5-1975

The Effects of Leadership Style on Group Interaction In Differing Socio-Political Subcultures

Kenneth W. Gilstein
Utah State University

THE EFFECTS OF LEADERSHIP STYLE ON GROUP INTERACTION IN DIFFERING SOCIO-POLITICAL SUBCULTURES

by

Kenneth W. Gilstein

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1975

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the great help and encouragement given to me in the design and implementation of this study to my dissertation director, Dr. David Stone, and my major advisor, Dr. E. Wayne Wright, and express to them my sincere appreciation.

I would also like to thank the other members of my doctoral committee, Dr. Elwin Nielsen, Dr. Walter Borg and Dr. Richley Crapo for all of their help and assistance given to me during this study.

Finally, I would like to thank my friends Larry Jarvis and Kathy Pope, without whose help this study would not have been possible.

Kenneth W. Gilstein

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

ABSTRACT

The Effects of Leadership Style on Group Interaction

In Differing Socio-Political Subcultures

by

Kenneth W. Gilstein, Doctor of Philosophy

Utah State University, 1975

Major Professor: Dr. E. Wayne Wright
Department: Psychology

Four encounter groups were run using 41 undergraduates at Utah State University to measure the effects of leadership style, member socio-political subculture, and member personality on the quantity and quality of group interaction, and on member satisfaction. Using Kerlinger's Social Attitudes Scale, the subjects were divided into subgroupings of "conservatives" and "liberals." One conservative group and one liberal group were each conducted by a leader acting in a non-directive style, while one conservative and one liberal group were run by a leader acting in a directive style. The California Psychological Inventory was administered to the subjects to gain information on the personality traits of the individuals, and a questionnaire was used to measure member satisfaction. Each group met for six sessions, and the groups were rated for interaction using the Hill Interaction Matrix.

Using an analysis of covariance, the results showed that the group led by the non-directive leader resulted in more interaction, and that this interaction was of a "member-centered" work type. A statistical relationship was also found between the personality of group members and:

1) quantity and quality of interaction, 2) member satisfaction, and 3) the socio-political subculture of the members. An interaction effect between leadership style and socio-political subculture of the subjects was found to affect member satisfaction. Conservatives preferred a directive leader, while liberals preferred a non-directive leader. Finally, a trend was found suggesting a difference in group interaction due to the socio-political subculture of an individual.

Implications for other types of groups, and for therapy and counseling, were discussed.

(110 pages)

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

Researchers have reported conflicting results when investigating the effectiveness of a non-directive leadership style, as compared to a directive leadership style, on group interactions. Salzburg (1961), McDaniel (1971), Becker, Harrow, Astrachan, Detre, and Miller (1968), and Jensen (1964) have found the non-directive approach to be more effective. Their results have shown that interaction is promoted when the leader cuts down on his verbalization and acts in a non-directive style. This results in the group members developing more self-positive concepts, becoming less dependent and less self-conscious, and acting more spontaneously.

On the other hand, Liebroder (1962), Abramozuk (1972), Baker (1960), and Frank (1964) have found that the directive leadership approach produces more group interaction. Their results show that the directive style leads to more work in the groups, helps individuals recognize underlying feelings more quickly, and helps people to focus their attention on, and to talk about, their problems more (as compared to a non-directive leader).

These are only a sample of the many studies which have resulted in conflicting findings concerning the effects of leadership style on group interactions. As Shaw (1971) states, when "a directive leader is compared with a non-directive one ... the evidence concerning productivity is inconsistent" (p. 274).

The studies concerning the effects of leadership style on group interaction in differing socio-political subcultures have left several questions to be answered. Although several studies have been reported on this topic, they have been general in nature. Vassilious and Vassilious (1974) studied variations of the group process across cultures. They found that the effectiveness of the interaction is directly related to the members' subjective cultures. Illing (1970) found that cultural circumstances not only influence the treatment process, they enter into the structure and effectiveness of the treatment. Bolman (1968) and Farwell, Gamsky, and Mathieu-Coughlan (1974) found that it is important for the leader to know the culture of the members of the group in order to be as effective as possible, and promote the most interaction.

Statement of the Problem

When attempting to affect interaction in a group situation, both the style of the leader and the socio-political subculture of the group members appear to be important variables. A review of the literature reveals conflicting results on leadership style, when comparing a non-directive leadership approach to a directive one, and is rather general and without direction concerning the socio-political subculture variable. Therefore, a study investigating the effects of leadership style on group interactions in differing socio-political subcultures appears to be warranted.

Objectives of the Study

Will non-directive as compared to directive leadership styles have differing effects on the quantity and quality of group interaction in different socio-political subcultures? The present study concerns itself with measuring the effects of such leadership styles on group interaction in different socio-political subcultures. Another variable that this study deals with is that of the personality of the individuals involved in the groups.

The present study investigates two types of leadership styles. The first is a non-directive style characterized by such leader behaviors as: reflecting feelings, giving unconditional positive regard (support, praise, and encouragement), inviting members to seek feedback, summarizing what has been said in the group, and giving the responsibility for the lead of the group to the group. The second type of leadership style investigated in this study was that of a directive leader. This style is characterized by the leader being confrontive, challenging evaluating, suggesting procedures for the group or an individual, and being assertive.

A second variable that this study investigates is that of the socio-political subculture of the group members. The two types of socio-political subcultures being investigated are a conservative subculture and a liberal one. Presumably, group interaction may be affected not only by the leadership style involved, but also by the type of socio-political subculture from which the group member comes. Here, the interaction of the two variables of leadership style and socio-political

subculture becomes important to examine, using such questions as: 1) How does a certain leadership style affect someone from a certain type of socio-political subculture; 2) Will a person from a conservative socio-political subculture find a non-directive leader more effective in a group setting than someone from a liberal socio-political subculture; and 3) Will a person from a conservative socio-political subculture find a directive leader more effective in a group?

The third variable that this study investigates is the personality of the group members. The main concern of this study is to look at personality as a concomitant variable, both in terms of overall personality and of the individual personality traits (as measured by the California Psychological Inventory), and how these may be related to the quantity and quality of group interaction.

Not only does this study look at the quantity and quality of group interaction, but it also examines some variables which might affect member satisfaction in these groups. The study considers three independent variables of leadership style, socio-political subculture, and personality, as related to member satisfaction in groups.

The purpose of this study is to investigate how the selected variables affect interaction in a group setting, and to suggest the range of applicability of these findings.

Hypotheses

1. There will be a difference in the quantity and quality of group interaction between groups with a non-directive leader and groups with a directive leader. There will be more interaction with a

directive leader and the interaction will consist of more member centered work responses (as measured by the HIM).

2. There will be a difference in the satisfaction of the group members between groups with a directive leader and groups with a non-directive leader. Group members will show a greater satisfaction for a non-directive leader than for a directive leader.
3. There will be a difference in the quantity and quality of group interaction for individuals from a liberal socio-political subculture as compared to individuals from a conservative socio-political subculture. There will be more group interaction with those of the liberal subculture and the interaction will consist of more member centered work responses.
4. There will be no difference in the satisfaction of group members when comparing individuals from the liberal and conservative subcultures.
5. There will be an interaction effect between the variables of leadership style and socio-political subculture as measured by the quantity and quality of group interaction. There will be the most interaction with the liberal subculture-directive leader group consisting of the most member centered responses, and with the conservative subculture-non-directive leader group.
6. There will be an interaction effect between the leadership style and subculture variables on member satisfaction. The liberal members will like the directive leadership style better, and the conservative members will show greater satisfaction with the non-directive leader.

7. There will be a difference in the quantity and quality of group interaction on the personality variable.
8. There will be a difference in the satisfaction of group members due to personality of the individuals in the groups.

Definition of Terms

Personality Traits

Achievement via conformity--identifies those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformity is a positive behavior.

Communality--indicates the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established.

Dominance--identifies individuals who could behave in a dominant, ascendant manner, who in interpersonal situations would take the initiative and exercise leadership, and who would be seen as forceful, self-confident and capable of influencing others.

Femininity--assesses how appreciative, patient, helpful and sincere a person is. (It assesses the masculinity or femininity of interests of an individual.)

Flexibility--indicates the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior.

Psychological-mindedness--measures the degree to which the individual is interested in, and responsive to, the inner needs, motives and experiences of others.

Sociability--identifies individuals who are outgoing, sociable, participative in social activities, expressive and who have a wide range of interests.

Socialization--indicates the degree of social maturity, integrity, and rectitude which the individual has attained.

Social Presence--identifies such factors as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interaction.

Tolerance--identifies persons with permissive, accepting, and non-judgemental social beliefs and attitudes.

Interaction-response Categories

Work Style

Pre-work--characterized by:

1. Responses characterized by behavior that is socially appropriate for any group. The interaction may be so socially oriented as to be devoid of any content and be no more than pleasantries and amenities. In all cases it, at least, performs a group maintenance function (conventional response category).
2. Interaction characterized by argumentative, hostile or aggressive statements (assertive response category).

Work--characterized by:

1. Interaction characterized by speculative, intellectual, or controlled approach to pertinent, therapeutic issues (speculative and exploratory response category).
2. Interaction characterized by a penetration to the significant aspects of a discussion and because of this penetration, these

statements confront members with aspects of their behavior usually avoided (confrontation-integration response category).

Content Style

Non-member-centered--characterized by:

1. Interaction is about any one of an infinite number of topics of general interest, exclusive of the group or its members being the topic (Random content).
2. Interaction indicating that the speaker identifies with the group as an entity, and personal reactions to the group are probed for or are given in answer to such probes (group process content).

Member-centered--characterized by:

1. Interaction that always has as its topic a group member and is usually about a member's actions, problems, or personality (individual content).
2. Interaction that demonstrates (acts out), alludes to or discusses a relationship between members or between a member and the group (relationship content).

Type I Response--a pre-work, non-member-centered response.

Type II Response--a work, non-member-centered response.

Type III Response--a pre-work, member-centered response.

Type IV Response--a work, member-centered response.

Limitations of the Study

Even with the careful design of this study, there were several limitations that arose, which must be mentioned here. First of all,

the study was done at a university setting, at Utah State University. How specifically applicable to other settings the results are, remain to be proven. The fact that it was conducted at one university also lends question to its applicability.

Secondly, the experimenter had no control over the attendance at the group sessions. This limitation became apparent when three of the subjects did not attend at all, four of the subjects did not attend at least five of the six sessions, and of the 41 remaining subjects (who were used in the final analysis) only 29 attended for all of the six sessions.

Thirdly, the formation of the groups was quite unnatural (as compared to the formation of an unobserved encounter or therapy group). Although the subjects were there as volunteers, they were manipulated as to which group they would be in, depending upon how they scored on a paper and pencil questionnaire.

Fourthly, this study was investigating conservatives versus liberals, as one of its variables, and it must be mentioned that the college population (the population used in this study) is, on the whole, more liberal than the population in general.

Finally, the group setting itself was unnatural. It was held in a room with a two-way mirror, and under conditions where the members were aware that they were being observed.

As to how much the "research conditions" affected the group session and the members in the groups, is impossible to tell. However, the probable effects must be reported for this study and future ones.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Research on leadership style presents the reader with conflicting results. The overall trend shows that there is a difference in interaction in groups which can be attributed to the type of orientation or style that a leader takes. However, as to which orientation will facilitate the most interaction, the researchers have come up with differing points of view. Additional confounding variables, relating to the personality of the leader and to the personality or background of the group members involved, also affect the findings.

Leadership Style

A pioneering study of leadership styles was conducted by Lewin and his associates (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939; Lippit & White, 1943). Four comparable groups of ten-year-old boys were observed as they successively experienced autocratic, democratic and "laissez faire" adult leadership. The results showed markedly different patterns of interaction as a function of leadership style. Hostility was thirty times as great in the autocratic as in the democratic groups, and aggression was eight times as great in the autocratic as in the democratic. There was more scapegoating in the autocratic groups than in either of the other two. Nineteen of the twenty boys liked the democratic leader better than the autocrat, and seven of ten liked the laissez faire leader better than the autocrat.

Harrow, Astrachan, Tucker, Klein, and Miller (1971) studying T-groups found many differences in the views of the leader and other differentiations in perceptions about the group as a whole, and about the other members, suggesting that it is the leader and his behavior which exert the most crucial influence on the group.

In studying leadership and content in group psychotherapy, Becker, Harrow, and Astrachan (1970) found that their data suggested that the behavior of the therapist both facilitates and inhibits the ability of the group to do work, and that the therapist's behavior is itself an important problem for the group. Further, the individual therapist might wish to modify his own behavior in the group setting in order to stimulate members dealing with certain issues, e.g.--to stimulate interpersonal interaction he might elect to model such interaction in the group, or he might develop specifically structured meetings and deal with other issues.

Ends and Page (1957) compared three different methods of group therapy (analytic, client-centered, and learning theory, and a control group). They used a Q-sort technique before and after treatment, and expressed the view that there is a difference between the various methods, claiming that different theoretical frameworks result in different patterns of movement in group therapy.

Zimmer, Hakstian, and Newby (1972) compared clients' responses under therapy with Carl Rogers, Albert Ellis and Fritz Perls and found significant differences that clearly indicated that the therapeutic approach had considerable effect.

Ring (1972) investigated the variable of "recognized similarity" in encounter groups and concluded that the recognition of similarity

is a pervasive and important group phenomena which distinguished therapeutic groups from individual therapy. The very feelings, attitudes, perceptions self-disclosures, and overt behaviors which are evoked by the encounter group experience serve as the cues for the recognition of similarities. The significance attributed to these events is influenced by differences in leadership style, individual differences, and the nature of the perceived similarity.

On the other hand, several researchers have stated that there is no difference between leadership style or approach, or that the different effects are not clear. Fiedler (1951), in comparing psychoanalytic, non-directive and Adlerian therapeutic approaches stated that the results indicated that therapists from one school do not create a relationship which is characteristically or significantly different from that created by therapist of the other two schools that were studied in his investigations.

In an earlier study, Fiedler (1950) had found that the therapeutic relationship created by experts of one school resembles more closely that created by experts of other schools than it resembles relationships created by non-experts within the same school. He concluded that the nature of the therapeutic relationship is a function of expertness, rather than theory or method. He felt that it is the "peculiarly affective state" which the therapist produced in the course of psychotherapy which provides the patient with rectifying experiences.

Kilman (1974) in studying the effects of structure of marathon groups, found that when working with internals and externals (locus of personal control), there was no difference in affect of leadership

style when comparing a directive leader with a non-directive leader.

