group interaction. The HIM yields data in a four by four matrix (see Figure 1). The horizontal dimension allows the rater to classify the interaction as to content into one of four categories progressing in terms of risk-taking by members: Topic, Group, Personal and Relationship. The vertical dimension also permits the rater to assign interaction to one of four categories of process (work), again according to increasing level of risk: Assertive, Speculative, Conventional and Confrontive. It should be noted that a fifth dimension, Responsive, is no longer used in standard rating procedures since it was included originally to describe the interactive behavior of groups of chronic and regressed psychiatric patients who responded only when group leaders took almost total responsibility for the discussion.

In the present study the HIM provides an operational definition of risk-taking behavior. The HIM sixteen cell matrix can be divided into four quadrants each consisting of the pairing of two content (horizontal) with two process (vertical) dimensions. Quadrant I (cells IIB, IIC, IIIC, IIC) results from the pairing of the Topic and Group content categories with the Conventional and Assertive process (Work) categories. Quadrant II (cells IID, IIE, IIE) results from the pairing of the Topic and Group content categories with the Speculative and Confrontive process categories. Quadrant III (cells IIIB, IVB, IIIC, IVC) consists of the pairings of the Personal and Relationship content dimensions with the Conventional and Assertive process categories. Quadrant IV results from the pairing of the remaining two categories from the content and process dimensions. In the HIM system the quadrants are ranked from lowest to highest in terms of risk-taking behavior by group members, with Quadrant I describing
I. Content

A. Topic: any issue of interest to the groups not falling into one of the other three categories.

B. Group: referring to group issues and its process.

C. Personal: dealing with a particular member attitudes, feelings, or behavior

D. Relationship: concerned with the relationships between specific individuals within the group.

II. Process

A. Conventional: conversational in nature. Sociable passing of time without much intensity. E.g., typical cocktail party chatter.

B. Assertive: self-revealing but in a manner which challenges others to deal with the individual. Not really open to feedback from others. E.g., "I've always been this way."

C. Speculative: exploring possible motivations for members' behavior.

D. Confrontive: feedback of reactions, especially of an affective nature, from person to person.
the least and Quadrant IV the most risky interactive behaviors. This order of level of risk-taking in the HIM format was determined based on three factors which increase level of risk as they increase, viz., member-centeredness (the extent to which the group's members directly consider each other's concerns), interpersonal threat (the extent to which members abandon typical defensive interpersonal styles during the group interaction), and member-leader role-taking (the extent to which all group participants are willing to actively engage themselves in mutual problem-solving). Quadrant I interaction, then, is characterized by the lowest levels of member-centeredness, interpersonal threat, and leader-member role taking. Quadrants II, III, IV reflect increasing levels of risk in the interaction.

Hill (1965) reviewed product-moment correlational studies of the instrument's reliability studies and found an average correlation of .77 among trained raters; several rank-order reliability studies of the ranking system with trained raters yield correlations of .90 and above. The primary evidence regarding the Hill's validity is an extensive analysis (Hill, 1965) of the system's ability to differentiate reliably between different types of group interaction. This distribution of interaction among the instruments' cells for seven different types of groups revealed different patterns of distribution for each of the groups. These differences were consistent with the type of group interaction which would be expected to occur in each approach. Finally, an extensive normative study of the Hill (Hill, 1965) provides comparative data on a wide variety of types of group interaction.
Ratings were made by two expert HIM raters (see Appendix ), blind to the study's design and hypotheses. Ten minute excerpts from the beginning, middle, and final 30 minute segments of each group session were rated by two persons trained by the instrument's author. These ratings permit an examination of the pattern of development of risk-taking behavior within the groups. A product-moment correlation was computed to assess the level of agreement between raters and equalled .94.

The dependent measure for hypothesis four (group cohesion) was a questionnaire used by Yalom (1970) in investigations of cohesion in psychotherapy groups (see Appendix G). One study has been reported regarding the validity of the cohesion scale. Gross (1957) reported a correlation of .81 between the cohesion scale and levels of compatibility in nine small groups (measured with FIRO subscales Schutz, 1966). In the present study, the cohesion scale was administered at the end of session three, i.e., after six hours of interaction. The instrument was not administered before this time in order to allow the members time to interact and begin the process of building relationships within the group.

The dependent measure for hypothesis five (expressed preference for interactive styles) was the individual assessment form of the Hill Interaction Matrix HIM B (Hill, 1965). In an investigation of the reliability of this form of the HIM, Anderson (1964) reported a test-retest coefficient of .82. With respect to validity, Cooper (Hill, 1965) conducted an item analysis of responses of 97 college students to the HIM-B and found positive intercorrelations between all four items contributing to each cell in the matrix. The magnitude of the correlations was not reported. The HIM-B was administered at the end of the final session (see Appendix H). Subjects' scores for hypothesis five consisted of the total scores endorsed for Quadrant III and IV interaction by each subject.
The dependent measure for the final hypothesis (member satisfaction with the group experience) was a "Post-group Reaction Survey" designed by the experimenter for this study (see Appendix J).

Summary of experimental procedure

Forty-eight undergraduate students were randomly assigned to one of four interaction groups, two with a high structure initiation, two with a low structure initiation. All groups met for a total of five, two-hour sessions. In the initial session high structure condition group participants received a structured introduction to group interaction, a detailed explanation of the behaviors necessary for successful interaction, and practice in these key behaviors. In the initial session low structure condition participants were encouraged to discuss whatever concerns they wished to deal with during the group sessions. Group leaders were selected, randomly assigned to high or low structure condition, and trained to deliver the appropriate initiation. Measures of attrition, initial session anxiety, group cohesion, member preference for types of interaction, and member satisfaction with the group experience were administered. All sessions were recorded and an interaction process analysis was carried out by trained raters.

Data analysis

The area small group process, is characterized at the moment by a relatively sparse set of solid empirical findings upon which to base research hypotheses. In addition, the complexity of the potential variables in the small group setting and their interrelationships, e.g., group composition,
leader personality and interpersonal style, and task differences, is such that any pattern of obtained results is likely to be accounted for by a number of these factors. For this reason it seems appropriate that the level of significance be set at a level which would likely rule out chance variations while remaining sensitive to important differences in the data obtained. For that reason the level of significance chosen for the present study is .05.

For those hypotheses yielding scores for individual members, viz., 1 (attendance), 2 (initial session anxiety), 3 (group cohesion), 5 (expressed member preference for risk-taking interaction), and 6 (satisfaction), the following sequence took place in the data analysis:

1. A one-way analysis of variance (Hayes, 1963) was used to determine whether significant overall differences were present in the procedural check for level of structure in the initial session.

2. Post-hoc comparisons (Bruning and Kintz, 1969) of the group means (H vs. H, L vs. L, HH vs. LL) were carried out in order to determine the appropriateness of pooling scores from the two high structure groups and the two low structure groups.