Finally, Rice (1974) takes a look at the question of leader orientation and its effect and states the following:

> It is uncertain whether the therapists tend to behave in accordance with their perceptions of what their preferred schools dictate their actions "should" be or whether therapists' primary and overriding interpersonal styles strongly influence their secondary choices of theoretical allegiance. It is likely that long standing personality characteristics and ways of viewing the world, with their associated interactional concomitants, strongly influence therapists' attraction to different cognitive theoretical systems and philosophies of treatment. Professional training programs also clearly affect therapists' values and modes of interaction. In the demonstrated relationship between theretical preference and therapeutic style in the present study, the causal elements affecting the direction of influence are difficult to unravel. (p. 420)

Influences on the Effectiveness of the Leader

There seems to be several influences that affect the effectiveness of the leader. In his book Small Group Psychotherapy, Walton (1971) talks about some of these influences, which he states, reflect variations in skill and procedure. For example, level of experience has been shown to be relevant (Strupp, 1962). Another study demonstrated the apparent importance of the degree of "concreteness" or specificity with which the therapist discusses feelings (Truax, 1961). However, the therapist's confidence, expectations regarding the progress of therapy (Goldstein, 1962) and personality (Sturpp, 1962) have also been shown to be important. In a recent, seemingly influential, series of studies, Truax and Carkhuff (1966) have related the successful outcome of psychotherapy to the degree which the qualities of warmth, genuineness and accurate empathy are shown by the therapist.

Walton (1971) states that most group psychotherapists would claim that, in addition, this form of treatment brings about changes which cannot be produced by other forms of treatment. If this is so, it is presumably because of aspects of interpersonal interaction which are unique to psychotherapy groups, so that any specific effects are due to what the group members do and say, what they talk about, what sort of emotional relationships they have, and so on. In order to increase the effectiveness of treatment, these crucial factors of group therapy interaction must be identified and ways of maximizing them must be discovered.

Directive, Non-directive Style

The most studied style contrast is that of directive, non-directive styles. Because of complex related variables, varied results have been obtained, which are reviewed below.

Value of Non-directive Leadership

Salzburg (1961) found that verbal interaction by group members was inversely related to the frequency of the therapist's verbalizations. The more the therapist speaks directly to a group member, the less group interaction takes place. Salzburg felt that is necessary for a leader to at least get a group started. However, once the group gets warmed up, it promotes interaction for the leader to cut down as much as possible on his verbal behavior (and therefore be non-directive as much as possible). These results supported similar findings of Dinoff, Horner, Kurpiewski, and Timmons (1960), and were later reconfirmed by Salzburg (1962).

In an unpublished doctoral dissertation, Jensen (1964) compared the effects of a passive and assertive therapist behavior on patients' responses to group therapy, and found the passive-therapist method to result in the following: 1) more interaction among patients, 2) higher spread of participation in group discussions, 3) the emergence of a patient as the group leader, 4) the introduction of more fantasy material into group content, 5) greater regard for the group by the patients, and 6) better ward adjustment by the patients as measured by a nurse checklist. Jensen also observed that the passive therapeutic situation could be better tolerated than the assertive situation by the hospitalized patients. It was her opinion that the former situation better approximated actual life situations and was thus more helpful in leading the patients toward a better social adjustment.

In measuring the effectiveness of directive versus non-directive approaches to group counseling, McDaniel (1971) obtained results that revealed a trend in the direction that students receiving group-centered counseling (non-directive) would develop more positive self-concepts than students in the directive and control groups. The subjective evaluation indicated that the more positive therapeutic changes were experienced by students who received group -centered counseling (the non-directive approach).

Taylor (1971) studied direct versus indirect intervention in elementary school group counseling, and found that an overall analysis of the data indicated that indirect intervention was generally more effective than direct intervention or no intervention in reducing parent-perceived classroom behavior problems, regardless of grade level.

Children exposed to indirect intervention, he concluded, made the greatest improvement in specific target behaviors during the experimental periods.

In studying highly anxious female neurotic drug addicts exposed to a directive and a non-directive twenty-three hour marathon group therapy session, Kilman and Auerbach (1974) found that there was a significant interaction effect among groups on pretherapy to posttherapy change in A-trait (anxiety as a personality trait, as measured by Spielberger's State-Trait Anxiety Inventory); subjects receiving directive therapy increased in A-trait, subjects receiving non-directive therapy declined, and control subjects did not change. The authors therefore concluded that the present findings indicate that marathon group therapy, geared at diminishing high levels of anxiety, should employ a non-directive approach as opposed to a directive approach.

Becker, Harrow, Astrachan, Detre, and Miller (1968) surveyed the overall results on the activity level of the different types of group meetings. The authors hypothesized that the presence of a leader who is clearly viewed by society and by the patients as a knowledgeable authority figure exerts a crucial influence on the therapist-led meetings. In the presence of this type of leader (a directive leader approach), or authority figure, the group members assume a more dependent role and behave in an inhibited, silent and somewhat more formal manner. When this authority figure is not present or when the effect of his presence is modified (the non-directive leader approach), the group members are less dependent, less self-conscious, and act more spontaneously.

Similar findings were reported by Koile and Gallessich (1972). They felt that a leader may need to cultivate the mythology of his own omnipotence, and control the group through paternalism, excessive ground rules or directed activities. Members then might react with exaggerated dependency or counter dependent, openly hostile behavior. Some leaders are able to use the reactive behavior to help free members from authority hangups. Leaders with relatively low power needs, either because of a crisis or group pressures, may feel compelled to take a controlling stance. However, the risk of leader take-over, whatever the cause, is that once the leader has forcefully used power, members tend to abandon responsibility for their own growth and for contributing to the growth of others in the group. Therefore, the non-directive approach would be the more favored one here.

In studies using a prison group and a grils' group, Sigrell (1968) found a tendency in the direction of "most therapeutic statements" after non-directive group leader responses, when comparing non-directive and interpretive, evaluative leadership in group psychotherapy.

Auger (1970) presented findings of preferences for a group of Catholic priests for directive and non-directive responses in the counseling relationships. He found that the priests in the directive group appeared less secure, insisting more on respect, formality, and prestige. They seemed more self-centered and less acceptant of others in value-conflict situations. They described themselves as more conservative and less flexible, more attracted to definite principles and preferring a stable and well-ordered life style. Intellectually, they appeared somewhat more rigid and constricted. The less directive

priests appeared more concerned about others and more open to others, more acceptant of others as they are, esteeming freedom and individuality more markedly. They seemed more secure and trusting. They also appeared happier with their work and more fulfilled by it. Parallels were suggested between directiveness and other traits like authoritarianism, conservatism and dogmatism.

Ajzen (1971) discovered a greater effectiveness of the non-directive condition, when comparing it to a directive counseling situation. Her results also showed that authoritarianism interacted with directiveness. Low F subjects showed a greater preference for non-directive counseling than did high F subjects. The preference for non-directive counseling was greater among females than among males.

Snadowsky's (1974) results showed that members of democratically-led groups were more satisfied than members of groups with authoritarian control in both of two phases of problem solving, independent of the type of communications networks in which they were working. This confirmed his earlier study (Snadowsky, 1969).

Shaw and Blum (1966) summarize findings regarding the non-directive leader's effect in groups.

> Fiedler's contingency model holds that directive leadership is more effective when the group task situation is either highly favorable or highly unfavorable for the leader, whereas non-directive leadership is more effective in the intermediate ranges of favorability. (p. 238)

> The results of this experiment show clearly that directive leadership is more effective than non-directive leadership when the task is highly structured; that is, when there is only one solution and one way (or only a few ways), for obtaining this solution. However, on tasks that require varied information and approaches, non-directive leadership is clearly more effective. On such tasks the requirements for leadership are great. Contributions from all members must be encouraged, and

> this requires motivating, advising, rewarding, giving support--in short, non-directive leadership. (p. 241)

To apply findings such as these of Shaw and Blum to most encounter groups or therapy or counseling groups, which are fairly unstructured, it would appear that the non-directive leadership approach would be significantly more effective.

Even with this extensive research favoring the non-directive approach, some results can be extremely puzzling. Ashby, Ford, Guerney, and Guerney (1957), compared the effects of a reflective and a leading type of psychotherapy. They report that from some points of view it appears superficially that the non-directive method produced more desirable results. For example, in the non-directive approach there were larger percentages of client "openness" and "covert resistance" while the interpretive method had larger percentages of "guardedness", "dependency", and "overt resistance". However, when they analyzed the data further they found that the "covert resistance" responses revealed that in the non-directive method 42% of these responses were so classified because the clients had made long pauses, while in the interpretive method only 13% of "covert resistance" responses were due to large pauses. Also, there was less "blocking" and "interrupting" in the non-directive setting than in the interpretive therapy approach. Considering this data from another point of view, however, the more interpretive therapy tended to seem to be superior. For example, clients in the interpretive therapy tended to become more positive in their feelings toward therapy, as measured by a rating scale compared at the end of the fourth and the eighth interviews (out of a total of eight). Whereas, clients in the more non-directive therapy

tended to become more negative or defensive. Also, therapists were able to hold clients in therapy better in the interpretive situation than in the non-directive one. The authors concluded that both types of therapy styles seem to have certain aspects which produce favorable reactions in some clients.

Value of Directive Leadership

Now turning to the other side of the argument, we find that there is much research that has been generated to support the hypothesis that directive leadership (or therapy) is superior to a non-directive approach. Liebroder (1962) investigated the impact of three different classical styles in matched groups. He found that when comparing psychoanalytical (personal) psychotherapy, group analytical psychotherapy, and non-directive psychotherapy leadership styles, both content style and work style (as measured by the Hill Interaction Matrix) differed significantly for each of these three leadership styles. He found that a non-directive leader evoked more conventional work styles, while the two types of analytical styles evoked more assertive work styles.

Comparing a non-directive and a directive approach while working with groups at a community hospital, Abramczuk (1972) found that the non-directive formula facilitated the expression of more passive, self-centered, hypochondriacal attitudes and simultaneously "helped to canalize in a skeletal atmosphere" aggressive and hostile impulses towards passive, defenseless and non-punitive substitutes--the staff. On the other hand, a more directive mode of conduct appeared to draw patients' attention to the more practical and realistic problems of the hospital community.

Baker (1960) found that a more leading type of psychotherapy, which is more interpretive, might help the client to recognize underlying feelings (of personal overgeneralization) more quickly and lead to an alteration of his self-generalizations. The therapist in a leading psychotherapy may also be offering the client more cues which may serve as a basis for imitating the therapist's behavior. Thus the client may learn from the "leading" therapist the importance of exploring generalizations.

Reflective therapy, Baker feels, appears to require an autonomous mode of behavior on the part of the client. The responsibility which is thrown upon the person in the initial stages of a reflective therapy may be so anxiety-producing that the more resistive client may terminate early. Overall, a leading psychotherapy may be more effective than a reflective psychotherapy in reducing personal overgeneralizations.

In looking at the content of patient verbalizations, Frank (1964) concluded that the results from his study indicated that the differences in what the patient said depended upon whether the therapist made a statement which could be regarded as either directive or non-directive. In particular, directive statements by the psychotherapist tend to be followed by more talking about the problems and symptoms and less exploration of meaning or awareness beyond what was just said in the therapy session. The reverse was found to be true for the non-directive statements.

In comparing a behavioral rehearsal therapy procedure with directive and non-directive therapy approaches, Lazarus (1966) found that in the management of specific interpersonal problems, behavioral rehearsal (a

systematic role-playing therapeutic procedure) was shown to be almost twice as effective as direct advice, with the non-directive treatment procedure faring worst of all.

The effects of authoritarian and non-authoritarian leadership were examined in a laboratory setting by Shaw (1955). Groups of four college males were assembled and assigned instructed leaders who played either an authoritarian or a non-authoritarian leadership role. The authoritarian leader was asked to issue orders, to accept no suggestion uncritically, and to make it clear that he was the boss of the group. The non-authoritarian leader was instructed to solicit suggestions, make requests instead of issuing orders, and make it clear that he wanted the group to function democratically. Each group solved three arithmetic problems via written communications. The authoritarian group made fewer errors, required fewer messages for problem solution, and required less time than did the non-authoritarian groups: however, the ratings of satisfaction with the groups were higher in the non-authoritarian groups.

Cammalleri, Hendrick, Pittman, Blout and Prather (1973) reported on the effects of different leadership styles on group accuracy. The data here support the prediction that the authoritarian leadership was most productive under conditions of good leader-member relations, a structured task and strong leader position power. In terms of goal achievement, which is synonymous with group accuracy in this study, the data indicated that highly accurate authoritarian leaders were most successful, authoritarian leaders with low accuracy were least successful, and democratic leaders produced moderate degrees of goal accomplishment,

which appeared to be independent of leader accuracy. Furthermore, the authors report that the activities of authoritarian-led groups were characterized by conflict and hostility, with certain of the groups marked by verbal clashes, aggression toward the leaders and a high number of disagreements. This would seem to indicate that a great deal of work (as defined by Hill on the Hill Interaction Matrix) was taking place in the authoritarian-led groups.

Using four matched sensitivity training groups, Pino (1969) found that the results of his study favored the leader-guided (group-process-intervention orientation--directive leader approach) over the group-centered (or person-oriented-intervention orientation--non-directive) style. This difference was seen as the effectiveness of the leader-guided style in helping to set the group norm process.

In comparing reality and client-centered models in group counseling with elementary school children, Bigelow and Thomas (1969) found that reality counseling, which emphasizes the here and now in behavioral terms, differs from the client-centered model in important ways. It treats observable behavior rather than expressed attitudes symptomatically. Group members work toward goals mutually defined with the counselor, and through continuous behavioral commitments, actively seek to establish new behavioral habit patterns. The client-centered approach traditionally provides an atmosphere in which, the authors feel, changes in attitudes are necessary precursors of behavioral change. Therefore, it is felt that the results of this study seem to emphasize that a counselor can direct an elementary age group into defined work areas (as measured by the Hill Interaction Matrix) and maintain it there more rapidly using

a reality-oriented counseling approach (as compared to a non-directive approach).

In studying leadership style effects on group development both Kelly (1970) and Tompkins (1972) conclude that the directive leader is more effective. The former states that the active leadership group had a more positive group experience than the passive group, while the latter's results suggest that decision quality is best in groups with structured leadership.

Variables Interacting with Leadership Style

It appears from the literature that just looking at the leadership variable by itself in contrasting the effectiveness of non-directive and directive leaders is not enough. Much research has aimed at the interaction of the leadership variable with other variables.

Looking at leadership styles in psychotherapy, DiLoreto (1970) compared the relative effectiveness of systematic desensitization, rational--emotive, and client-centered psychotherapies in the reduction of interpersonal anxiety in introverts and extroverts. He found that while systematic desensitization was equally as effective with introverts and extroverts, client-centered therapy was more effective with extroverts and rational-emotive therapy was more effective with introverts.

Working with T-groups, leadership style and personality, Boller (1974) found that extroverts appeared to profit more from the training group experience as a whole than did introverts. He concluded that contrasting group styles apparently affect different personality types in different ways.

In studying authoritarian attitudes, degree of pathology, and leadership style preference, Cantor (1971) found that authoritarianism was higher in those preferring the structured approach. He concluded that the personality of the patient can be an important factor in considering the kind of psychotherapeutic approach to be used. Similar interaction effects were found by Strupp (1962) and Auger (1970) with personality variables; Kilman and Auerbach (1972) with client's anxiety; and O'Hearne (1969) with identification of the client with the therapist.

Van Der Veen (1965) looked at the effects of the therapist and the patient on each other's therapeutic behavior, and found that the change in patient level of experiencing from the initial to the subsequent interviews was a function of the particular therapist as well as the patient, and also that it was a function of the therapist's level of therapeutic behavior.

Astrachan, Schwartz, Becker, and Harrow (1967) investigated which aspects of group behavior and interaction are influenced more by the particular psychotherapist and patients involved than by the type of group therapy session. They found that on the basis of their data they would hypothesize that the interactions of the particular therapist and his group specifically determines acceptable patterns of intergroup behavior. In any therapeutic setting, it was felt, knowledge of the overall systems of values, the specific treatment modalities available, and the particular therapist's philosophy and values should facilitate the development of effective treatment programs for patients.

Hagebak and Parker (1969) looked at therapist directiveness, client dominance and therapy resistance. They found that the general hypothesis

that resistance in therapy may be a function of therapist technique and of client personality characteristics, received support. The main effect showing significantly fewer resistant responses to directive than to non-directive therapist statements must be qualified in the light of a significant interaction between directiveness and type of client problem. This interaction suggests that resistance may be reduced if therapist technique is varied according to the type of client problem. Closer examination of the data indicated that non-directive statements elicited significantly more resistance than directive statements with the "most severe" (hostility control) problems and the least resistance to the less than directive statements with the least severe problem clients.

In looking at the factor of group size and its interaction with leadership style, Hempkill (1950) reported that as the group becomes larger, demands upon the leader's role become greater and more numerous, therefore tolerance for leader-centered direction of group activities becomes greater. In other words, as the group gets larger, a directive leader becomes more effective.

Locus of Control

Locus of control is a personality dimension that refers to the way an individual characteristically perceives himself in his interactions with his environment. Abramowitz, Abramowitz, Roback, and Jacobsen (1974) studied the differential effectiveness of directive and non-directive group therapies, as a function of client internal and external (locus of) control. They found that the degree to which an individual believes that

the events that occur in his life are a result of his own initiatives (internal control) as opposed to being determined by luck or powerful outside forces (external control) defines a concept (locus of control) that has proven to be useful in understanding individual variations in complex social behaviors, including responsiveness to influence of different types of leadership style.

Since, as Strupp (1973) has stressed, the psychotherapeutic transaction can be viewed as a process of interpersonal influence, a person's position along the internal-external dimension might help explain his differential reaction to various classes of therapeutic intervention. Therefore, two verbal group therapies (i.e., directive and non-directive) conducted by the same leader, can have differential effects, depending upon the personalities of the members.

Along the same lines, Kilman (1974) studied the interaction between direct and non-direct marathon groups and internal-external control. He found that the shift toward externality for internal subjects in a direct or control condition suggested that with no treatment subjects with an internal orientation shift towards externality, and that non-direct treatment helps keep internal subjects from shifting toward externality, while direct treatment facilitates this.

Leadership Generalization

So far, an attempt has been made to look at the literature in comparing the two styles of leadership being studied here, one a directive approach, and the other a non-directive approach. Several articles have dealt with leadership in groups, leadership in therapy, or therapist

styles in individual or group therapy. Also, terms like authoritarian, democratic, group-centered, leader-centered, directive, non-directive, etc. are used throughout the literature. According to Shaw (1971) in examining several studies on leadership styles, although different terms are used, these several researchers are dealing with similar leadership variables.

> In each instance, a directive leader is compared with a non-directive one. The results concerning the group members' reactions to the groups are entirely consistent across a wide range of situations and groups. Members of groups with non-directive leaders react more positively to the group than do members of groups led by directive leaders. The evidence concerning productivity is inconsistent; however, it appears that either the directive-led groups are usually more productive than the non-directive-led groups, or there is no difference in productivity. (p. 274)

A final comment by Ellis (1948) seems appropriate at this time. Ellis claims that:

> [N]on-directive therapy ... is actually directive, in that the counselor often selects one of the client's first statements, channelizes this by very precise and subtle"non-directive" probing and encourages the client to exhaust this original stream of thought before he is given the opportunity to go on to something else. (p. 250)

A question that arises concerns the discussion of therapy groups in the same breath as encounter groups, marathon groups, etc., and as to how closely related is the therapist and the group leader. Gibb and Gibb (1968) define therapy as the process of restoration of the growth processes. Health, they feel, is growth--both in the person and in the group. This growth viewpoint toward therapy is central to what the authors have called "emergence therapy".

> During all social interaction, four modal concerns arise in the person and in the group: concerns about acceptance, data flow, goal formation, and social control. In normal

> interaction there is movement, in individuals and in groups, toward trust and away from fear, toward open and away from closed behavior, toward self-realization and away from imposition, toward interdependence and away from dependence. ... These processes are therapeutic--define therapy--are independent of the presence of a therapist, regenerative in character, and intrinsic to all normal life processes in human organisms. (p. 96)

> Therapy takes place in growth relationships. Therapy is a relationship, a social process. All relationships which are growth-producing and defense-reducing are therapeutic. All relationships which are trust-reductive and defense-producing are contratherapeutic. It is the writers' thesis that all group relationships can become growthful and thus therapeutic. (p. 98)

The Socio-political Subculture Variable

As to the effect of the socio-political subculture variable, there seems to be little research done on this specific topic, especially in relation to a group setting. Except for a few studies, most research on this topic has been either of a very prescriptive nature, i.e., "Yes, research should be done on this topic," or it has been very general, concerning itself with the general variable of culture--i.e., the concept of conservatism.

Vassilious and Vassilious (1974) report that social psychological studies, following rigorous methodology, have shown that there are significant differences in the way various cultural groups perceive their social environment, a process for which, in the social psychological literature, the technical term "subjective culture" is widely used. Styles of leadership, assigned and assumed roles, goal-setting and goal pursuing patterns, styles and patterns of interpersonal transactions, relations with authority, peer relations, and above all value orientation

and the categorization of concepts as well as their perceived antecedents and consequences are found to vary across milieus (Traindis, Vassilious, Vassilious, Tanaka, & Shanmuzam, 1972). Furthermore, fundamental emotions, while having a transcultural core meaning, also have culture-specific meanings (Izard, 1971). It is therefore to be expected that the group process will vary across milieus since group members are bound to follow the patterns of transaction characteristic of their subjective culture.

Vassilious and Vassilious (1974) studied variations of the group process across cultures. They found that the group process in both clinical and nonclinical groups is shaped by the members' subjective culture, defined as the way people perceive their social environment. Consequently, the effectiveness of interaction is directly related to its subjective culture specificity.

In examining the cultural aspects of psychotherapy, Wittkower and Warnes (1974) found that preferences in the choice of forms of psychotherapy cross-culturally depend on differences in etiologic views and on cultural and ideologic differences.

Harpel (1970) was a little more specific as he looked at the effect of encounter group composition upon social and political attitudes. He found that liberals were significantly more negative than conservatives in their rating of the group experience.

Illing (1970) describes personal experiences with the use of psychotherapy in an outpatient clinic in an upperstratum social setting and in a lower-middle class industrial school. Both clinics were staffed by the same members of the therapeutic team. Cultural circumstances, it

was found, do not just influence the treatment process, they enter into the structure of treatment. The treatment situation is seen as capable of absorbinb social factors and eventually attempting to change them.

Chen (1972) reported his experiences with group psychotherapy in Taiwan. He concluded that cultural implications of group processes, group dynamics, group discussions, intra-group relationships and communicative tools in group psychotherapy were studied and that some modification in therapeutic techniques should be made to account for this "culture" variable.

Socio-political Subculture and Leadership Style

Pertaining to the possible interaction effect between the subculture variable and leadership style, Levinson and Jensen (1967) studied assertive versus passive group therapist behaviors with southern white and Negro schizophrenic hospital patients. They found that there was a significant difference in the proportion of speech directed to the leader who was assertive, with Negro patients directing a proportionately higher number of remarks to the leader in the assertive group.

Concerning cross-cultural psychotherapy, Bolman (1968) reports that those experienced in transcultural work uniformly stress the importance of knowing the social and cultural setting within which work is being done; otherwise many difficulties occur and disruptive effects result. He feels that even in the United States there are a number of "cross-cultural" problems which are just beginning to receive attention. These include work with American blacks, Indians, and various ethnic groups who have maintained some identity. Some like Harrington (1962),

for example, maintain that the state of being poor in the United States is associated with such significant differences in outlook and life style as to justify calling poverty a separate culture. "Whatever the terminology, no doubt there are ... differences" (p. 1240).

In talking about the dimensions of counseling behavior and cultural values of clients, Farwell, Gamsky and Mathieu-Coughlan (1974) feel that in addition to knowing his own value system and that of the client, the counselor can also benefit from an understanding of the society or culture of the client. The authors feel that every culture or subculture defines for its members the limits of acceptable behavior. Sociologists refer to these dimensions as norms. An examination of the norms of a social group will permit the counselor to determine which client behaviors are likely to be rewarded and which will be punished. Since norms differ from culture to culture and over time, it is necessary that the counselor possess tools for analyzing them. The basis for understanding the values of a social group can be attained through a familiarization with the disciplines of anthropology and sociology.

The authors report that every individual, within his own lifespace, is a member of many different systems or subcultures. Some of these subgroups may reflect or magnify the values and attitudes of the general culture, while others may tend to reject or disconfirm them. The family is the chief mediator of the general culture, and is instrumental in providing the first and probably the most permanent foundations of values. However, as the child moves away from the protection of the family into a broader range of associations, with peers and teachers, for example, he will likely be exposed to new value systems, which may

challenge his existing orientation. Thus, the counselor must be particularly sensitive to the unique set of influences that effects each client, and especially be aware to the discontinuities that may result from the juxtaposition of conflicting value orientations.

The authors suggest that sociological studies of norms and of cultural values which converge in descriptions of the healthy or effectively functioning person can provide the counselor with an integration of concepts from philosophy, psychology and sociology, which can give him information from which to judge the desirability of counseling goals, and which might also suggest possible therapeutic styles to use.

Defining Socio-political Subcultures

What this socio-political subcultural variable is all about, how it is defined, and how it relates to certain personality variables, has been the topic of several research articles in the past few years.

In defining structural characteristics of liberal-conservative attitudes, Rambo and Fromme (1970) state that their results support a general factor in the liberal-conservative attitude domain. They feel that not only is this factor visible in the two independent samples that they studied, but the pattern of factor loadings displays convincing stability. Therefore, they conclude, an investigator may realistically consider the liberal-conservative domain in terms of a general factor around which a system of social attitudes is organized.

Websters' Collegiate Dictionary (1970) defines a conservative as "tending to preserve established traditions or institutions, and to

resist or oppose any changes in these." A liberal, on the other hand, is defined as "favoring reform, open-minded to ideas that challenge tradition."

Nowicki (1969) studied this conservative-liberal socio-political variable in college students and concluded that there seems to be consistent attitudinal and personality trait differences between liberals and conservatives who are college age students.

In defense of measuring socio-political attitudes, Steininger (1973) feels that the data of his study support the thesis that there are attitude constructs which can be measured and that such measurement permits predictions for different sample and criterias.

> Without a construct like "liberalism-conservatism", furthermore, one cannot understand the data of this study or similar ones. (p. 134)

Abramowitz (1974) related student activism to personality and the sociocultural environment. He found that the demonstration of the interdependence of the personality and sociocultural domains warrants consideration of the joint contributions of the two classes of variables to the understanding of activism.

Krug and Kulhavy (1973) studied personality differences across regions of the United States and found that while many of their findings are generally congruent with commonly prevailing attitudes, they suggest that there is no single trait which appears to be characteristic of a particular region of the country. Instead, a rather complex pattern of differences emerge which makes traditional stereotypic conceptions inadequate and provides substantially richer ground for generating hypotheses as to the origin of these differences.

Suziedelis and Lorr (1973) conducted a study whose aim was to determine the structure and dimensionality of socio-political attitudes. Their results indicate that the use of simple referents to define social issues is relatively effective. However, there remains the question regarding the similarity of findings to prior studies. In measuring this socio-political variable, it is possible that the type of items used in the study will influence the dimensionality of response obtained.

Therefore, how is this variable of socio-political attitude defined? Oswald (1971) found that conservatives scored significantly lower on autonomy than moderates or liberals. Liberals showed greater confidence in science and tended to use the scientific method in their thinking more than the moderates or conservative. Liberals were more inclined to reflective thinking and showed interest in a wider range of ideas than either moderates or conservatives. Conservatives and moderates disliked ambiguous situations. They preferred the security of accepting traditional regulations. Liberals were more likely to believe that there is more than one right answer for most problems. Liberals were more anxious than conservatives and moderates, and tended to have a poorer opinion of themselves. Finally, higher levels of dogmatism were related to conservatives than liberals, in their religious beliefs.

Using a rich battery of personality scales developed at the University of Minnesota and elsewhere, McKloskey (1953) found that the extreme conservatives are sharply differentiated from both the liberals and moderates in being more submissive, anomic, alienated, pessimistic, guilty, hostile, rigid, paranoid obsessive, intolerant of human frailty, and extremely ego-defensive. It was felt that the personality traits

of extreme conservatives have a very close relation to those of the authoritarian personality.

How closely is this "socio-political subculture" variable related to an individual's personality? Nadell (1951) states that we take for granted the fact that there is some connection between the makeup of a culture and the particular personality (or personalities) of its human carriers.

Hsu (1972), in her book Psychological Anthropology states the following:

> Culture and personality deals with human behavior primarily in terms of the ideas which form the basis of the inter-relationship between the individual and his society. It deals with characteristics of societies; patterns of reactions, internal or external impetus to change, militarism and pacifism, democratic or authoritarian character, and so forth; and how such characteristics may be related to the aspirations, fears and values held by a majority of the individuals in these cultures. (p. 6)

For Hsu, the primary forces in social and cultural development are to be found in the patterns of man's relationships with his fellow men. And of all human relationships, those which characterize the kinship systems come earliest to the individual, and are more influential than others. In turn, the psychological tendencies nurtured in a majority of the individuals tend to maintain the social and cultural status quo, relentlessly pressing for alterations of existing arrangements even without external pressure, or move the society and culture toward predictable patterns of response. Hsu's model includes such factors as the maintenance systems, the socialization practices, the personality characteristics and the extrasystemic forces. But she seeks to integrate them into a large and more comprehensive "personality-and-culture"

whole, which accounts for stability and change without having to shift grounds.

Socio-political Subculture and Personality

Wilson and Brazendale (1973) were concerned with the relationship between personality variables and social attitudes. They studied 97 female teachers aged 18 to 34. Their results showed that extraversion significantly correlated with liberalism, realism, hedonism, and the absence of religious-puritanism, while psychoticism has a low but significant association with general conservatism, and neuroticism related to ethnocentrism and intolerance of minority groups.

In his book The Psychology of Conservatism, Wilson (1973) talks about the liberal-conservative socio-political variable as a particular characteristic or dimension of personality that is inferred on the basis of the organization of certain attitudes. He conceives conservatism as a general factor underlying the entire field of social attitudes, "much the same as intelligence is conceived as a general factor which partly determines abilities in different areas". This general factor, he feels, is manifested as a largely positive pattern of group inter-correlations amongst different attitude areas, and is presumed to reflect a dimension of personality similar to that which has previously been described in the "semi-scientific" literature in terms of a variety of labels such as "facism", "authoritarianism", "rigidity", and "dogmatism".