3. Data for hypotheses 1-4 and 6 were subsequently pooled into one high structure and one low structure group. T-tests for groups with unequal n (McGuigan, 1960) were performed on the pooled data.

The data for hypothesis 4 (frequency of risk-taking behaviors) involved rating of group interaction rather than individual scores. Since the Hill Interaction Matrix, the dependent measure for hypothesis 5, yields data in the form of a matrix of discrete categories the chi-square test provides an appropriate statistical tool for analyzing the data obtained. The following sequence took place in the data analysis:
1. A three-way chi-square test was carried out (Groups X Quadrants X Sessions), in order to assess whether or not significant overall differences were present in the matrix of data obtained for hypotheses 4.

2. When significant overall differences were found, two two-way chi-squares (Groups X Quadrants, Sessions X Quadrants) were carried out to assess the presence of significant differences in those two matrixes.

3. Four two-way chi-square tests (Groups X QI, QII, QIII, QIV) were performed to test for overall differences among the four groups in time distribution to the HIM quadrants.

4. Data for high and low structure groups were pooled. A two-way chi-square tests (Structure X Quadrants) was performed to test for the presence of differences in time distribution to the HIM quadrants due to the level of structure.

5. One way chi-square tests (Structure X Quadrant) were performed to test for significant differences in time distribution between high and low structure conditions.

This sequential pattern of data analysis was carried out both for overall differences, i.e., all sessions combined, and for session-by-session differences.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In this chapter, the results of the experiment will be presented. Each of the hypotheses will be restated and findings pertinent to its confirmation or nonconfirmation will be reported.

As a check on the experimental procedure, participants in the high and low structure initiation conditions were asked to fill out a perceived structure rating scale (see Appendix) at the end of session one. The rating scale consisted of a fifty-point continuum with 1 indicating a rating of "very unstructured," and 50 indicating a rating of "very structured." The means and standard deviations for the four groups are presented in Table 4.1.
Table 4.1
Perceived Structure Ratings by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GROUP</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>3.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to evaluate the legitimacy of pooling the data from the two high structure and the two low structure groups for purposes of evaluating the effects of high vs. low structure initiation on the study's six dependent measures, two steps were taken. First, a one-way analysis of variance (Hayes, 1963) was performed to test for the presence of significant overall differences among the four groups on the perceived structure rating. The results are presented in Table 4.2 and indicate that such differences were present.
Table 4.2

Analysis of Variance for Groups' Ratings of Initial Session Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between</td>
<td>5486.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1828.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within</td>
<td>3943</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9429.2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second, t-tests (McGuigan, 1960) were performed to evaluate the significance of differences between the following pairs of means: 
H(1) vs. H(2), L(1) vs. L(2), and H(1+2) vs. L(1+2). The results of these analyses are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3

Summary of t-tests for Initial Session Structure Rating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comparison</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H(1) vs. H(2)</td>
<td>11, 10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L(1) vs. L(2)</td>
<td>11, 11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H(1+2) vs. L(1+2)</td>
<td>21, 22</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7.28</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results indicate that the differences between the pairs of groups in each structure condition were not significant. The difference between the high and low structure groups when pooled was highly significant. The data thus indicate that the levels of initial session structure were perceived as intended. On this basis, data from the two high structure groups and the two low structure groups were pooled for purposes of testing the significance of differences obtained for each of the study's hypotheses.

The Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1: High initial structure in group activities will result in higher attendance rates per session than will low initial structure.

Table 4.4 presents the attendance figures for each group by session.

Table 4.4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>S1</th>
<th>S2</th>
<th>S3</th>
<th>S4</th>
<th>S5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5 presents the mean number of sessions attended by the individual members of each of the four groups.
Table 4.5

Mean Attendance per Member by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>.24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to test for the presence of significant differences between the high and low structure conditions, a t-test for groups of unequal n (McGuigan, 1960) was performed on the pooled data. Table 4.6 presents the results of the test.

Table 4.6

T-test for Pooled Attendance Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results indicate that overall significant differences in attendance were present, and that these differences were in the opposite of the predicted direction, i.e., low structure attendance was significantly greater than high structure attendance.

**Hypothesis 2:** High initial structure will result in lower levels of anxiety for group members, measured midway through the first session, than will low initial structure.

Table 4.7 presents the means and standard deviations for the four groups' Anxiety Differential scores.

Table 4.7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>9.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>108.9</td>
<td>9.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>103.3</td>
<td>9.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to test for the presence of significant differences between the high and low structure conditions, a t-test for groups of unequal n (McGuigan, 1960) was performed on the pooled data. Table 4.8 presents the results of the test.
Table 4.8

T-test for Pooled Anxiety-Differential Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>.46</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the t-test indicate that the differences present in the data obtained are not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 3: High initial structure will result in higher levels of group cohesion after three sessions than will low initial structure.

Table 4.9 presents the means and standard deviations for the four groups' scores on the group cohesion scale.
Table 4.9

Means and Standard Deviations for Group Cohesion Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.85</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.57</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25.20</td>
<td>3.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.50</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t-test for groups with unequal n was carried out on the pooled group cohesion data. The results of the test are presented in Table 4.10.

Table 4.10

T-test for Pooled Group Cohesion Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data presented in Table 4.10 indicate that the differences in the data obtained for the two conditions are not statistically significant.

**Hypothesis 4:** High structure initiation will result in a greater frequency of risk-taking behaviors by members during the group sessions than will low structure initiation.

Table 4.11 presents the amount of time spent in the HIM quadrants (1-4) by each group per session.

In order to test for the presence of significant differences in distribution of time in each session to the HIM quadrants for the two levels of structure, across all sessions, a sequential set of chi-square analyses was performed as outlined in Chapter III:

1) A three-way chi-square (Groups X Quadrants X Session) was carried out to test for significant overall results in the interaction time distribution data. The results obtained ($X^2 = 756.9$, $df = 36$, $p < .001$) indicate the presence of highly significant overall differences.

2) A two-way chi-square (Groups X Quadrants) was carried out to test for overall differences in interaction time distribution by the groups in the four quadrants. The results ($X^2 = 167.3$, $df = 9$, $p < .001$) indicate the presence of significant differences in time spent by the groups in the four quadrants.

3) Four one-way chi-squares (Groups X Q1, Groups X Q2, Groups X Q3, Groups X Q4) were carried out to test for significant differences among the four groups in distribution of time, to each of the four quadrants. The results obtained are presented in Table 4.12.
Table 4.11

Groups' Interaction Time per Session in HIM Quadrants in Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>38.03</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.12
Results of Chi-square Tests
of Group X Quadrant Differences in Time Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Q1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Q2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Q3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Q4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results indicate that significant differences among the four groups in time distribution were present for Quadrants 1, 2 and 4.