Wilson prefers the term "conservatism" not only because it provides the best overall description of the factor concerned (according to him), but also because it is relatively free of derogatory value-tone. Most

people, he feels, would quite reasonably take exception to being described as "fascist", "authoritarian", or "dogmatic", whatever their actual orientation, but would probably be happy to admit to being "conservative", if they were, in fact, positioned towards that end of the spectrum of socio-political attitudinal values. Likewise, the term "liberal" is usually perfectly acceptable to individuals located towards the other end of the spectrum. (The terms "liberal" and "conservative" may, however, tend to have a mild negative connotation to individuals at the opposite pole.)

Wilson defines the "ideal conservative" as being characterized by some of the following attitude clusters: religious fundamentalism; pro-establishment politics; insistence on strict rules and punishments; militarism; ethnocentrism and intolerance of minority groups; preference for the conventional in art, clothing, instituions, etc; anti-hedonistic outlook and restrictions of sexual behavior; opposition to scientific progress; and superstitious. The ideal liberal would be an individual who is located at the other end of these dimensions.

In studying the correspondence between religious orientation and socio-political attitudes, Stellway (1973) found that for a semi-rural population in west-central Illinois, Christian conservatism was significantly and positively related to socio-political status quo orientation and to conservative political party preference. Conversely, Christian liberalism was found to be significantly and positively related to socio-political change orientation and to liberal political party preference.

Costin (1971), in investigating dogmatism and conservatism, found that the results of his study indicated a strong relationship between what he terms "conservatism" (political, economic, and social) and Rokeach's (1960) interpretation of "close-mindedness".

Wilson and Patterson (1968) defined the extreme conservative person as displaying religious fundamentalism, right-wing political views, insistence on strict rules and punishments, intolerance of minority groups, preference for conventional fashions and institutions, anti-hedonistic outlook, and superstitious resistance to science.

In examining the personality correlates of conservatism, Joe (1974) found that subjects exhibiting conservatism seem to have a high need to maintain standards and to work towards distant goals (achievement); to dislike ambiguity in information (cognitive structure); to avoid risk of bodily harm (harm avoidance); to dislike disorganization (order); to be held in high esteem by acquaintances (social recognition); and to seek the protection and reassurance of others (succorance). They also have a low need to break away from restraints or restrictions of any kind (autonomy); to dislike routine experiences (change); to give vent readily to emotions and wishes (impulsivity); to spend a good deal of time in amusement activities (play); to maintain a hedonistic view of life (sentience); and to value intellectual curiosity and the synthesis of logical thought (understanding).

High conservative subjects, Joe found, agree more strongly with the F-scale, which suggests that the conservative person has an intolerance for minority groups, a superstitious resistance to science, and religious fundamentalism.

Following along with the seemingly strong relationship between dogmatism and conservatism, it is interesting to look at two studies concerning dogmatism and counseling and groups. Frye, Vidulick, Meierhoefer and Joure (1972) found that basic differences in life style, personality, emotional adjustment and adaptation of defense mechanisms as theorized by Rokeach (1960, 1968) and others, suggest that high dogmatics and low dogmatics will behave differently in T-groups, and that the high dogmatics will benefit less from a sensitivity training experience.

Mitchell (1972) looked at the effect of group counseling on selected personality variables and found that dogmatism did not significantly relate to counselor effectiveness, although this variable was significantly diminished within the group counseling experience.

In comparing conservatives in the East and the West, Eckhardt (1971) found that both Eastern and Western conservatives generally share the following variables in common--affectively, they value personal conformity and leadership, but not benevolence, and they were optimistic. (Western conservatives did not value personal independence.) Behaviorally, they were higher than average in their socio-economic status and politically inactive. (Western conservatism was positively related to religious affiliation.) Cognitively, they were less interested in politics, and less internationally curious, interested and knowledgeable. Ideologically, they were Western oriented, resistant to social change, opposed to marijuana, and they held hereditary theories of war, aggression, and capitalism.

The Personality Variable

Concerning the third independent variable, that of personality, Shaw (1971) reports that researchers have not neglected personality variables in the study of group behavior. In reviewing the literature, Mann (1959) found that researchers have used over 500 different measures of personality. Unfortunately, fewer than one quarter of these measures were used in more than one investigation. Mann's findings lead to two possible conclusions: 1) there is a tremendously large number of different personality attributes, or 2) different investigators often use different names and measures for the same attribute. Although personality is exceedingly complex, it is doubtful that meaningful results or theories can be achieved by subdividing personality into so many parts. Furthermore, it is clear that basically the same characteristic is given many names and many different measures have been devised to measure it. Indeed, Mann concluded that empirical work indicates that the multitude of measured personality attributes can be subsumed under seven dimensions of personality. Although his dimensions may not be entirely accurate, it is evident that personality can be represented by fewer characteristics than have been employed in the past.

In looking at the dimensions of psychotherapy group interaction, McPerson and Walton (1970) used seven experienced clinicians and had them observe at least 25 meetings of a psychotherapy group to describe the intragroup interactions of the patient members. A principal component analysis of the data isolated three main independent dimensions

differentiating group members who are assertive and dominant from those who are passive and submissive; who are emotionally sensitive to other members, as opposed to insensitive; and those who hinder rather than aid in the attainment of group goals.

The dimensions are roughly similar, in the behavior to which they refer, to those which have been extracted in studies of groups of many different types, ranging from laboratory groups to families. It is possible, therefore, that they represent major ways in which the interpersonal interaction of people differ. They may thus eventually form the basis of an empirically derived framework for the observation and measurement of interpersonal behavior in general and in small group interaction in particular. The present study has shown that, applied to the analysis of psychotherapy groups, such a framework could account for much of the observed differences in the interaction of patients. The present results have also shown that such a framework, based on concepts which are not unique to psychotherapy but are applicable to groups of all types, is nevertheless meaningful to the "implicit personality theories" in terms of which their prescriptions and descriptions of group events are structured.

Tosi (1970) found that both client and counselor personality traits have a great influence in a counseling relationship. In his research it was shown that the levels of dogmatism for the client and counselor combine additively in terms of their effect on the counseling relationship. The highest rated relationships were given by low and medium dogmatic clients interacting with low and medium dogmatic counselors. Conversely, the lowest rated relationships were high dogmatic counselors and medium

and high dogmatic clients. Similarly, medium dogmatic counselors contributed to relationships that were given high ratings by clients.

Shaw (1971) stated that: 1) individuals who are positively oriented toward other people enhance social interaction, cohesiveness, and morale in groups; 2) socially sensitive persons behave in ways which enhance their acceptance in the group and the group's effectiveness; 3) ascendant individuals are dominating and self-assertive in groups and generally facilitate group functioning.

Boller (1974) found that extroverts appeared to profit more from training groups, as a whole, than did introverts. He concluded that there appears to be a significantly positive relationship between personality and gain in a T-group. Along the same variable, DiLoreto (1970) found that client-centered therapy was more effective with extroverts, while rational-emotive therapy was more effective with introverts.

Several studies have concluded that personality is an important variable in measuring group interaction.

> Benefit from group therapy appears to be optimized by the kind of compatibility which represents a match between the ... therapeutic environment and the personality of the patient. (Abramowitz, et al., 1974, p. 852).

> The more general hypothesis that resistance may be a function of therapist technique and of client personality characteristics has received support. (Hagebak & Parker, 1969, p. 539)

> It is concluded that the personality of the patient can be an important factor in considering the kind of psychotherapeutic approach to be used. (Cantor, 1971, p. 231)

For Ashby, et al. (1957) the client pretherapy personality characteristics appeared to be extremely important in relationships to whether a nondirective or interpretive therapist was used.

Abramowitz, et al. (1974) and Kilman (1974) have both shown that the degree to which an individual believes that the events that occur in his life are a result of his own initiative as opposed to being determined by luck or powerful outside forces (locus of control) can be useful in understanding individual variations in complex social behaviors, including responsiveness to influence. In other words, a person's internal-external locus of control can be a determining factor in his interaction in a group setting.

Others that have shown the effect of the personality variable in a person's interaction include Astrachan, et al. (1967), Ajzen (1971), O'Hearne (1969), Auger (1970), Van Der Veen (1965), Jacobsen (1971), and Helweg (1971).

Member Satisfaction

A final variable that this review of literature will look at is that of member satisfaction. It is being used in this study as a dependent variable of the three independent variables--leadership style, socio-political subculture of the group members, and personality of the group members. Not only is the amount of interaction in a group situation important, but so is the satisfaction of the members. The member satisfaction can determine if a person chooses to remain in a group, which group he chooses to enter in the first place, and interact with his responses and interactions in the group situation.

Heslin and Dexter (1964), on the basis of a review of literature, proposed that a substantial amount of the variance in the satisfaction of members of small groups can be accounted for by variations along

three other major dimensions. They are: 1) status consensus--i.e., the degree of consensus in the group concerning leadership; 2) perceived progress toward group goals; and 3) perceived freedom to participate.

Anderson, Harrow, Schwartz, and Kupfer (1972) studied the relevance of the three major factors reported by Heslin and Dexter. They concluded that when the patient and therapist ratings of therapist behavior in group psychotherapy were compared, patients were able to accurately rate their therapists' behavior, and his feelings about the group, but they were not able to rate his general mood. A significant correlation was found between therapist "relationship" variables (interest, pleasure and understanding) and patient satisfaction. However, neither the therapists' activity level nor his directiveness level was related to patient satisfaction. The results suggest that patients in therapy groups consider some of the same ingredients important to their satisfaction as do nonpatients in social groups.

Snadowsky (1969) in a study on group effectiveness, found that members of democratic-led groups were more satisfied than members of authoritarian-led groups. In a later study done specifically on member satisfaction, Snadowsky (1974) had his findings reconfirmed and concluded that in addition to the type of leadership, member satisfaction seems to be influenced by the satisfying experience of bringing a procedure to successful fruition.

As to the interaction between member satisfaction, personality and leadership style, Jacobsen (1971) showed that subjects who preferred behavior therapy, and were more satisfied with it (as opposed to analytically oriented therapy), were on the average more dependent,

more authoritarian, and more externally oriented. Helwet (1971) showed that those who prefer a directive leadership approach (as opposed to a non-directive approach) are more dogmatic and more externalized, are more anxious and have a lower level of education.

Summary of Trends on the Major Variables

1. Leadership Style

Research on leadership style has produced conflicting results. The overall trend shows that there is a difference in interaction in groups which can be attributed to leadership style. However, when comparing directive and non-directive leadership styles, the research appears to be divided as to which approach is more effective.

Research favoring the non-directive approach has shown that interaction is promoted when the leader cuts down on his verbal behavior as much as possible, and becomes non-directive. Members in non-directively led groups become less dependent, less self-conscious and act more spontaneously. They become more responsible for their actions and interactions in the group and develop more positive self-concepts. Finally, the non-directive leader evokes less anxiety from the group members, and is also preferred by the group members (when compared to a directive leader).

The findings that support the directive leadership approach suggest that this style is more effective in promoting interaction in groups because it draws attention to problems which arise, and helps the group members recognize underlying feelings more quickly. The directive leadership style tends to be followed by more talking about the problems

and symptoms, and less exploration of meaning or awareness beyond what was just said. The directive leader works better in a highly structured situation, where he can set the group norms, set specific goals and direct the members into defined work areas. Finally, the directive leadership approach appears to be more effective for problem solving, where a strong leader is needed who can produce the "best decision quality".

Other variables have been found that interact with leadership style in affecting group interaction. The non-directive style seems to be more effective with introverts. In therapy groups, the type of client problem effects which type of leadership style is more useful. Patients with more severe problems (of hostility control) elicit less resistance to directive therapists, while those with the least severe problems had less resistance to non-directive therapists. It was found that as the size of the group increases, the directive leader becomes increasingly more effective (as compared to the non-directive leader). Finally, the research suggests that the non-directive leadership style will be more effective with people who have "internal locus of control". That is, individuals who believe that the events that occur in their life are determined by their own initiative, as opposed to luck or outside forces, will react more positively to a non-directive leader.

2. Socio-political Subculture Variable

Although most of the research on this topic is of a general nature, i.e., "culture appears to affect group interaction", several studies have been more specific. The research has shown that the group process

is shaped by the members' subjective culture, which is defined as the way people perceive their social environment. Consequently, the effectiveness of interaction is directly related to its subjective culture specificity. The differences in group interaction relating to socio-political subculture depend on the etiologic views of the members involved and on the cultural and ideologic differences of those members.

The research on the interaction between the socio-political subculture of group members and the style of the group leader, suggests only that it is important for the leader to know the culture of the group members in order for him to act accordingly in affecting group interaction.

Finally, in defining the conservative and liberal socio-political subcultures, the research has found that conservatives tend to preserve established traditions or institutions, and to resist or oppose changes in them, to prefer structure, and to be more dogmatic. Liberals, on the other hand, favor reform and are open-minded to ideas that challenge tradition, are more autonomous, and believe that there is more than one approach or solution to a problem.

3. Personality Variable

The research has shown that an individual's personality has a great influence on determining interaction in a group setting. To describe intragroup interaction, research has isolated three independent dimensions of personality, differentiating group members who are assertive and dominant from those who are passive and submissive; those who are emotionally sensitive to other members, as opposed to insensitive; and those who hinder rather than aid in the attainment of group goals.

Other findings have suggested that individuals who are positively oriented toward people, socially sensitive, ascendant, dominating, and self-assertive enhance social interaction. The introvert-extrovert continuum and the "locus of control" dimension also have been found to be important personality variables which influence group interaction.

Most researchers feel that eventually an empirically derived framework for the observation and measurement of interpersonal behavior in general, and in small group interaction in particular, can be formed through the use of implicit personality theories.

METHODOLOGY

Subjects

The sample for this study consisted of forty-eight undergraduates at Utah State University who were in elementary psychology courses. They were obtained as subjects for an experiment dealing with group interaction. Each experimental condition started out with a total of 12 subjects (6 female, and 6 male). However, 3 subjects never showed up and 4 others attended less than 5 of the 6 group sessions. Therefore, the final sample ended up with forty-one subjects (23 females and 18 males) with 11 subjects in the conservative, non-directive led group, 9 in the liberal, non-directive-led group, 11 in the conservative, directive-led group and 10 in the liberal, directive-led group.

Locale

Each of the group sessions were conducted in a room at the Exceptional Child Center at Utah State University. The room was carpeted, well-lit, had one small window, bright white walls, and a two-way mirror along one of the walls. There were 13 plastic chairs arranged in a circle in the room where the subjects could sit (or choose not to sit) during the sessions. Behind the two-way mirror was an observation booth where the raters observed the group sessions.

Procedures

Subjects who were interested in participating in an experiment dealing with group interaction were given the Kerlinger Social Attitudes

Scale. This scale was used to divide the volunteers into three groups, one "conservative", one "liberal", and one "middle". The "conservative" and "liberal" subjects were informed that they had been selected as subjects, while those in the "middle" group were told that they would not be used in the experiment (the reason given to them was that there were more volunteers than were needed).

The remaining subjects in each of the two socio-political subgroupings (liberal and conservative) were then randomly divided into four groups, with 12 subjects in each, with the conservatives and liberals at least one standard error of measurement away from the mean, on the Social Attitudes Scale. This procedure was continued until the groups had 12 subjects in each. These groups were drawn from a typical college population (age range of approximately 18 to 24), and the groups were matched as to sex. The subjects were then informed of a meeting time and place for their respective groups.