4) Data for high and low structure groups were pooled in order to test for the significance of differences due to the high and low structure conditions. A two-way chi-square (Structure X Quadrant) was performed on the data. The results ($X^2 = 36.7, df = 3, p < .001$) indicate the presence of significant differences between high and low structure conditions in time distribution per quadrant.

5) Four one-way chi-squares were performed (Structure X Q1, Structure X Q2, Structure X Q3, Structure X Q4) in order to test for the presence of significant differences in time distribution to the four quadrants as a function of structure. The results of the tests are presented in Table 4.13.
Table 4.13

Results of Chi-square Tests
of Structure X Quadrant Differences in Time Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results obtained, which include the Yates correction (Dixon and Massey, 1957) for a 1 df test, indicate the presence of significant differences in time distribution for quadrants 1, 2, and 4.

The analyses pertinent to overall differences in time distribution, i.e., for all sessions combined, have been completed and are summarized in Table 4.14.
Table 4.14

Results of Chi-square Tests of Time Distribution Differences for All Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Quadrants X Session</td>
<td>5385</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>756.9</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Quadrants</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>167.3</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Q1</td>
<td>298.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Q2</td>
<td>710.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Q3</td>
<td>587.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Q4</td>
<td>198.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Quadrants</td>
<td>1795</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q1</td>
<td>297.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q2</td>
<td>710.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q3</td>
<td>587.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q4</td>
<td>198.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analyses summarized in Table 4.14 attest to the presence of significant differences between high and low structure conditions in distribution of total interaction time to the HIM quadrants. In order to establish the direction of those differences, i.e., which conditions spent more or less time in which quadrants, it is necessary to return to the data in Table 4.11 which details the group's interaction...
time in HIK quadrants by session. Since this portion of the analysis is concerned with overall differences due to level of initial structure, the session-by-session data in Table 4.11 were collapsed to reflect five-session totals in distribution of time by levels of structure. These data are presented in Table 4.15.

Table 4.15

Overall Differences in Time Distribution to HIK Quadrants by Level of Structure in Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q3</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>433.2</td>
<td>274.2</td>
<td>114.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>225.9</td>
<td>277.2</td>
<td>312.9</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A joint inspection of the results of the significance tests (Table 4.14) and the data from Table 4.15 leads to the following conclusions regarding overall differences in time distribution between high and low structure conditions:

1) High structure groups spent significantly less time in Quadrant 1 interaction than did low structure groups ($p < .001$).

2) High structure groups spent significantly more time in Quadrant 2 interaction than did low structure groups ($p < .001$).

3) No significant difference in time distribution was found between high and low structure groups with respect to Quadrant 3 interaction.
4) High structure groups spent significantly more time in Quadrant 4 interaction than did low structure groups (p < .05).

In order to examine patterns of interaction in the groups from session to session, a second set of analyses was performed on the data with the purpose of locating session-by-session differences in distribution of interaction time as a result of level of initial session structure. The following sequential analyses were performed.

1) Five two-way chi-squares (Groups X Quadrant at Sessions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5) were carried out to test for significant differences among the four groups in time distribution within each session. The results are presented in Table 4.16.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination, Session</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Quadrant (S1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>256.0</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Quadrant (S2)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Quadrant (S3)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>124.6</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Quadrant (S4)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groups X Quadrant (S5)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>176.1</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results obtained indicate the presence of significant differences between the groups for each of the five sessions.
2) The Structure (pooled) X Quadrant chi-square tests performed in step 5 above have previously established the presence of overall differences between high and low structure conditions in distribution of time to three of the four quadrants: 1, 2, and 4. This legitimates an examination of session-by-session differences in the distribution of time to those three quadrants.

3) One-way chi-squares (Structure X Q1 at Session 1, Structure X Q2 at Session 2 ... Structure X Q4 at Session 5) were performed to test for the presence of significant differences in time distribution to quadrants 1, 2, and 4 between the structure conditions on a session-by-session basis. The results are presented in Table 4.17.
Table 4.17

Session-by-Session Differences in Time Distribution
to HIM Quadrants by Structure Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q1:</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q1:</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q1:</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q1:</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q1:</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q2:</td>
<td>231.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q2:</td>
<td>112.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q2:</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q2:</td>
<td>152.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q2:</td>
<td>124.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q4:</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q4:</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q4:</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q4:</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure X Q4:</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analyses presented in Table 4.17 indicate the presence of significant session-by-session differences between high and low structure conditions in distribution of total interaction time to the
HIM quadrants. In order to establish the direction of those differences, Table 4.18 presents a session-by-session breakdown of time spent in each quadrant by high and low structure conditions.

Table 4.18

Session-by-Session Distribution of Time to HIM Quadrants by Structure Conditions in Minutes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A joint inspection of the significance tests (Table 4.17) and the data from Table 4.18 leads to the following conclusions regarding session-
by-session differences in time distribution between high and low structure conditions:

1) In sessions 1, 3, 4, and 5 high structure groups spent significantly less time in Quadrant 1 interaction than did low structure groups.

2) In sessions 1 and 4 high structure groups spent significantly more time in Quadrant 2 interaction than did low structure groups.

3) In session 1 low structure groups spent significantly more time in Quadrant 4 interaction than did high structure groups.

4) In sessions 3 and 5 high structure groups spent significantly more time in Quadrant 4 interaction than did low structure groups.

Hypothesis 5: High structure initiation will result in greater expressed member preference for risk-taking interaction upon termination of the group, than will low structure initiation.

Table 4.19 presents the means and standard deviations for the members' scores from Quadrants 3 and 4 of HII-B, the standardized measure of expressed preferences for types of interaction. The maximum possible score for the two quadrants was 80.
Table 4.19

Means and Standard Deviations for HIM-B Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to test for the presence of significant differences in the data obtained, the t-test for groups of unequal n was performed on the pooled data from high and low structure groups. The results of that analysis are presented in Table 4.20.

Table 4.20

T-test for Pooled HIM-B Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The test results indicate that the obtained differences between the groups were not statistically significant.

Hypothesis 6: High structure initiation will result in more favorable evaluation of the group experience upon termination than will low structure initiation.

Table 4.21 presents the means and standard deviations for the groups on the Post-Group Reaction Survey. The maximum possible score was 25.

**Table 4.21**

Means and Standard Deviations for the Post-Group Reaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (1)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Structure (2)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (1)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure (2)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>2.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The t-test for groups of unequal n was performed on the pooled post-group satisfaction data. The results of this test are presented in Table 4.22.
Table 4.22

T-test for Pooled Post-group Reaction Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Structure</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Structure</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of the analysis do not indicate the presence of statistically significant differences in the data obtained for hypothesis six.
The present chapter is divided into four sections. The first section consists of a restatement of the study's hypotheses accompanied by a summary of the results pertinent to each. Section two presents a discussion of the overall pattern of results obtained. The third section looks at the limitations of the study. Finally, section four is a discussion of implications for future research.