The groups met once a week for a period of six weeks, each session lasting one and one half hours. Two of the groups (one conservative and one liberal) were run by a leader acting in a non-directive style. The other two groups (one conservative and one liberal) were run by a leader acting in a directive style. To control for possible personality effects of the leader, the same person ran all four groups.

At the first meeting of each group, the subjects were informed that they were there for two reasons, one was to have a group experience, and the other was to be part of an experiment dealing with group interaction. They were told that they were being observed through the rather conspicuous two-way mirror, and that a complete explanation of what was

going on would be given to them at the end of the six sessions. Questions, preconceptions, and expectations about the group experience were then discussed.

Following this, a list of topics was presented to the groups ranging from politics and religion to sex, love and personal problems. The list was given so that the group members would have possible topics to talk about in the sessions. However, they were not restricted just to the topics presented on the list.

At the end of the first session, the California Psychological Inventory was given to the subjects, who were asked to fill it out and return it by the next session.

At the end of each session, each member of the groups was asked to fill out a questionnaire concerning that session.

Each session was rated as to the quantity and quality of interaction for each member of the groups on the Hill Interaction Matrix. Two raters, both graduate students in counseling psychology at Utah State University (both of whom were familiar with the HIM) each rated all of the groups. Each rater was responsible for each of the 12 group members of each group. Through this method it was possible to obtain not only a measure of the quantity and quality of interaction for each of the group members, but also a measure of inter-rater reliability could be obtained. (An inter-rater reliability of .92558 was found between the two raters.)

A time chart (see Figure 1) which lists the activities for each of the sessions is included.

1. Administer Social Attitudes Scale

   Obtain sample

2. Divide Sample (using Social Attitudes Scale)

   Assign 2 groups (1 liberal, 1 conservative) to each leadership style

   Non-directive
   1. Liberal
   2. Conservative

   Directive
   3. Liberal
   4. Conservative

3. Session 1:

   Present topic list at beginning

   Conduct session

   Give CPI to entire sample

   Administer questionnaire at end

   Session rated on HIM (by independent graduate students)

4. Sessions 2-6:

   Conduct session

   Administer questionnaire at the end of each session

   Sessions rated on HIM by independent graduate students

5. Independent rating of leader style

Figure 1. Time chart.

Analysis of the Data

1. An analysis of covariance was done on the data. Dependent variables that were used were a) quantity of interaction, b) quality of interaction, and c) member satisfaction for the group sessions. Through an anlysis of covariance it was possible to use all of the scales of the CPI as continuums and therefore correlate all personality variables measured by the CPI with the dependent variables of this study.
2. Correlations were done as follows:
   a. Correlated the personality variables and the socio-political subculture variable.
   b. Correlated personality with member satisfaction (questionnaire) and quantity and quality of interaction.
   c. Correlated socio-political subculture with member satisfaction and quantity and quality of interaction.
   d. Correlated leadership style with member satisfaction and quantity and quality of interaction.

(For subjects who attended only five of the six sessions, a correction favor of 6/5 was used to get their scores on the dependent variables to correspond to the others. There were 12 subjects who attended only five of the six sessions.)

Measures

This study will use four different measures, two as independent variables, and two as dependent variables. The former are the Kerlinger

Social Attitudes Scale and the California Personality Inventory. The latter are the Hill Interaction Matrix and a group development questionnaire.

The Kerlinger Social Attitudes Scale was developed to measure attitudes on a dimension of liberalism-conservatism. It is comprised of 26 modified Likert-type items which were selected by factor analysis. The two title factors (liberalism and conservatism) are actually a combination of four complementary factors. The author selected items from earlier social attitude instruments by Eysenck, Better, Lentz, Sinai and others and also wrote an additional 80 items. From this pool he selected 40 items (20 to reflect liberalism and 20 to reflect conservatism). A factor analysis of these 40 items produced four factors: complementary Factors A and C on the one hand, all with liberal items, and Factors B and D, on the other hand, with all conservative items. This 40-item pool was then further reduced to the best 13 liberal and 13 conservative items to produce the present scale.

The author (1967) reported the split-half reliability estimates (corrected) to be .78 (liberalism) and .79 (conservatism), based on a sample of 168 unidentified subjects.

Concerning validity, Kerlinger administered the scale along with a number of other instruments to 161 of the 168 subjects used to assess reliability. Among the other instruments administered were Kerlinger's education scales (measuring progressivism-traditionalism), the F-scale, Rokeach's Opinionation Scale, Edward's Social Desirability Scale, Bass' Social Acquiescence Scale, Keniston and Couch's Agreement Response Scale, the Gough Rigidity Scale and the Wonderlic Intelligence Scale. All

All these were intercorrelated and factor analyzed. Among other results, the conservative items of the Social Attitudes Scale fell together with the F-scale. The only other response set measure that also fell on this factor (.66) was the Bass Social Acquiescence Scale. Most important, the liberalism and conservatism items fell on different factors as the author predicted, indicating construct validity. The conservatism items loaded .86 on one factor (A) and hardly at all on any other factor. The liberalism items loaded .57 on a different factor (C) and .29 on a second factor (B). The scale has adequate content validity (Shaw and Wright, 1967).

The California Personality Inventory is a widely used personality test. It was constructed to measure "folk" concepts, that is, positive cross-cultural traits. Test-retest reliability from .49 to .87 with a median of .80 for a three week period was obtained. For a one year period the correlations of .65 for males and .68 for females were obtained. Scales vary greatly in reliability and Cm and Py showed the lowest reliability. Internal consistency coefficient is .22 to .94.

Concerning validity, cross-validation studies show that different scales show a great deal of variability when cross validated. Sc compared to staff ratings has the lowest coefficient (.21) and Gi compared with the K scale of the MMPI has the highest coefficient (.60). The CPI was empirically derived and has a good reputation for validity. It has been used extensively and there are sizeable and varied norm groups available (Buros, 1965).

The Hill Interaction Matrix was designed as a device to measure interaction in groups. From its inception, the scale has been visualized

in the form of a matrix with two interacting scales. The current scale has two dimensions--one dealing with the level and style of content has four categories, and the other dealing with the level and style of therapeutic work contains five categories. The essential aspect of the HIM is that both determinants are concerned with the characteristic modes of styles of interaction in therapy groups, and the twenty cells are each intended to typify twenty recognizable and familiar patterns of group behavior.

The reliability of the HIM is at least adequate and in all probability is highly satisfactory. Depending upon the method of computation, the percentages of agreement reported range from 70 to 92, and correlation coefficients range from .70 to .90.

As it now stands, the HIM yields reliable quantitative indices of group interaction. These indices can be interpreted to produce meaningful and significant descriptions of total group operations so that groups can be systematically compared. Also, it is possible to obtain information on sub-group phenomena, movement within a meeting or over a series of meetings as well as investigating therapist intervention and the degree to which the therapist or any individual member is consonant with the rest of the group (Hill, 1965).

The questionnaire is taken from a "Development Group Questionnaire" developed by Albert R. Wight for a Proceedings Manual for Peace Corps Training Laboratories. It is designed as a Likert scale to measure the reactions of individuals in a group situation to the group as to their feelings about the satisfaction of the group's proceedings and effectiveness.

Independent Variables

Socio-political Subculture Variable

Scores on the Social Attitudes Scale can range from -78 to +78. For liberal items, response alternatives are weighted from +3 (agree very strongly) to -3 (disagree very strongly). Weights for the response alternatives for conservative items are reversed. The subject's score is the sum of the weighted alternatives endorsed by him. Higher scores are indicative of liberalism. Using scores of at least one standard error of measurement above the mean as "liberal" scores and scores of at least one standard error of measurement below the mean as "conservative" scores, the two subgroupings--one liberal and one conservative--were formed, discarding all individuals who fell in the middle group of between -1 and +1 standard error of measurement.

Personality Variable

All individuals who scored at least one standard error of measurement above or below the mean on the Social Attitudes Scale took the entire California Psychological Inventory. Six scales of the CPI were specifically investigated--dominance, sociability, social presence, flexibility, tolerance and feminity. The rationale for selecting these six scales comes from the hypotheses set forth by Shaw (1971, pp. 184-185): 1) Individuals who are positively oriented toward other people enhance social interaction, cohesiveness, and morale in groups; 2) Socially sensitive persons behave in ways which enhance their acceptance in the group and group effectiveness; 3) Ascendant individuals are dominating and self-assertive in groups and generally facilitate group functioning.

A second way of using the CPI scores in this study was to investigate any significant results in relation to the other 12 personality traits measured by the CPI. This alternative will allow significant differences in personality that might arise from the sample being used to be analyzed.

Leadership Variable

The leader was familiar with both non-directive and directive leadership styles. The two types of leadership styles being studied were determined by the verbal behavior of the leader. A directive leader was characterized by one who makes the following behaviors:

1. verbally leads the group in discussion
2. challenges a member
3. confronts a member
4. exhorts a member
5. suggests procedures for the group or a member
6. evaluates or interprets a response by a member.

A non-directive leader was characterized by one who makes the following behaviors:

1. reflects feelings of a member
2. gives support, praise or encouragement to a member
3. invites members to seek feedback
4. summarizes what has been said
5. allows the members of the group to take responsibility for the lead of the group discussion.

Each session was audio taped, and the tape was reviewed to make sure that the leader was following the style assigned to the specific

group. It was found that while acting in a non-directive style, the leader emitted responses that were rated to be 82% non-directive responses. While acting in a directive style, the leader emitted responses that were rated 88% directive responses (as scored by an independent rater using Porter's ratings on directive-non-directive leadership styles [Porter, 1950]). The rater scored 3 10-minute segments (beginning, middle, and end) of each group session. It was also found that while acting in the directive style, the leader emitted over three times as many verbal responses as when he acted in the non-directive style. (Appendices D and E contain sample scripts taken from a non-directive and a directive session, respectively.)

RESULTS

A two-way analysis of covariance was done on the data and it was found that the leadership variable had a significant effect on both the quantity and quality of interaction in the groups. A trend was found in the socio-political subculture variable that suggests an effective difference in interaction in the groups. The interaction of the leadership and socio-political subculture variables had a significant effect on the member satisfaction of the subjects in the groups. There were significant relationships between several of the personality variables and the amount of interaction in the groups, the member satisfaction of the groups, and the socio-political subculture of group members. Finally, a significant relationship was found between member satisfaction and the socio-political subculture of the group members. Also, a relationship was found between leadership style and certain personality traits of the group members.

Hypothesis 1 stated that there will be a difference in the quantity and quality of group interaction between groups with a non-directive leader and groups with a directive leader. There will be more interaction with a directive leader and the interaction will consist of more member-centered work responses. The results confirmed a difference, but in the opposite direction of that hypothesized. Table 1, which contains an analysis of covariance, shows that the non-directive groups had significantly more total interactions (at the .05 level), and they had significantly more member-centered work responses, type IV responses (at the .05 level). Also, a trend for more non-membered pre-work

Table 1. Analysis of Covariance.

Source	df	SS	MS	F
	Type I Response--Pre-work, Non-member-centered			
Leadership	1	4682.939	4682.939	4.210*
Subculture	1	4102.216	4102.216	3.689*
Interaction	1	4.826	4.826	.004
Error	19	21130.793	1112.147	
	Type II Response--Work, Non-member-centered			
Leadership	1	16.825	16.825	.355
Subculture	1	117.085	117.085	2.469
Interaction	1	4.006	4.006	.084
Error	19	900.918	47.417	
	Type III Response--Pre-work, Member-centered			
Leadership	1	249.882	249.882	4.068*
Subculture	1	1.050	1.050	.017
Interaction	1	148.508	148.508	2.418
Error	19	1167.145	61.429	
	Type IV Response--Work, Member-centered			
Leadership	1	35.775	35.775	5.523**
Subculture	1	2.798	2.798	.432
Interaction	1	1.132	1.132	.175
Error	19	123.074	6.478	
	Total Responses			
Leadership	1	8896.777	8896.777	4.406**
Subculture	1	5508.747	5508.747	2.728
Interaction	1	234.724	234.724	.116
Error	19	38367.137	2019.323	
	Member Satisfaction			
Leadership	1	1.611	1.611	.136
Subculture	1	33.534	33.534	2.824
Interaction	1	52.430	52.430	4.415**
Error	19	225.641	11.876	

* = $p < .10$
** = $p < .05$
df 1, 19

responses, Type I response, and a trend to suggest that there were more member-centered pre-work responses, type III responses, were found for the non-directive-led groups (at the .10 level).

Hypothesis 2 stated that there will be a difference in the satisfaction of the group members between groups with a directive leader and groups with a non-directive leader. This was not supported by the data (Table 1).

Hypothesis 3 stated that there will be a difference in the quantity and quality of group interaction for individuals from a liberal socio-political subculture as compared to individuals from a conservative socio-political subculture, and that there will be more group interaction with those of the liberal subculture, and the interaction will consist of more member-centered-work responses. A trend was found (at the .10 level) to suggest that the conservative groups had more non-membered pre-work responses, type I response, than did the liberal groups. Table 1 illustrates this finding.

Hypothesis 4 stated that there will be no difference in the satisfaction of group members caused by the socio-political subculture of the members when comparing individuals from the liberal and conservative subcultures. This was supported by the data on Table 1.

Hypothesis 5 stated that there will be an interaction effect between the leadership style and socio-political subculture variables, as to the quantity and quality of group interaction. This was not supported by the data (Table 1).

Hypothesis 6 stated that there will be an interaction effect between the leadership style and socio-political subculture variables on

member satisfaction. The liberal members will prefer the directive leadership style better, and the conservative members will show greater satisfaction with the non-directive leader. A difference was found (at the .05 level), but in the opposite direction of that which was hypothesized. The conservative members preferred the directive leader more, while the liberal group members were more satisfied with the non-directive leader. An analysis of covariance of this data is shown in Table 1.

Hypothesis 7 stated that there will be a difference in the quantity and quality of group interaction on the personality variable. This was supported by the data. As the amount of dominance of an individual increased, so did the amount of non-member-centered, pre-work responses, type I responses, increase (at the .05 level). As the amount of socialization of an individual increased, the amount of total interaction (.01), and each individual type of interaction responses, types I (.01), II (.05), III (.01) and IV (.05), decreased. As the amount of flexibility of an individual increased, the number of work responses (both member-centered and non-member-centered--types II (.05) and IV (.01), and the number of pre-work, member-centered responses, type III responses (.01), increased. (See Table 2, which contains the significant correlations among all variables.)

Hypothesis 8 stated that there will be a difference in the satisfaction of group members due to the personality of the individuals in the groups. This was supported by the data. As the communality trait of individuals increased so did their satisfaction of the group (at the .05 level, see Table 2).