Summary of Results

Hypothesis 1: High initial structure will result in higher attendance rates per session than will low initial structure.

The results obtained for hypothesis one (Table 4.6) indicate that, in fact, overall attendance was significantly higher for the low structure initiation groups than for the high structure groups. Inspection of the attendance data (Table 4.5) indicates that low structure group, LS (1), had an average attendance of 4.6 sessions per member—more than 1.5 more than the next highest group, HS (2), which had an average attendance of 3.0 sessions per member. A reexamination of the session-by-session attendance figures (Table 4.4) allows for the calculation of attrition rates per group.
Rate of attrition is defined as the percentage of members present at session one but not present at session five. These attrition rates are presented in Table 5.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th># Members Lost</th>
<th>% Attrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High structure (1)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High structure (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low structure (1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low structure (2)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data indicate that group LS (1) lost a minimum of 50% fewer members than remaining groups. The results obtained for hypothesis one seem clearly to be a function of events specific to a particular group. These events caused the attrition rate in group LS (1) to be well below the rate of the other groups in the current study, as well as the 33% attrition rate reported in Chapter II (Yalom, 1970) as typical of early session dropouts from psychotherapy groups.

Hypothesis 2: High initial structure will result in lower levels of initial session anxiety for group members, measured midway through the first sessions, than will low initial structure.

The results obtained for hypothesis two (Table 4.8) do not indicate significant differences in initial session anxiety score. Thus, acceptance of this hypothesis is not warranted by the data.
Hypothesis 3: High initial structure will result in higher levels of group cohesion after three sessions than will low initial structure.

The analysis of group cohesion data (Table 4.10) does not warrant acceptance of the hypothesis in question. No significant differences in group cohesion were found among the groups by the end of the third session.

Hypothesis 4: High structure initiation will result in a greater frequency of risk-taking behavior by members during the group sessions than will low structure initiation.

The data and analyses pertinent to hypothesis four, taken as a whole, offer substantial support for the fourth hypothesis. With respect to overall differences, i.e., data combined for all sessions, the following conclusions are supported by the results obtained:

(1) High structure groups spent significantly less time in Quadrant I interaction than did low structure groups.

(2) High structure groups spent significantly more time in Quadrant 2 interaction than did low structure groups.

(3) High structure groups spent significantly more time in Quadrant 4 interaction than did low structure groups.

With respect to session-by-session differences between high and low structure conditions, the following conclusions are supported by the results obtained:
(1) High structure groups spent significantly less time in Quadrant I interaction than did low structure in four of the five sessions.

(2) High structure groups spent significantly more time in Quadrant 2 interaction than did low structure groups in two of the five sessions. The remaining Q2 differences were not significant.

(3) High structure groups spent significantly less time in Quadrant 4 interaction than did low structure groups during session one. High structure groups spent significantly more time in Quadrant 4 interaction during sessions three and five than did low structure groups.

Hypothesis 5: High structure initiation will result in greater expressed member preference for risk-taking interaction upon termination of the groups than will low structure initiation.

The data analysis pertinent to hypothesis five (Table 4.20) does not warrant acceptance of the hypothesis regarding the differential effects of the group experience on members' stated preferences for types of interaction.

Hypothesis 6: High structure initiation will lead to greater member satisfaction with the group experience upon termination than will low structure initiation.

The analysis of data obtained for hypothesis six (Table 4.22) does not indicate the presence of significant differences in member evaluations of the group experience as a function of level of initial session structure.
Discussion

The data collected in the present study was of two varieties. The first of these was score data which reflected the reactions of individual members to the group experience. The data for the hypotheses regarding attendance, initial session anxiety, group cohesion, member interactive preferences, and satisfaction, was of this type. The second variety of data was group data, i.e., it reflected group patterns of interaction between individual members. The data for hypothesis four, which dealt with levels of risk-taking behavior in the group sessions, was of the second type. The results from each of these types of data will be discussed in turn. With one exception, the data which dealt with individual reactions to the group experience did not indicate the presence of significant differences due to the level of structure in the initial session.

The analysis of the data regarding initial session anxiety (Table 4.8) did not indicate significant differences between high and low structure groups. There would seem to be at least two possible reasons for this. First, it may be that the Anxiety Differential was not sensitive to differences in member anxiety which were in fact present. Since the instrument is based on the semantic differential technique (Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, 1957) it attempts to operationalize anxiety by means of an assessment of changes in the connotative meanings of certain words for individuals. This fact regarding the nature of the instrument may support the notion that it was not a sensitive measure of different levels of anxiety which were present, for this reason: connotations of words are subject to change over time and as a result of popular usage of terms. Since the Anxiety Differential was constructed and validated on a group of college students in the early 1960's it seems possible that shifts in the connotative meanings of
words such as "today", "germs," "screw," etc., may effect the respondent's reaction to the words contained in the instrument.

If one assumes, however, that the instrument employed was not at fault, how can the lack of differences in initial session anxiety between the high and low structure groups be accounted for? Why did the presence of a high level of initial structure seemingly not lower members' initial session anxiety as predicted? It may be that the exercises used in the high structure condition, while giving the group members an unambiguous task, created another source of anxiety for the participants. It is possible that by setting up a structure which "forced" members to talk directly to and make observations about their fellow members during the first meeting, the group leaders may have eliminated one typical mode of managing early session anxiety, i.e., silence. This may have led to increased anxiety for high structure member thereby offsetting some of the potentially positive effects of structure.

With respect to group cohesion a similar question arises. How do we account for the lack of significant differences due to the structure variable? The instrument used to measure group cohesion is based on a view of cohesion as the sum total of forces which attract individual members to the group (Schacter, 1959). It focuses on questions such as how many of the group's members the respondent views positively, how often the respondent would like to meet, etc. It seems possible that differences along these "attraction" dimensions may not have solidified by the end of session three. It is an open question as to whether differences in group cohesion scores would have been found at the end of five sessions. The attendance data—certainly one measure of the group's attraction for its members—
indicates that group LS (1) consistently had a larger number of members present at its sessions, suggesting that differences in cohesion may have been present due to particular group climates. One bit of post-hoc evidence which supports this notion is that a review of the final session recordings indicates that group LS (1) was the only one of the four groups to spontaneously discuss the possibility of continuing to meet and to actually arrange to meet socially.

The data regarding member preferences for types of interaction (Table 4.20) did not reflect significant differences among the four groups due to structure. This measure was intended to serve as a post-test-only outcome measure, and is limited first by the fact that it is based on self-reported preferences rather than on any behavioral assessment of preferred modes of interaction. Secondly, if there are indeed important differences among people in terms of the types of interactions which they favor, as suggested by many authors (Carson, 1967; Leary, 1959), it may be unrealistic to expect that a brief and relatively non-intensive small group experience would result in changes in such interactive patterns. This may account for the failure of the structured initiation to have the predicted results in the present study.

The data regarding member satisfaction with the group experience (Table 4.22) indicated no significant differences among the groups’ evaluations of their experience. Thus, level of initial structure did not seem to affect the subjective, retrospective evaluation of the groups by their members. It seems likely, and this observation may apply to other data gathered during the final session as well, that group events intervening
between the initial and final sessions may have overridden the effects of level of initial session structure. That is, in the four sessions following the group's initiation other experiences not related to initial session structure may have had an impact on member evaluations of the group, levels of group cohesion, etc.

The final set of individual data to be discussed, attendance, did show significant differences between high and low structure groups. The differences observed were, however, in the opposite of the predicted direction. As indicated above this difference is attributable to the fact that one group LS (1) averaged 1.6 sessions greater attendance per member than did the other groups who were roughly equivalent in terms of attendance. These results suggest that events unique to a particular group accounted for the results obtained.

With respect to group data, i.e., data regarding differences in frequency of risk-taking interaction as a result of initial session structure, the results obtained offer a good deal of support for structure effects. In order to explore the meaning of the pattern of results obtained it is important to recall that the quadrants of the Hill Interaction Matrix reflect increasingly higher levels of risk-taking as one proceeds from Quadrant I through Quadrant IV interaction. Figure 5.1 specifies the meaning of the interaction specific to each HIM quadrant in terms of content (what people are discussing) and process level (how they are discussing it).
FIGURE 5.1
Meaning of the HIM Quadrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quadrant</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Process Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>T,G</td>
<td>CN,A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>T,G</td>
<td>S,CF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>P,R</td>
<td>CN,A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>P,R</td>
<td>S,CF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T = Topics
G = Groups
P = Persons
R = Relationships
CN = Conventional
A = Assertive
S = Speculative
CF = Confrontive

The data regarding differences in time distribution to the HIM quadrants (Tables 4.15 and 4.18) indicate that highly significant overall differences were present for Quadrant I interaction. The fact that high structure groups overall spent significantly (p<.001) less time in Quadrant I interaction than did low structure groups, and that these significant differences occurred in four out of five sessions, suggests that the high structure initiation had the predicted effect. Specific high structure groups spent less time dealing in Conventional and Assertive process modes while dealing with the Topics and Group content dimensions.
At the next higher level of risk-taking behavior, Quadrant 2 interaction, the results obtained (Tables 4.14, 4.15, and 4.18) indicate that high structure groups spent significantly more time in quadrant 2 interaction than did low structure groups. It appears, as was suggested, in Chapter II, that the initial activities of the high structure groups encouraged and enabled group members in that condition to move to the two deepest levels of interaction in terms of process (see Figure 3.1) on the HIM, the Speculative and Confrontive modes. This suggestion is also supported by the results for Quadrant 4 data to be discussed below.

In terms of Quadrant 3 interaction no significant differences were found. That is, no differences were present for high and low structure groups in terms of dealing with Personal and Relationship issues in Conventional and Assertive ways. Inspection of the distribution of Quadrant 3 time in the high and low structure groups (Table 4.11) indicates a good deal of variation in terms of differences from session to session in time spent in the quadrant. It can be noted for example that a different group spent the largest amount of time in Q3 for each of the first four sessions: session 1: LS (1), session 2: HS (1), session 3: HS (2), and session 4: LS (2). Apparently, events unique to particular groups overrode structure effects for Quadrant III interaction.

The data and analyses regarding Quadrant 4 interaction (Tables 4.13 and 4.15) indicate that high structure groups spent significantly more time than low structure groups in Quadrant 4 interaction. These data offer the strongest support for this study's hypothesis regarding effects of initial session structure in prevalence of risk-taking interaction, since
Quadrant 4 of the HIM is the locus of what is clearly the most potentially threatening forms of human interaction. Specifically, groups receiving the high structure initiation spent significantly more time dealing with Personal and Relationship issues in a Speculative and Confrontive manner. It should be further noted that this pattern was true in terms of total Quadrant 4 interaction time, that it seemed to strengthen as the sessions went on. Table 4.17 indicates that high structure groups spent significantly more time in Q4 interaction at sessions three and five, after having spent less time than low structure groups in Q4 during the initial session.

The results of the data analysis for Quadrant 2 and Quadrant 4 interaction (Table 4.17) when taken together, reveal an interesting pattern of differences between high and low structure groups. A review of the Hill Matrix schematic (Figure 3.1) indicates that Quadrant 2 and Quadrant 4 interaction both involve the Speculative and Confrontive process dimensions. One might infer from the data obtained in the present study that the high structure initiation had its most significant and consistent impact on the process dimension of group interaction. Results obtained regarding the effects of structured initiation on the content dimension were mixed, viz., significant results in the predicted direction were found for Quadrant 1 but not for Quadrant 3 interaction. The high structure initiation seems to have prepared members to engage each other at a deeper level with respect to process, but had mixed results regarding content. This would suggest that the potency of the structured initial session could be enhanced in three ways. First, the structured introduction component could be re-written to stress the importance of member willingness to deal directly with what
the HIM categorizes as Personal and Relationship concerns. Secondly, the modeling component of the micro-training format could be deliberately structured to include interactions exemplifying the HIM Personal and Relationship content dimensions. Finally, an exercise to teach effective self-involving behavior, e.g., Danish and Hauer (1973) could be incorporated into the skill-training component of the high structure initiation format, in order to permit actual practice of the desired behavior.

Limitations of the Study

A number of limitations of the present study should be noted.

The fact that group leaders did only a high structure or a low structure group rather than one of each, made it difficult to isolate effects due to group leader behavior. Crossing group leaders with structure conditions would allow the experimenter to examine obtained results for leader effects.

The difficulties inherent in co-ordinating the schedules of the number of persons involved in an extended non-laboratory study of group process made it impossible to assign members to groups in a completely random fashion. While group members were assigned randomly to either high or low structure conditions, composition of particular groups may have added to the proportion of the variance accounted for by group differences.

Systematic assessment of potentially important member individual differences was not carried out, and this may have added to the difficulty of accurately assessing the impact of the structure variable on individual
data. Part of the difficulty here is that the evidence currently available as to what the crucial individual differences are with respect to group composition is far from clear. Some suggestions, however, have been advanced. Yalom (1975) suggests that group members should be chosen so as to be heterogeneous with respect to conflict areas and preferred coping styles but homogeneous with respect to ego strength. Bednar and Lawlis (1971) suggest that severity of disturbance, intellectual and emotional resources, and compatibility are the critical selection dimensions. While still rather general and cumbersome for applied use, these suggestions do suggest potential guidelines for future research.

As mentioned above the measurement of group cohesion may have been carried out prematurely. In retrospect, it seems that the study would have been strengthened by an additional assessment of group cohesion upon termination of the groups.