Table 2. Correlations

Personality with Group Interaction	
Dominance with type II response	.306*
Socialization with type I response	-.568**
with type II response	-.336*
with type III response	-.592**
with type IV response	-.317*
with total responses	-.578
Flexibility with type II response	.364*
with type III response	.425**
with type IV response	.490**
with total responses	.358*
Personality and Member Satisfaction	
Communality with member satisfaction	.360*
Socio-political Subculture with Member Satisfaction	-.346**
Personality with Socio-political Subculture	
Social Presence	.432**
Socialization	-.410**
Communality	-.404**
Achievement via Conformity	-.308*
Psychological-mindedness	.379*
Flexibility	.588**
Personality with Leadership	
Socialization	.465**
Psychological-mindedness	-.423**

* = $p < .05$
** = $p < .01$
df 1,39

It was also found that there were relationships between member satisfaction and the socio-political subculture of individuals; between the socio-political subculture and certain personality traits; and between the leadership style and certain personality traits. First of all, as individuals' conservatism increased, they responded that they were more satisfied with the groups (.05). Secondly, those individuals classified as socio-politically liberal showed more social presence (.01), psychological-mindedness (.05), and flexibility (.01). Those individuals classified as socio-politically conservative showed more socialization (.01), communality (.05) and more achievement via conformity (.05). (See Table 2.)

A relationship was also found between leadership style and the personality traits of socialization and psychological-mindedness. People in the directive-led groups showed a significantly higher amount of socialization (.01), and those in the non-directive-led groups showed a significantly higher amount of psychological-mindedness (.01), on the CPI (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

In general, one of the most important findings of this study is that there is a significant difference in the effectiveness of leadership style on the quantity and quality of group interaction, and that a non-directive leader will result in more group interaction, and that this interaction will be more of a member-centered work type. This finding supports the findings of Salzburg (1961), Jense (1964), McDaniel (1971), Taylor (1971), Kilman and Auerbach (1974), Becker, et al. (1968), Koile and Gallesich (1972), Auger (1870), Ajzen (1971) and Shaw and Blum (1966).

It seems that in the present study, the members of the non-directive-led groups took the responsibility of interacting onto themselves, and therefore resulted in significantly more group interaction. Conversely, the members of the directive-led groups looked to the leader for direction and the main initiative for any interactions that took place. In the non-directive-led groups, when there was a silence or pause, the members took the responsibility (were given the responsibility) for getting the interactions going. In the directive-led groups, when an interaction stopped, the members turned to the leader for guidance, and were therefore less likely to continue interacting.

These results can be explained also in terms of the members' "perceived freedom to participate." In the non-directive group, the members not only felt the responsibility to participate, but also expressed the feelings that they felt freer to participate in this setting. In the directive-led group setting, the participation was, to a great extent, controlled by the leader, (the leader in this situation "directed

the group interaction"), and therefore, the perceived freedom to participate was greatly reduced here.

Although no significant differences were found in the effects of the socio-political subculture variable on group interactions, a trend was indicated suggesting that conservatives tend to give more non-membered, pre-work responses. This type of interaction consists of mainly conventional or assertive responses which are characterized by random or "group process" content. The difference in interaction due to the subculture variable (the trend in this case), supports the findings of Chen (1972), Illing, (1970), Vassilious and Vassilious (1974), Farwell, et al. (1974) and Bolman (1968). The differences found may be explained by the fact that the group members were told that they were participating in an experiment dealing with group interactions. Conservative individuals have been found to "prefer the security of accepting traditional regulations" (Oswald, 1971); "have a need to maintain standards" (Joe, 1974); "value conformity and leadership" (Eckhardt, 1971); and "tend to preserve established traditions and institutions" (Webster, 1970). Therefore, a possible explanation for the difference in the type I, or non-member-centered, pre-work responses, is the fact that the conservative members wanted to maintain and conform to the rules that had been established for the groups, that is that they were there to interact. (The type I responses is a conventional, pre-work response category and is the most prevalent response to be made without any intervention, whether it be by an outsdie force--i.e., the leader--or by an internal force--i.e., work by the individual group member.

A significant interaction effect between leadership style and the socio-political subculture of the group members on membership satisfaction was found. After each session, the group members were asked to rate the question, "How do I feel about this group as of now", on a 9-point Likert-type scale ranging from "best possible group" to "worst possible group". The results showed that the liberal members preferred the groups that were run by a non-directive styled leader, while the conservative group members preferred groups that were run by a non-directive styled leader. This seems to support the findings of Wittkower and Warnes (1974), where they report that preferences in the choice of forms of psychotherapy cross-culturally depend on differences in etiologic views and on cross-cultural and ideologic differences.

These differences can be explained in several ways. First of all, Oswald (1971) found that liberals were more inclined to reflective thinking (a function of the non-directive leader), while conservatives disliked ambiguous situations and scored lower on autonomy (therefore they should prefer the structured, leader-directed situation). McKloskey (1953) found that the conservative personality trait has a very close relation to those of the authoritarian personality (should prefer the directive leader). Joe (1974) found that persons exhibiting conservatism seem to dislike ambiguity in information or structure (the non-directive leader situation). As has been shown by Wilson (1973), the term's "liberal" and "conservative" are two end points of a spectrum. Therefore, those studies cited above would seem to show also that the liberal should like more ambiguous situations, score higher on autonomy, and have a lower relation to the authoritarian personality. Therefore, they should prefer a non-directive leader.

The results of the present study show a significant difference in the quantity and quality of group interaction on the personality variable. This supports the findings of McPherson and Walton (1970), Tosi (1970), Shaw (1971), Abramowitz, et al. (1974), and Hagebak and Parker (1969). In the present study, the data show that as the score of dominance of an individual group member (as measured by the CPI) increases, so does the amount of non-member-center, pre-work responses increase. This agrees with Shaw's findings (1971) that ascendant individuals who are dominating and assertive in groups, generally facilitate group functioning. Even from the definition of the term itself, dominance should appear to positively affect group interaction. The dominance scale was developed to identify individuals who would behave in a dominant, ascendant manner, who in interpersonal situations would take the initiative and exercise leadership, and who would be seen as forceful, self-confidant and capable of influencing others. The purpose of the dominance scale also is to assess the social initiative of individuals (Gough, 1968).

A significant difference in the quantity and quality of group interaction was found on the socialization personality trait of the individuals in the groups (as measured by the CPI). A negative relationship was revealed between the amount of socialization that a group member had, and the amount of interaction that he emitted in the group session. This negative relationship was found for the total interactions of an individual, and for each of the four categories of interaction (types I, II, III, and IV). Taking a first, superficial look at these results, the findings appear to be quite surprising. The socialization

scale is defined as an indicator of the degree of social maturity, integrity and rectitude which the individual has attained (Gough, 1957). High scorers on this scale tend to be seen as serious, honest, industrious, modest, obliging, sincere, and steady; as being conscientious and responsible. This would appear to be the picture of an individual who would work in a group, and therefore take part in more interactions. However, on closer examination, it is found that those who tend to score lower on the socialization scale are classified as opinionated, uninhibited, headstrong, rebellious, outspoken, and as given to excess exhibition, and ostentation in behavior (Gough, 1957). Therefore, it seems consistent that there should be a negative relationship between the socialization personality trait (as measured by the CPI), and the amount of interaction that a person exhibits in a group situation, due to the fact that lower scorers tend to be outspoken, etc. and should be involved in more interactions.

The third finding in this study is that there is a significant relationship between the quantity and quality of group interaction and the personality trait of flexibility (as measured by the CPI). As the amount of flexibility of an individual group member increases, the number of work responses (both member and non-member centered) increases, as did the number of pre-work, member-centered responses. Shaw (1971) reports that socially sensitive persons behave in a way that enhances their acceptance in a group and group effectiveness. This can be seen as supporting the results concerning the flexibility of a group member. The scale itself is a measure of the degree of flexibility and adaptability of a person's thinking and social behavior. Therefore, it appears

consistent that the more flexible person should exhibit more social behavior.

On relating the satisfaction of group members with personality, it was found that as the communality trait of an individual increases, his satisfaction of the group also increases. Gough (1968) says that subjects scoring high on communality will be in tune with their peers and surroundings, will perceive as their peers perceive, and will form impressions that are sound, stable and sensible. They will be individuals who tend to be sincere, patient, steady, realistic, and conscientious. On the other hand, those scoring low on the communality trait tend to be impatient, nervous, restless, changeable and indifferent. Therefore, it would seem to follow, that the lower the communality of an individual, the more he would tend to be dissatisfied with the status quo of a group, and the lower his responses would be on member satisfaction rating of the group. Furthermore, the higher the communality of an individual, the more his degree of reactions and responses correspond to the modal ("common") pattern established. It would seem here that the more communal individual would want to give the impression that he was satisfied with the group; that is, it was normal to be satisfied with the group (since this was supposed to be a positive experience--as many of the initial responses of preconceptions of the group revealed).

Several of the personality traits significantly correlated with the socio-political subculture variable. It was found that an individual's "liberalism" was positively correlated with the personality traits of social presence, psychological-mindedness, and flexibility. Those individuals classified as "conservative" showed more socialization,

communality and achievement via conformity. This would seem to support the findings of Oswald (1971), Joe (1974), Wilson (1973) and Eckhardt (1971).

Liberal Correlates

Social presence assesses such factors as poise, spontaneity, and self-confidence in personal and social interactions. Oswald (1971) found that liberals scored higher in autonomy than conservatives, and did not need the security of accepting traditional regulations. Joe (1974) found liberals to have a higher need for impulsivity (giving vent readily to emotions and wishes), autonomy (breaking away from restraints or restrictions) and play (spending time in amusement activities). It would appear, therefore, that the liberal individual would tend to be more spontaneous, and self-confident in personal and social interactions, and would have a significant relation to the social presence scale (in a positive direction).

The psychological-mindedness scale measures the degree to which an individual is responsive to the inner needs, motives and experiences of others. Also, a person who is high on psychological-mindedness tends to be seen as rebellious towards rules, restrictions and constraints (Gough, 1957). This latter description, in particular, would seem to point to a positive correlation between the liberal individuals (those individuals who have a high need to break away from restraints or restrictions--Joe, 1974) and psychological-mindedness.

Flexibility is defined as indicative of the degree of flexibility of a person's thinking and social behavior. Those who score high on

the flexibility scale of the CPI are seen as informal, and adventurous; as being sarcastic and cynical; and as highly concerned with personal pleasures and diversions (Gough, 1957). This seems to correlate to the picture of the liberal, as discussed by Joe (1974), Wilson (1973) and Eckhardt (1971). Therefore, it should follow that there is a positive correlation between flexibility and "liberalism".

Conservative Correlates

Conservatism correlated positively with three personality traits measured by the CPI. First of all, there was a relationship between the socialization trait and conservatism. Those scoring high on socialization tend to be seen as being conscientious, serious, honest, industrious, modest, obliging, responsible, sincere and steady. Also they are seen as conforming and self-denying (Gough, 1957). Webster (1970) defines a conservative as "tending to preserve established traditions or institutions, and to resist or oppose any change in them". Wilson and Patterson (1968) define the conservative individual as having a preference for the conventional. Joe (1974) has shown that conservatives have a high need to maintain standards and to work toward distant goals (achievement oriented). Eckhardt (1971) found that conservatives value personal conformity. Therefore, it seems that the research has pointed to a description of the conservative individual as a person possessing such qualities as self-denying and conforming, modest and obliging, industrious, and serious, and therefore, it follows, that there should be a positive correlation between the trait of socialization and that of conservative socio-political subculture of an individual.

Secondly, conservatism was found to positively correlate with the personality trait of communality. This trait is defined as the degree to which an individual's reactions and responses correspond to the modal or common pattern established (Gough, 1957). In other words, to measure conformity to the norm. Again, the literature has shown the conservative individual to be one who tends to conform to the norm, to want to maintain the traditions, institutions and norms of the society. Therefore, a positive correlation between the communality personality trait and the conservative socio-political subculture variable is not surprising.

Finally, conservatism was found to correlate positively with the personality trait of "achievement via conformity". This trait is defined as identifying those factors of interest and motivation which facilitate achievement in any setting where conformance is a positive behavior. Again, the literature has shown that conformance is one of the personality attributes of a conservative individual, and therefore a trait measuring "conformance as a positive behavior" should positively correlate with conservatism.

Using the initial ratings of group members on the -78 to +78 continuum of the Social Attitudes Scale, it was found that there was a relationship between socio-political subculture and member satisfaction. The more conservative the individual, the more satisfaction he had with the group. This can be explained in a similar manner to the findings on subculture and group interaction, and member satisfaction and communality. Conservatives value conformity and leadership (Eckhardt, 1971), prefer the security of accepting traditional regulations (Oswald,

1971), and have a need to maintain standards (Joe, 1974). Therefore they would tend to perceive the group as good, thereby maintaining the standard and preferring the traditional regulations set upon them (that of the group rules or norms), and show satisfaction with the group. Added to this are the findings that communality is positively related to member satisfaction, and that communality is also positively related to conservatism, giving a possible indication that member satisfaction might be related to conservatism. Since the more communality a person exhibits, the more satisfied he is with the group, and the more conservative he is, therefore, the more conservative an individual is, the more satisfaction he should show towards the group.

The final correlations, that of socialization with individuals in the directive-led groups and psychological-mindedness with persons in the non-directive-led groups may suggest certain things. How much effect these correlations have on the initial findings that leadership affects interaction in groups, is hard to tell at this time.

It was found in this study that the directive-led groups had people who scored higher on the socialization personality trait (on the CPI), or reversing that, the non-directive-led groups had people who scored lower on the socialization trait. These people, as has already been shown, are more outspoken, rebellious, and opinionated. Also, socialization correlated negatively with group interaction. Therefore, it would seem that these people would lend themselves to more group interaction.

There was also found a positive correlation between people in the non-directive-led groups and the personality trait of psychological-

mindedness. Individuals who score high on psychological-mindedness tend to be seen as spontaneous, talkative, verbally fluent, and socially ascendant (Gough, 1957). These individuals should show a greater amount of interaction in a group setting than individuals who score low on this scale. Therefore, it was found that the non-directive-led group seemed to score higher on psychological-mindedness.

These last two correlations indicate that the personality variable might be interacting with leadership to produce more group interaction. Those people in the non-directive-led groups seemed to be more talkative, outspoken, verbally fluent, and opinionated. This would be seen as an additive variable to the non-directive leadership style effect on group interaction.

Summary

Overall, the findings reveal many interesting results. Leadership style does seem to affect the quantity and quality of group interaction. When comparing a non-directive leader to a directive one, the non-directive leader seems to result in significantly more interaction, especially in the member-centered, work style, or most therapeutic and "worthwhile" type of group interaction. This seems to be explained by the fact that the responsibility of work is left up to the individual group members and not left to be directed or initiated by the leader. There also appears to be a significant relationship between certain personality variables and group interactions. As people become more dominant, assertive, outspoken and opinionated, they will interact more in group situations.

Even though no significant results were found concerning the effectiveness of the socio-political subculture variable of an individual, as to the amount and type of group interaction, a trend was found suggesting that conservatives tend to give more non-member-centered, pre-work responses in groups, than do liberals.

As to member satisfaction with groups, this seems to depend upon the personality of the individuals in the groups, and is also influenced by an interaction between the socio-political subculture of the group member and the leadership style used in the group.