The relatively short duration of the groups, i.e., five sessions may have had some impact on patterns of group development. It seems likely, for example, that the participants in the present study may have come to the groups with a different set of expectations than persons seeking out a counseling group with the prospect of sessions lasting for a substantially longer period of time.

A final limitation of the present study was the relative inexperience of the group leaders. The criticism of the validity of psychotherapy research that it is rarely carried out with experienced therapists involved (Bergin and Strupp, 1972) is germane to this point. It is difficult to predict what differences one might expect, but it seems reasonable to suggest that experienced group leaders might manage what seems to be a
potentially potent intervention, i.e., initial structure, more ably than novice group leaders.

**Implications for Future Research**

The results obtained in the present study regarding the impact of initial structure on resultant patterns of group interaction while encouraging with regard to the potential effectiveness of structured initiation for enhancing the effectiveness of group interventions, suggest some potential directions for future research. It seems important that the impact of initial structure on group process and outcome be studied intensively in actual counseling and psychotherapy groups. Preliminary efforts in this direction (Yalom, 1970) were reported in Chapter II and should be extended.

It seems to the writer that it is important to look seriously at questions regarding differential effects of group treatment as a function of individual difference variables. The suggestions of Yalom (1975) and Bednar and Lawlis (1971) regarding important group composition dimensions offer one fruitful source of hypotheses for future research. A second area of potentially significant individual differences are those suggested by research in cognitive developmental psychology. Perry (1969), Hunt and Sullivan (1973), and others have suggested that cognitive complexity, defined as the capacity to reason abstractly and to view events from multiple perspectives, significantly affects the individual's capacity to benefit from educational experiences. These authors suggest that optimal matching (or to be precise, optimal mismatching) of level of cognitive complexity with learning task will best facilitate personal learning and development. Widick, Knefelkamp, and Parker (1975) report data from a recent study of college students suggesting that a high level of task structure was effective in moving individuals from a low to a higher level of cognitive complexity. Their data also suggest that after a certain level of cognitive complexity has been attained, further development is enhanced by allowing the members to assume more responsibility for the task structure.
Future research should also attempt to separate effects due to leader personality, style, and level of experience, from effects due to particular intervention strategies. One means of accomplishing this would be to have all leaders in a particular study carry out each type of intervention which is being tested.

A final comment pertains to strategic approaches to research in the area of group psychotherapy. Lindzey, Hall and Thompson (1975), and Bergin and Strupp (1972) suggest that intensive study of the individual case can serve as an initial step in testing particular approaches to counseling and psychotherapy. Such intensive study may yield hypotheses which can then be investigated experimentally. It is the writer's belief that the state of the art in group psychotherapy, presumably a more complicated endeavor than individual psychotherapy, is such that intensive study of carefully selected groups, systematically varying leader and member attributes as well as intervention techniques, may be an extremely fruitful source of testable hypothesis for future research. Future studies should attempt to identify both key leader variables, e.g., core conditions offered; and key individual difference variables, e.g., cognitive complexity. When these variables have been identified, matching or blocking design procedures may then be used to look at interaction between these variables and such process variables as level of structure.
CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

This dissertation was an investigation of the effect of high vs. low levels of initial session structure on the development of small groups. It was an attempt to assess differences in the reactions of the group members to their experience as a result of the level of initial session structure. In this connection, several dimensions were evaluated: amount of anxiety during the groups' initial session, stated preferences for types of interaction upon termination of the sessions, and post-group evaluation of the group experience. The study also examined the effects of level of initial session structure on cohesion and on patterns of risk-taking behavior within the groups.

Forty-seven undergraduate students who had requested information regarding a small group communications experience were assigned randomly to either high or low structure initiation groups led by graduate students pre-trained in one of the two approaches. In the high structure initiation group members were given a detailed introduction regarding the nature of such group's development. They also received training in several basic interpersonal communication skills. This training included their observation of the behavior being modeled for them by the leaders of the group and the opportunity for practice with feedback of the key behaviors. In the low structure initiation group members were told by the leaders that what would happen in the group would be largely up to them, and then were invited to begin to discuss any concerns of
theirs relevant to the topic of interpersonal communication.

The results of the experiment indicated that the high structure initiation groups spent significantly more time than did low structure initiation groups in patterns of interaction characterized by member willingness to take risks. Level of initial session structure did not cause differential results with respect to initial session anxiety, group cohesion, member interactive preferences, or member satisfaction with the group experience. Possible interpretations of the results obtained were discussed and implications for future research were noted.
APPENDIX A

HIGH STRUCTURE INTRODUCTION
In order for you to become involved as quickly and easily as possible in the group, we'll begin by giving you some information about how groups such as this work. In order to do this, we'll touch on three points: (1) what are the goals of the group? (2) what will your group leaders expect of you? (3) what can you expect of your group leaders?

The goal of the group is to establish a climate of trust, mutual support, and cooperation in which members:

(1) feel free to share their concerns.

(2) give and receive feedback on behavior in the group.

(3) get new information about themselves and about relationships with others.

(4) try on new, more constructive behaviors with group support.

In order for the group to reach the above goal it is necessary that the leaders and the members be willing to do certain things in the group, which may be a bit different than the ways of relating to others that you're accustomed to. We want you to understand these behaviors very concretely, and so we'll begin by defining them for you. Later, you'll have a chance to practice each of them.

Key Group Behaviors

(1) Offering support. This involves working to understand and be sensitive to the goals and concerns that bring your fellow members to the group. In order for the attitudes to have an impact on the group, you must be able to communicate them.
(2) Self-disclosure. Sharing with the other group members the areas of concern in your life and your values, thoughts and feelings about them.

(3) Giving and receiving feedback. The way other people see you is important information for you to have. Your reactions to others are important bits of "data" for them. Giving and receiving feedback allows this information to be shared.

(4) Observing group interaction. Learning to observe and understand how people communicate is a valuable skill for anyone who is involved with other people, and who isn't. The group will be an opportunity for you to practice this important skill.

The leader in your group will be willing to engage in all of the above behaviors in order that the group will develop and help you to meet your needs. He or she will also provide information to you about how people relate to each other, including the kinds of difficulties they run into. The leader is there as a group member who will do anything that is expected of you, but also as a resource person for you - your own "consultant" in interpersonal relationships.
SKILLS-TRAINING EXERCISES

A good way to develop the communication skills important for our group and for relating to others in your life is to practice them. The following exercises were developed to help you engage in the kinds of interaction we discussed in the introduction to the group.

Each exercise involves three steps and tasks for three persons.

The steps:
1) The leader will explain the "target" behavior to you.
2) The behavior will be demonstrated so that you can see how it looks concretely.
3) You will each have a chance to practice the behavior and receive feedback on your effort.

The tasks:
1) One person (A) will be practicing the target behavior.
2) The second person (B) will be working with A on the target behavior.
3) The third person (C) will observe the interaction and give feedback to A.

After completing one round, each person will rotate through each of the positions.
Exercise 1: Offering support

There are many ways to offer support to another person. One of the best ways is to make an effort to listen when they speak and to let them know that you understood their message. This exercise is designed to help you practice doing just that.

Instructions: Person A will listen to person B make one or two statements about his or her goals for the group. A will then paraphrase B’s statements to show that they were understood. Person C will then offer A feedback on the accuracy and completeness of his or her response.
Exercise 2: Self-Disclosure

An important part of forming satisfying relationships with other people is the ability to share your thoughts and feelings with them. Try thinking of such communications as having two basic parts, content and feeling. One way of letting another person get to know you is to share what's happening in certain areas of your life (content), and your personal reaction to it (feeling).

Instructions: Person A will make one or two statements to Person B about things currently happening which concerns him or her in a personal way. B will respond to A by indicating the feeling and content that he or she heard in the message. B may want to use the following formula: "You feel__________because____________". Person C will offer feedback to A on the clarity of the self-disclosing statement(s).
Exercise 3: Giving and receiving feedback

Letting another person know about how you see them and how they affect you can be extremely important part of deepening relationships with others. In order for this to be constructive it is important that the other person not hear your feedback as an accusation, but rather as a tentative personal reaction. This, too, is a skill which can be practiced.

Other persons can be the source of a wealth of information about ourselves. How we affect others may well be one of the most important things for us to be aware of. When another individual shares a personal reaction with us it can be thought about and reacted to as an important message, and one worth responding to. Perhaps the most positive response to constructive feedback from another is self-examination: does this message have some truth in it?

Instructions: Person A will share his first impressions of Person B with B, again making one or two statements. B will respond by considering the feedback and then A whether he or she sees themselves in a similar way, and how they felt about A's feedback. Person C will observe the interaction and give A feedback on the attempt.
Exercise 4: Observing group interaction

An important asset for a member of any group-family, class, or bullsession with friends - is the ability to observe an interaction and how the people involved are feeling about it. Is someone not saying something that's on their mind? Has someone been left out of the conversation? Who's running the show and how did that come about? The person who knows how to get the answers to these questions has mastered a valuable communication skill.

Instructions: For this exercise you will be asked to observe some interactions on video tape. After each tape you will be asked to identify what was happening between the people involved, and then be given feedback as to the accuracy of your response.
APPENDIX C

LOW STRUCTURE INITIATION
My name is ______________, and this is ______________. I suspect that we will all know each other a good deal better at the end of the group sessions than we do now. We can make of this group exactly what we wish. Where do we start?
APPENDIX D

GUIDELINE FOR LOW STRUCTURE INITIATION
Some guidelines for the low structure initial session

Your basic task as group leaders during the initial session will be to assist your group members in discussing their reasons for coming to the group. In order to accomplish this you should rely largely on accurate empathy which, as you know, is defined as communicating to another your understanding of both the things which concern them (content) and their emotional reactions to these concerns (feeling).

By actively attending, responding empathically, and encouraging members to voice and clarify their concerns you will facilitate the development of trust within your group.

Do not make use of any structured exercises during your first session. If unexpected events occur, e.g., confrontation between two members, you should attempt to accurately sum up for the group your view of both sides of the issue. Indicate to your members that the purpose of the first session is to share the concerns that bring them to the group, and that there will be time later to go more deeply into specific issues. Then encourage the members to return to the task at hand.
APPENDIX E

PERCEIVED STRUCTURE RATING SCALE
RATING SCALE

Structure can be defined as the organization of parts into a meaningful whole. In a structured experience the activities seem to progress in a planned and orderly fashion to the desired goal. Prior planning by those in charge is evident.

In an unstructured experience the activities do not appear to have been decided upon beforehand. The leaders seem to prefer to allow the members to bring up whatever they wish to work on, rather than to preplan activities.

Directions: Make a check (✓) along the line to indicate your judgment of the degree of structure in your group's first session.

very unstructured ........................................ very structured
APPENDIX F

ANXIETY DIFFERENTIAL
INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this instrument is to measure the meaning of certain things to people by having them judge them against a series of descriptive scales. In taking this test, please make your judgments on the basis of what these things mean to you.

Here is how to use these scales:
If you feel that the concept above each scale is very closely related to one end of the scale, you should place your check mark as follows:

fair  X:____:____:____:____: unfair
or unfair __:____:____:____:____: X: fair

If you feel that the concept is quite closely related to one or the end of the scale (but not extremely), you should place your check mark as follows:

strong __:X:____:____:____: weak
or strong __:____:____:____:____: X: weak

If the concept seems only slightly related to one side as opposed to the other side (but is not really neutral), then you should check as follows:

active __:____:X:____:____: passive
or active __:____:____:X:____: passive

The direction which you check, of course, depends upon which of the two ends of the scale seem most characteristic of the thing you're judging.

If you consider the concept to be neutral on the scale, both sides of the scale equally associated with the concept, or if the scale is completely irrelevant, unrelated to the concept, then you should place your check mark in the middle space:

safe __:____:X:____:____: dangerous

IMPORTANT: (1) Place your check marks in the middle of the spaces not on the boundaries.

this not this

__:____:X:____:____:

(2) Be sure you check the scale under each word - do not omit any.

(3) Never put more than one check mark on a single scale.
Make each item a separate and independent judgment. Work at fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry or puzzle over individual items. It is your first "impressions", the immediate feelings about the items, that we want.

ME

frightened _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ fearless

DREAMS

loose _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ tight

TROUBLE

here _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ there

MY MIND

loose _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ tight

ME

worried _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ carefree

MOVIES

wet _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ dry

LITTLE BOYS

safe _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ dangerous

ME

jittery _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ calm

HANDS

loose _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ tight
YESTERDAY
BREATHING
FINGERS
ANXIETY
HANDS
HANDS
EYES
MOVIES
SCREW
GERMS
helpless __:___:____:____:____: secure

nice __:___:____:____:____: awful

THE REAL ME

hard __:___:____:____:____: soft

FINGERS

stiff __:___:____:____:____: relaxed

MOVIES

loose __:___:____:____:____: tight

Screw

clean __:___:____:____:____: dirty

ME

wet __:___:____:____:____: dry

Screw

loose __:___:____:____:____: tight

TODAY

curved __:___:____:____:____: straight
APPENDIX G

GROUP COHESION SCALE
Group Questionnaire

The following questions refer to your experiences in this group. Please circle the letter preceding the answer which fits best with your own opinion.

1. How many of your group members fit what you feel to be the idea of a good member?
   a. All of them.
   b. Most of them.
   c. Some of them.
   d. Few of them.
   e. None of them.