Throughout the review of literature, studies talking about the several variables investigated in this present study dealt with several types of groups and leadership effects. These ranged from leaders of work groups to intensive group psychotherapy sessions in the hospital setting. The question that arises here is how similar are these various settings and how applicable are these present results to group setting other than the one studied? It seems that throughout, the findings of leadership effects appear to be consistent across settings, even with the conflicting results themselves. Instead of differentiating various settings--clinical groups versus encounter groups versus marathon groups versus work groups, the studies have differentiated mainly the differing leadership styles. The conflicting differences in results appear to represent another variable (or other variables) which appear to be intervening and affecting the results of the various studies. This variable might be the personality of the group leader, the expectations of the group members, the size of the groups studied, or other variables that could be only speculated about. However, across settings the

effects of the different leadership styles seem to be somewhat consistent.

Therefore, it appears that the results of this present study can be applied to other group settings outside that of a university encounter group setting. The implications for therapy groups, marathon groups and other encounter groups are also present. The variables that must be taken into consideration when dealing with the other settings are those of leadership style, personality of the group members (or clients) and the socio-political subculture (or background and values) that the individuals take into the group or therapy setting. What is as important, is the interaction of these variables, both to the group and therapeutic situation. What style the therapist, or leader, uses must reflect certain information that he has about his client. Certain styles will be more compatible with certain personality traits of clients. Certain styles will be preferred by certain clients, depending upon their personality and socio-political subculture. These findings are helpful not only to the encounter group leader, but also to the group therapist in the clinical setting, and could be applied as satisfactorally to the individual therapy or counseling setting. The interaction of two people can be affected by the values and personality traits that each brings into the situation, as well as by what occurs in the session.

Even though only a trend was found in the effectiveness of the socio-political subculture variable on group interaction, with a larger sample and possibly more screening of the group members (use of 1 standard deviation from the mean, as opposed to 1 standard error of

measurement from the mean) a significant difference might be found. The literature is just starting to examine more closely the effect of this variable, as opposed to the very general studies that have been reported in the past--"Yes, it does need study". What this present study has shown is the need for further, more specific research into the topic of socio-political subculture, and its relation to group interaction, effectiveness of therapy, and therapy and leadership styles.

All in all, there are several implications presented in this study for groups of all kinds, and for counseling and psychotherapy. These range from the effects and relations of personality and individual values (the socio-political subculture variable), to the effects of leadership style used in different settings, and to its effect on interaction and member satisfaction in groups, and in counseling and psychotherapy.

CONCLUSIONS

Leadership style significantly affects the quantity and quality of group interaction. The non-directive leader will result in more interaction in a group, and this interaction will be of a member-centered, work response type. The personality of individuals in a group will be related to the amount and type of interaction that an individual emits in a group, to the satisfaction that a person reports about the group, and to his socio-political subculture.

An interaction effect between leadership style and the socio-political subculture of group members was found to affect the satisfaction that a group member reports concerning the group sessions. There is a relationship between the socio-political subculture of group members and their satisfaction with the group, in that as an individual is rated as more conservative (on a paper and pencil questionnaire) he tends to report higher scores of preference to the group sessions (on a group questionnaire). Finally, a trend was found to suggest a difference in the quantity and quality of group interaction due to the socio-political subculture of the individuals in the groups.

Implications for therapy and therapeutic groups are to be found from the results of this study. A follow-up study on the socio-political subculture variable to support or negate the trend that was found in the present study, and also to give support to the applicability of the findings of the present study for therapy and counseling, both of the group and individual style, are suggested.

REFERENCES

Abramczuk, J. The type of leadership and the topics of discussion in a large open group: observations on community meetings. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 1972, 18(1), 53-60.

Abramowitz, C. V., Abramowitz, S. I., Roback, H. B., & Jacobsen, C. Differential effectiveness of directive and nondirective group therapies as a function of client internal and external control. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(6), 849-853.

Abramowitz, S. I. Personality, the sociocultural environment, and student activism: toward a field theory of social behavior. Journal of Psychology, 1974, 88(1), 103-112.

Ajzen, R. Acceptance of counselor and client proposed solutions in directive and client-centered counseling situations. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31(12-B), 7585-7586.

Anderson, C. M., Harrow, M., Schwartz, A. H., & Kupfer, D. J. Impact of therapist on patient satisfaction in group psychotherapy. Comprehensive Psychiatry, 1972, 13(1), 33-40.

Ashby, J. D., Ford, D. H., Guerney, B. G. Jr., & Guerney, L. F. Effects on clients of a reflective and a leading type of psychotherapy. Psychological Monographs, 1957, 71, 453.

Astrachan, B. M., Schwartz, A. H., Becker, R., & Harrow, M. The psychiatrist's effect on the behavior and interaction of therapy groups. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1967, 123, 1379-1387.

Auger, L. Counseling style and personality: some psychological concomitants of preferences of a group of Catholic priests for directive and nondirective responses in the priest-parishoner counseling relationship. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30(8-A), 3271.

Baker, E. The differential effects of two psychotherapeutic approaches on client perceptions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7(1), 46-50.

Becker, R. E., Harrow, M., Astrachan, B. Leadership and content in group psychotherapy. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1970, 150(5), 346-353.

Becker, R. E., Harrow, M., Astrachan, B. M., Detre, T., & Miller, J. C. Influence of the leader on the activity level of therapy groups. Journal of Social Psychology, 1968, 74, 39-51.

Bigelow, G. S., & Thomas, J. W. Reality versus client-centered models in group counseling. The School Counselor, 1969, 16(3), 191-194.

Boller, J.D. Differential effects of two T-group styles. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1974, 14(2), 117-123.

Bolman, W. M. Cross-cultural psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1968, 124, 1237-1244.

Buros, O. K. (Ed.). The sixth mental measurements yearbook. Highland Park, N.J.: Gryphon Press, 1965.

Cammalleri, J. A., Hendrick, W. C., Pittman, W. C. Jr., Blout, H. D., & Prather, D. C. Effects of different leadership styles on group accuracy. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1973, 57(1), 32-37.

Cantor, F. M. Authoritarian attitudes, degree of pathology and preference for structured versus unstructured psychotherapy in hospitalized mental patients. Psychological Reports, 1971, 28(1), 231-234.

Chen, C. Experiences with group psychotherapy in Taiwan. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1972, 22(2), 210-225.

Costin, F. Dogmatism and conservatism: An empirical follow-up of Rokeach's findings. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1971, 31(4), 1007-1010.

DiLoreto, A. O. A comparison of relative effectiveness of systematic desensitization, rational-emotive and client-centered group psychotherapy in the reduction of interpersonal anxiety in introverts and extroverts. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 30(12-A), 5230.

Dinoff, M., Horner, R. F., Kurpiewski, B. S., & Timmons, E. O. Conditioning verbal behavior of schizophrenics in a group therapy-like situation. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1960, 16, 367-370.

Eckhardt, W. Conservatism, east and west. Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 1971, 2(2), 109-128.

Ellis, A. A critique of the theoretical contributions of non-directive psychotherapy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1948, 4, 248-255.

Ends, E. J., & Page, C. W. A study of three types of groups of psychotherapy with hospitalized male inebriates. Quarterly Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 1957, 18, 263-277.

Farwell, G., Gamsky, N. R., & Mathieu-Coughlan, P. The Counselor's Handbook. New York: Intext Educational Publishers, 1974.

Fiedler, F. E. The concept of an ideal therapeutic relationship. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 239-245.

Fiedler, F. E. A comparison of therapeutic relationships in psychoanalytic, non-directive and Adlerian therapy. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 436-445.

Fiedler, F. E. Factor analysis of psychoanalytic, non-directive and Adlerian therapeutic relationships. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1951, 15, 32-38.

Frank, G. H. The effect of directive and nondirective statements by therapists on the content of patient verbalizations. Journal of General Psychology, 1964, 71, 323-328.

Frye, R. L., Vidulick, R. N., Meierhoefer, B., & Joure, S. A. Differential T-group behaviors of high and low dogmatic participants. Journal of Psychology, 1972, 81(2), 301-309.

Gazda, G. M. Group Counseling: A Developmental Approach. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Gibb, J. R., & Gibb, L. M. Emergence therapy--the TORI process in an emergent group. In Gazda, G. M. (Ed.), Innovations to Group Psychotherapy. Springfield, Ill.: Charles C. Thomas Publishers, 1968, pp. 96-129.

Goldstein, A. P. Therapist and Patient Expectancies in Psychotherapy. New York: Pergamon Press, 1962.

Gough, H. G. The California Psychological Inventory Manual. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press,1957.

Gough, H. G. An Interpreter's Syllabus: The California Psychological Inventory. Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists' Press, 1968.

Hagebak, R. W., & Parker, G. V. C. Therapist directiveness, client dominance and therapy resistance. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1969, 33(5), 536-540.

Harpel, R. L. The effect of encounter group composition upon social and political attitudes. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31(6-A), 2683.

Harrow, M., Astrachan, B. M., Tucker, G. J., Klein, E. B., & Miller, J. C. The T-group and study group laboratory experiences. Journal of Social Psychology, 1971, 85(2), 225-237.

Helweg, G. C. The relationship between selected personality characteristics and perceptions of directive and non-directive psychotherapeutic approaches. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32(4-B), 2396.

Hempkill, J. K. Relations between the size of the group and the behavior of "superior" leaders. Journal of Social Psychology, 1950, 32, 11-22.

Heslin, R., & Dexter, D. Three Dimensions of member satisfaction in small groups. Human Relations, 1964, 17, 99-112.

Hill, W. F. Hill Interaction Matrix. Los Angeles: Youth Study Center, University of Southern California, 1965.

Hsu, F. L. K. Psychological Anthropology. Cambridge, Mass.: Schenkman Publishing Company, Inc., 1972.

Huber, J. T., & Millman, H. L. (Eds.). Goals and Behavior in Psychotherapy and Counseling. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1972.

Illing, H. A. Psychotherapeutic effectiveness in different social situations. Dynamische Psychiatric, 1970, 3(2), 77-85.

Izard, E. C. The Face of Emotion. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1971.

Jacobsen, R. A. Personality correlates of choice of therapist. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 31(9-B), 5626.

Jensen, S. Ein versuch zur quantitativen analyse des gruppen-psycho-therapeutischen prozesses mit schizophrenen patienten. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany, 1964.

Joe, V. Personality correlates of conservatism. Journal of Social Psychology, 1974, 93(2), 309-310.

Kelly, M. A. Active versus passive leadership techniques with development groups. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1970, 31(6-A), 2683.

Kerlinger, F. N. Social attitudes and their criterial referents: a structural theory. Psychological Review, 1967, 74(2), 110-122.

Kerlinger, F. N. A social attitude scale: evidence on reliability and validity. Psychological Reports, 1970, 26 , 379-383.

Kilman, P. R. Direct and non-direct marathon group therapy and internal-external control. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1974, 21(5), 380-384.

Kilman, P. R., & Auerbach, S. M. Effects of marathon group therapy on trait and state anxiety. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(4), 607-612.

Kilman, P. R., & Howell, R. J. Effects of structure of marathon group therapy and locus of control on therapeutic outcome. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1974, 42(6), 912.

Koile, E. A., & Gallessich, J. Beyond the group's mythology. Journal of Psychology, 1972, 81(1), 129-138.

Krug, S. E., & Kulhavy, R. W. Personality differences across regions of the United States. Journal of Social Psychology, 1973, 91(1), 73-79.

Lazarus, A. A. Behavior rehearsal versus non-directive therapy versus advice in effecting behavior change. Behavior Research and Therapy, 1966, 4, 209-212.

Levinson, D. A., & Jensen, S. M. Assertive versus passive group therapist behavior with southern white and Negro schizophrenic hospital patients. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1967, 17, 328-335.

Lewin, K., Lippit, R., & White, R. K. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates. Journal of Social Psychology, 1939, 10, 271-299.

Liebroder, M. N. Effects of therapist style on interaction in psychotherapy groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utah, 1962.

Lippit, R., & White, R. K. The "social climate" of children's groups. In Barker, R. G., Korinin, J., & Wright, H. (Eds.), Child Behavior and Development. New York: McGraw Hill, 1943, pp. 485-508.

Mann, R. D. A review of the relationship between personality and performance in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 1959, 56, 241-270.

McDaniel, W. V. Changes that occur with mild mental defective following two approaches to group counseling: Directive and group centered. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32(4-A), 1859.

McKloskey, H. Conservatism and personality. American Political Science Review, 1953, 52, 27-45.

McNally, H. A. An investigation of selected counselor and client characteristics as possible predictors of counseling effectiveness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1973, 33(12-A), 6672-6673.

McPerson, F. M., & Walton, H. J. The dimensions of psychotherapy group interaction: an analysis of clinicians' constructs. British Journal of Medical Psychology, 1970, 43(3), 281-290.

Megaragee, E. I. The California Psychological Inventory Handbook. London: Jossey-Bass Inc., 1972.

Mitchell, R. A. The effect of group counseling experiences in a didactic classroom setting on selected personality variables and counseling effectiveness. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 32(12-A), 6765.

Nadell, S. F. Foundations of Social Anthropology. Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1951.

Naum, R. J. Comparison of group counseling approaches with Puerto Rican boys in an inner city high school. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32(2-A), 742-743.

Nowicki, S. J. Conservatism and liberalism in college students. Psychological Reports, 1969, 25(1), 252.

O'Hearne, J. J., & Glad, D. D. The case for interaction. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1969, 19(3), 268-278.

Oswald, R. M. The relationships between certain personality variables and conservative, moderate, and liberal theological beliefs. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32(1-A), 251.

Parloff, M. B. Some factors affecting the quality of therapeutic relationships. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1956, 52, 5-10.

Patterson, C. H. Theories of Counseling and Psychotherapy. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1966.

Pino, C. J. Illinois Institute of Technology in sensitivity training groups. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30(6-B), 2915.

Porter, E. H., Jr. An Introduction to Therapeutic Counseling. Chicago: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1950.

Rambo, W. W., & Fromme, D. K. Structural characteristics of liberal-conservative attitudes: a note. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1970, 31(3), 970.

Randar, M. A. T. Systems of group work--Rogers' and Johnson's: A comparison with implications from an integrated model. International Journal of Social Psychiatry, 1972-73, 18(4), 280-286.

Rice, D. G., Gurman, A. S., & Razin, A. M. Therapist sex, style, and theoretical orientation. Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 1974, 159(6), 413-421.

Rice, L. N. Client behavior as a function of therapist style and client resources. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1973, 20(4), 306-311.

Ring, B. Recognized similarity: an investigation of significant events reported by encounter group participants. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(4-A), 1527-1528.

Robinson, J.P., & Shaver, P. R. Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, 1969.

Rokeach, M. The Open and Closed Mind. New York: Basic Books, 1960.

Rokeach, M. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

Salzburg, H. C. Manipulation of verbal behavior in a group psychotherapeutic setting. Psychological Reports, 1961, 9, 183-186.

Salzburg, H. C. Effects of silence and redirection in verbal response in group psychotherapy. Psychological Reports, 1962, 11, 455-461.

Schwartz, A. H., Harrow, M., Anderson, C., Geinstein, A. E., & Schwartz, C. C. Influence of therapeutic orientation on patient and therapist satisfaction in group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1970, 20(4), 460-469.

Seward, G. Psychotherapy and Culture Conflict. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1956.