2. To what degree do you feel that you are included by the group in its activities?
   a. I am included in all the group's activities.
   b. I am included in almost all the group's activities.
   c. I am included in some of the activities, but not in some others.
   d. I don't feel that the group includes me in very many of its activities.
   e. I don't feel that the group includes me in any of its activities.

3. How attractive do you find the activities in which you participate as a member of your group?
   a. Like all of them very much.
   b. Like almost all of them.
   c. Like some of them, but not others.
   d. Like very few of them.
   e. Like none of them.

4. If most of the members of your group decided to dissolve the group by leaving, would you like an opportunity to dissuade them?
   a. Would like very much to persuade them to stay.
   b. Would like to persuade them to stay.
   c. Would make no difference to me if they stayed or left.
   d. Would not like to try to persuade them to stay.
   e. Would definitely not like to try to persuade them to stay.

5. If you were asked to participate in another project like this one, would you like to be with the same people who are in your present group?
   a. Would want very much to be with the same people.
   b. Would rather be with the same people than with most others.
   c. Makes no difference to me.
   d. Would rather be with another group more than present group.
   e. Would want very much to be with another group.

6. How well do you like the group you are in?
   a. Like it very much.
   b. Like it pretty well.
   c. It's all right.
   d. Don't like it too much.
   e. Dislike it very much.
APPENDIX G

GROUP COHESION SCALE
APPENDIX H

HIM-B TEST
HIM-B TEST

ADMINISTRATION INSTRUCTIONS

INSTRUCTIONS:

Think of yourself as a member of a therapy group. The situations and conditions described in the test items are about such a group. For each test item, there are six possible answers. Select the response which is most consistent with your reaction. On the Answer Sheet fill in the circle which represents your answer.

1. I talk to people about my background, family, school, work, etc.
2. I tell other people specifically what kind of reactions I have toward them when they ask me.
3. I like to discuss Psychology with people.
4. I side in with people who say they are getting a raw deal.
5. In a group I'd ask questions about how one member reacts to another.
6. I'm interested in what kind of things motivate people.
7. People need to be told off regularly.
8. When a group is having trouble operating, I figure out what's wrong with the group and propose solutions.
9. I ask for or give summaries and restatements of what's said.
10. I am sarcastic to people.
11. I try to support and encourage other people.
12. When people point out examples of my immature, irrational or inadequate behavior I try to profit by this.
13. Even though my ideas are unpopular I tend to uphold them.
15. I like to know something about the background of people.
16. I let people know what I think of them.
17. I offer suggestions as to how a group might improve its functioning.
18. I'm willing to seek help from people for my personal problems.
19. I like people who initiate and plan group activities.
20. When groups try to solve people's problems, it's a case of the 'blind leading the blind.'
21. If conflicting goals are fouling up a group I will point this out.
22. Groups tend to get off the subject and wander all over.
23. I try to get people to honestly examine the kind of relationships they form with others.
24. I like to discuss current events.
25. I help plan a group's activities.
26. I like to chat with people.
27. I openly criticize the policies of those in charge or in positions of authority.
28. I try to integrate or synthesize and pull together divergent opinions or ideas expressed in a group.
29. I like to discuss what causes various kinds of emotional upsets and mental illnesses.
30. I compare the group I'm in with other groups I've known.
31. I try to help people with their personal problems.
32. I retaliate when people point out my weaknesses.
33. When people talk about their problems, I like to bring the discussion around to the principles or types of behavior that are illustrated by these problems.
34. I share with the group my observations of its function and its subsequent failures.
35. I point out discrepancies or contradictions between peoples behavior and what they say they're like.
36. I like for others to help me understand myself.
37. I'm the one who asks what are the plans and procedures of the group.
38. I like to praise people.
42. It is my responsibility to give group members an honest statement of how I react to them even if it may hurt their feelings.

43. I'm willing to share details of my private life with people.

44. When I tell people how I react to them, I try to do so - but in a way that doesn't hurt their feelings.

45. I try to clarify or pull out some conclusions for the group when it gets bogged down or confused when discussing a topic.

46. When a member's behavior prevents or inhibits a group's progress, I point out to the group the effect of his behavior.

47. I try to find out what kind of reactions my behavior produces on other individuals.

48. I like to exchange gossip.

49. I like to kid with people.

50. I try to get people to discuss the kinds of defenses and psychological principles that their behavior illustrates.

51. People have pretty foggy notions on most controversial issues.

52. I like to offer observations about the group's performance.

53. I like to get people to discuss how they feel about each other.

54. People need to know more about psychological and psychiatric terms and concepts.

55. I react negatively to suggestions implying that I change my personality.

56. I try to get people to deal with their problems which they avoid.

57. I like to argue with people.

58. I like to be close and personal with people.

59. People who talk about their troubles gripe me.

60. I share with the group how I think we're doing.

61. When people ask about how I react toward them I usually tell them something.

62. I try to find out how people actually see me and see my problems.

63. I like to socialize.

64. I'm interested in people.
APPENDIX I

POST-GROUP REACTION SURVEY
Post-Group Reaction Survey

In order for us to learn how the group affected you, we would like for you to respond to the following statements. We will be using your response for evaluation and planning, so please be candid in your evaluation. Thank you.

1. Did you enjoy the group?
   1. Not at all.
   2. Unenjoyable for the most part.
   4. Enjoyed somewhat.
   5. Enjoyed very much.

2. Did you achieve your desired goal(s) in the group?
   1. Feel that I lost ground.
   2. Achieved fewer goals than I had expected.
   3. No movement, either positive or negative.
   4. Achieved most of my goals.
   5. Achieved all my goals.

3. Was the atmosphere in the group comfortable for you?
   1. Very uncomfortable.
   2. Somewhat uncomfortable.
   4. Somewhat comfortable.
   5. Very comfortable.

4. Did you like the other members of the group?
   1. None of them.
   2. Few of them.
   3. About half and half.
   4. Most of them.
   5. All of them.

5. What was your reaction to your leaders' performance in the group?
   1. Very dissatisfied.
   2. Somewhat satisfied.
   4. Somewhat satisfied.
   5. Very satisfied.
APPENDIX J

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW FOR NON-RETURNING MEMBERS
Follow-up Interview for Non-returning Members

My name is _________________. We're very interested in learning more about what kinds of group experience students find worthwhile during their time at O.S.U. I wonder if you would mind answering a few questions about the group you had joined earlier this quarter?

1. Would you briefly describe your reasons for not returning to the group.

2. On a scale of 1-10 (1 being low, and 10 being high), how would you rate your group's leaders on the following tasks:
   a. Explaining the group's purpose ____.
   b. Prior planning of group activities ____.
   c. Making group members comfortable ____.
   d. Understanding members' concerns ____.

3. What could have been done during the first session(s) that would have made the group more helpful to you?
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