Shaw, M. E. A comparison of two types of leadership in various communication nets. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 50, 127-134.

Shaw, M. E. Group Dynamics: The Psychology of Small Group Behavior. New York: McGraw Hill Book Co., 1971.

Shaw, M. E., & Blum, M. Effects of leadership style upon group performance as a function of task structure. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 3(2), 238-242.

Shaw, M. E., & Wright, J. M. Scales for the Measurement of Attitudes. New York: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1967.

Sigrell, B. Group Psychotherapy. Stockholm: Alquist and Wiskell, 1968.

Slavson, S. R. Racial and cultural factors in group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1956, 6, 152-165.

Slavson, S. R. Eclecticism versus sectarianism in group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1970, 20(1), 3-13.

Snadowsky, A. M. Group effectiveness as a function of communication network, task complexity and leadership type. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1969, 30(5-A), 2155.

Snadowsky, A. M. Member satisfaction in stable communication networks. Sociometry, 1974, 37(1), 38-53.

Solomon, L. N., & Berzon, B. (Eds.). New Perspectives on Encounter Groups. London: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers, 1972.

Steininger, M. In defense of measuring attitudes. Journal of Psychology, 1973, 85(1), 131-136.

Stellway, R. J. The correspondence between religious orientation and socio-political liberalism and conservatism. The Sociological Quarterly, 1973, 14(3), 430-439.

Strupp, H. H. Patient-doctor relationships: Psychotherapist in the therapeutic process. In Bachrach, A. J. (Ed.). Experimental Foundations of Clinical Psychology. New York: Basic Books, 1962.

Strupp, H. H. Toward a reformulation of the psychotherapeutic influence. Presedential address delivered at the fourth annual meeting of the Society for Psychotherapy Research, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, June 1973.

Suziedelis, A., & Lorr, M. Conservative attitudes and authoritarian values. Journal of Psychology, 1973, 83(2), 287-294.

Taylor, W. F. Direct versus indirect intervention in elementary group counseling. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1971, 32(4-A), 1869.

Thomas, E. J., & Fink, C. F. Effects of group size. Psychological Bulletin, 1963, 60(4), 371-384.

Tompkins, D. S. Group effectiveness as a function of leadership style moderated by stage of group development. Dissertation Abstracts International, 1972, 33(4-B), 1839.

Tosi, D. J. Dogmatism within the counselor-client dyad. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17(3), 284-288.

Triandis, H. C., Vassilious, V., Vassilious, G., Tanaka, T., & Shanmuzam, A. V. The Analysis of Subjective Culture. New York: Wiley Publishers, 1972.

Truax, C. B. The process of group psychotherapy. Relationships between hypothesized therapeutic conditions and interpersonal exploration. Psychological Monographs General and Applied, 1961, 75(7), Whole #511.

Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Co., 1967.

Truax, C. B., Wittmer, J., & Wargo, D. G. Effects of the therapeutic conditions of accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness in hospitalized mental patients during group therapy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1971, 27(1), 137-150.

Van Der Veen, F. Effects of the therapist and the patient on each other's therapeutic behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29(1), 19-26.

Vassilious, V. G., & Vassilious, G. Variations of the group process across cultures. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1974, 24(1), 55-65.

Walton, H. Small Group Psychotherapy. London: Penguin Books, 1971.

Webster's New World Dictionary. New York: World Publishing Co., 1970.

Wile, D. B., Bion, G. C., & Pollack, H. B. The group therapy questionnaire: an instrument for the study of leadership in small groups. Psychological Reports, 1970, 27, 263-273.

Wilson, G. D. The Psychology of Conservatism. London: Academic Press, 1973.

Wilson, G. D., & Brazendale, A. H. Social attitude correlates of Eysenck's personality dimensions. Social Behavior and Personality, 1973, 12(1), 148-156.

Wilson, G. D., & Patterson, J. R. A new measure of conservatism. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 1968, 7, 264-269.

Wittkower, E. D., & Warnes, H. Cultural aspects of psychotherapy. American Journal of Psychotherapy, 1974, 28(4), 566-573.

Zimmer, J. M., & Cowles, K. H. Content analysis using Fortran: applied to interviews conducted by C. Rogers, F. Perls, and A. Ellis. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19(2), 161-166.

Zimmer, J. M., Hakstian, A. R., & Newby, J. F. Dimensions of counselee responses over several therapy sessions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1972, 19(2), 448-454.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

The Social Attitudes Scale

Given below are statements on various social problems about which we all have beliefs, opinions, and attitudes. We all think differently about such matters, and this scale is an attempt to let you express your beliefs and opinions. There are no right and wrong answers. Please respond to each item as follows:

Agree very strongly	+3	Disagree very strongly	-3
Agree strongly	+2	Disagree strongly	-2
Agree	+1	Disagree	-1

For example, if you agree very strongly with a statement you would write +3 in the left margin beside the statement, but if you should happen to disagree with it, you would put -1 in front of it. Respond to each statement as best as you can. Go rapidly but carefully. Do not spend too much time on any one statement; try to respond and then go on. Don't go back once you have marked a statement.

_____ 1. Individuals who are against churches and religions should not be allowed to teach in colleges.

_____ 2. Large fortunes should be taxed fairly heavily over and above income taxes.

_____ 3. Both public and private universities and colleges should get generous aid from both state and federal governments.

_____ 4. Science and society would both be better off if scientists took no part in politics.

_____ 5. Society should be quicker to throw out old ideas and traditions and to adopt new thinking and customs.

_____ 6. To ensure adequate care of the sick, we need to change radically the present system of privately controlled medical care.

_____ 7. If civilization is to survive, there must be a turning back to religion.

_____ 8. A first consideration in any society is the protection of property rights.

_____ 9. Government ownership and management of utilities leads to bureaucracy and inefficiency.

_____10. If the United States takes part in any sort of world organization, we should be sure that we lose none of our power and influence.

_____ 11. Funds for school construction should come from state and federal government loans at no interest or very low interest.

_____ 12. Inherited racial characteristics plan more of a part in the achievement of individuals and groups than is generally known.

_____ 13. Federal Government aid for the construction of schools is long overdue, and should be instituted as a permanent policy.

_____ 14. Our present economic system should be reformed so that profits are replaced by reimbursements for useful work.

_____ 15. Public enterprises like railroads should not make profits; they are entitled to fares sufficient to enable them to pay only a fair interest on actual cash capital they have invested.

_____ 16. Government laws and regulations should be such as first to ensure the prosperity of business since the prosperity of all depends on the prosperity of business.

_____ 17. All individuals who are intellectually capable of benefitting from it should get college education, at public expense if necessary.

_____ 18. The well-being of a nation depends mainly on its industry and business.

_____ 19. True democracy is limited in the United States because of the special privileges enjoyed by business and industry.

_____ 20. The gradual social ownership of industry needs to be encouraged if we are ever to cure some of the ills of our society.

_____ 21. There are too many professors in our colleges and universities who are radical in their social and political beliefs.

_____ 22. There should be no government interference with business and trade.

_____ 23. Some sort of religious education should be given in the public schools.

_____ 24. Unemployment insurance is an inalienable right of the working man.

_____ 25. Individuals with the ability and foresight to earn and accumulate wealth should have the right to enjoy that wealth without governmental interference and regulations.

_____ 26. The United Nations should be whole-heartedly supported by all of us.

Appendix B

Group Questionnaire

NAME _____

Please circle the number of the statement that best expresses your feelings regarding today's group session.

1. How interested was I in the group's discussion today?

   9. Completely interested all the time
   8. Almost completely interested most of the time
   7. Quite interested most of the time
   6. Somewhat interested most of the time
   5. Neither very interested nor disinterested most of the time
   4. Somewhat disinterested most of the time
   3. Quite disinterested most of the time
   2. Almost completely disinterested most of the time
   1. Completely disinterested all the time

2. How do I feel about this group as of now?

   9. Best possible group
   8. Almost the best possible
   7. Quite good
   6. Moderately good
   5. Equally good and poor
   4. Quite poor
   3. Moderately poor
   2. Almost the worst possible
   1. Worst possible group

3. Was I leveling with the group? That is, did I feel free to say what I really thought at the time that I felt it was necessary or did I find it difficult or impossible to express my true feelings? I felt:

   9. Completely free and expressive, open and aboveboard
   8. Almost completely open
   7. Somewhat open
   6. Slightly more open than closed
   5. Neither open nor closed
   4. Slightly more closed
   3. Somewhat closed
   2. Almost completely closed
   1. Completely under wraps, closed and hidden

4. Were members out to win own points?

   9. Completely considering merits of issues
   8. Almost completely considering merits of issues
   7. Moderately considering merits of issues
   6. Slightly more considering merits of issues than out to win points
   5. Equally out to win own points and considering merits of issues
   4. Slightly more out to win points than considering merits of issues
   3. Moderately out to win own points
   2. Almost completely out to win own points
   1. Completely out to win own points

5. Were different views listened to?

   9. They were completely discussed, examined, evaluated or considered, in an effort to gain consensus
   8. Almost completely used
   7. Used quite a lot
   6. Used more than disregarded
   5. Equally disregarded and used
   4. Disregarded more than used
   3. Disregarded quite a lot
   2. Almost completely disregarded
   1. They were completely disregarded, disallowed or rejected

6. To what extent did we talk about present events (here and now) or past events (there and then)?

   9. Completely here and now, the present
   8. Almost completely here and now
   7. Quite here and now
   6. Somewhat here and now
   5. Equally between here and now and there and then
   4. Somewhat there and then
   3. Quite there and then
   2. Almost completely there and then
   1. Completely there and then, the past

7. Did the group talk about <u>content</u> or <u>group development</u>?

   9. Completely group development oriented--dealt with problems of interpersonal relationships, feelings, or procedures within the group
   8. Almost completely development oriented
   7. Quite a bit more development than content
   6. A little more development than content
   5. About equally content and development
   4. A little more content than development
   3. Quite a bit more content than development
   2. Almost completely content oriented
   1. Completely content oriented--talked about issues, did not discuss what we were doing in the group or how we were doing it.

8. Group atmosphere words (Circle as many words as needed to describe your feelings about today's group session).

9. Rewarding
8. Sluggish
7. Cooperative
6. Competitive
5. Neutral
4. Work
3. Play
2. Tense/frustrating
1. Relaxed

Appendix C

Topic List

The following is a list of topics that can be discussed at the group sessions. This list in no way should limit the range of possible topics to be discussed. The group can choose to discuss all of these topics, or none of these.

1. What do I value in a relationship?
2. What is friendship? What does it mean to me?
3. What is trust? What do I have to do to get you to trust me?
4. Religion--why or why not?
5. Sex--premarital, extramarital, homosexual, etc. How do I feel about it? Why do I feel that way?
6. Interaction with other people--games or sincerity?
7. Why do I get angry? Why am I angry at ...?
8. Love
9. I have problems with ... about ...
10. What is life all about? What am I doing here?

Appendix D

Sample Script of a Non-directive Session

Member 1: The teacher has to set up what goes on in the class. I'll say, we'll do it this way. Let the class be their own policeman. You can't teach anything when you are trying to be a policeman too. It just distracts everything.

Leader: So, you'd set up the original rules, but let them be enforced by the kids?

Member 1: Yes, and if they don't do it, then you take disciplinary action.

Leader: If they enforce it, you don't have to enforce it.

Member 1: Yes, that's right.

Leader: I hear you saying that no matter what happens, the final responsibility is going to be on the teacher.

Member 1: Yes, ah, hum.

Member 2: I think you have to go to a kind of democratic method of electing a president, vice president, secretary and say, O.K. this is your officers. They'll say what you're going to do, and you'll put in your little quibs and quotes for them if you want, and they'll narrow it down and when they narrow it down, the teacher takes it and then goes on and sees if its O.K. If it isn't O.K. he hands it back in and they hand more in.

Leader: You're saying that the teacher would set down the final rules?

Member 2: No, he would go over them until he got something more reasonable, cause you know kids are going to hand in stuff like, every 10 minutes we get a pop break and stuff like that, things that are just really absurd instead of really coming down to basic things that they're supposed to do, until they realize not to hand in stuff that's rotten. They got to realize themselves that what they hand in will be the rules. They have to make the decisions themselves.

Leader: So the kids will make the decisions with the help of the teacher?

Member 2: Yes.

Member 3: I think that if children started out as being responsible people, that you wouldn't have to worry about them handing in rotten stuff, like a pop break every 10 minutes, because they would become responsible people. I feel if I treat someone like a responsible individual, that I expect that they will behave like a responsible individual, and I don't expect any less. I guess it's kind of hard to expect things.

Leader: So you feel that if it was set up in the beginning that ...

Member 3: If I set up a relationship, a person to person relationship, where I take responsibility for my actions, and the things I feel responsible for, and treat them like responsible people who are going to take care of their own responsibilities.

Appendix E

Sample Script of a Directive Session

Member 1: I do a lot of rock climbing, and I seek my limits, and pretty much come close to hurting myself. That's what I get a charge out of. My skills keep me alive. I really yearn for it. I know that if something would happen to me, I wouldn't exist. That's sad and that's why I don't want to reach that point.

Leader: Is there life after death?

Member 1: Not as far as I am concerned.

Leader: Anyone else? Does anyone believe there is life after death?

Member 2: That's pretty hard, you know. Is there life after death?

Leader: I don't know.

Member 2: Like it is now?

Leader: Like it is now, or different? Is there something?

Member 2: There's something. Nothing just begins and ends.

Leader: Wait. It's just that you're not here. Is there something after death? You're saying there is something.

Member 2: Yeah, I don't know what it is, there's some kind of continuity, I'm sure. Everything moves that way. You're born, you die, you move like that, you have to be born again, I guess.

Leader: Anyone, do you want to comment on that?

Member 3: I was thinking that if someone told me there was life after death, it wouldn't make me want to live any more, than, if I was told there was absolutely nothing after death, I would want to live more than if I were told there was something there. In my mind.

Leader: How about the religious belief of everything we do is for the life after death:

* * * * * Silence

Leader: What's happening:

Laughter

Leader: How does that sit with anyone? Reaction, feelings on it. What can you do here if there is no life after death? What is your whole existence for?

Silence

Leader: What are you feeling?

Member 2: It's a funny question once you think about it.

Leader: Why is it funny?

VITA

Kenneth W. Gilstein

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: The Effects of Leadership Style on Group Interaction in Differing Socio-political Subcultures

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born in Brooklyn, New York, April 29, 1949.

Education: Graduated from Erasmus Hall High School, in Brooklyn, New York, in 1966; received the Bachelor of Arts degree from Cornell University, with a major in Neurobiology and Behavior, in 1970; received the Master of Science degree from the University of Bridgeport, specializing in General-Theoretical Psychology, in 1973; will complete the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree in Psychology, with emphasis in Professional-Scientific Psychology (a combination of clinical, counseling and school psychology), in 1976.

Professional Experience: 1974-75, teaching assistant in psychology at Utah State University; 1974-75, youth counselor for the Logan City Police Department; 1974-75, head coach--Utah State University Lacrosse Team; 1974, career education counselor for the Logan City Board of Education; 1972-73, head coach--Fairfield University Lacrosse Team; 1970-71, national representative for Pi Lambda Phi Fraternity.