

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ENCOUNTER GROUP PHENOMENON:
ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIETY AND OUR EDUCATION SYSTEM

by

MARGARET WOOD

B.A., University of Wales, 1963

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Faculty

of

Education

ACCEPTED

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

DEAN

DATE

30 May/74

We accept this thesis as conforming
to the required standard

© MARGARET WOOD, 1974

UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA

April 1974

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced
in whole or in part, by mimeograph or other means,
without the permission of the author.

Joint Supervisors: Dr. Margaret A. McHugh and
Dr. Vance Peavy

ABSTRACT

The term "encounter group" was examined in the literature in terms of its methods, processes and outcomes. In spite of the diversity of techniques, theoretical positions, and leadership styles, it was possible to identify certain characteristics common to all such groups. These were their small size (usually six to twelve members); the members are usually the "normals" of our population, not judged to be emotionally "sick"; the group is relatively unstructured; it uses the feelings and interactions of group members as the focus of interaction; value is placed on openness, honesty, and the expression of emotion; and the principal purpose is to promote personal growth and the development of human potential. The chief encounter technologies were identified and described in eleven categories.

The meaning of "encounter" was traced in the philosophy of dialogue of Martin Buber. He expressed the need of modern man "to be a person again," to establish genuine dialogue between man and man, and he described in detail the I-Thou relationship through which real communication is established. This philosophy the encounter movement has embraced.

The historical roots of the encounter group were traced from the first T-group meeting at Bethel, Maine, in 1947, through the period of rapid expansion and experimentation in the 1960's to the present time of assessment and consolidation. The influences on the encounter movement from the various fields of therapy were examined, and Moreno's work in psychodrama was described as the most pervasive influence on encounter techniques.

Finally, current research on encounter groups was investigated in an effort to assess their value and effectiveness. Special attention was given to the issues of leadership, hazards, and outcomes of groups. It was found that encounter groups have only limited effectiveness as agents of change, though the successfulness of groups varied greatly; and under some kinds of leadership groups can be dangerous. In order to improve the effectiveness of groups there needs to be a better definition of how people change and of the requisite techniques to achieve this end. However, such groups were found to be highly successful in providing members with a brief, intense, generally enjoyable experience; a feeling of warmth, intimacy, and closeness with others. As such they were seen to provide an escape from the modern curse of loneliness and alienation.

The encounter group, thus defined, and its value and effectiveness assessed, was viewed with regard to its use in

education. It was seen that it has achieved a broad acceptance as belonging in a school or college counselling programme. Many educators, it was observed, also believe that the encounter group can be a means of promoting understanding between generations, between students, administrators, and parents. However, a need for proper forethought, leadership, and definition of goals was advised. Others feel that the spirit of encounter would engender more freedom and creativity in teaching and learning.

It was concluded that the value and effectiveness of encounter groups in society and education must, in the last analysis, be viewed in terms of the sort of individual we value and want to produce. Encounter, it was seen, encourages questioning, openness, honesty, and flexibility whereas society often demands obedience, reticence, stability or sometimes even deceit. The intellectual vigour, idealism, vision and enthusiasm which gave birth to the encounter movement in itself holds promise for man's future. However, it was felt that society's answer to this value question will determine the survival and future usefulness of the encounter group as a social institution.



Dr. Margaret A. McHugh

Dr. Vance Peavy

Dr. Rodger G. Beehler

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	2
	The Significance of the Problem	2
	Specific Purpose and Framework of this Study	7
II	A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	10
	Historical Development of the Encounter Group	10
	Its Relation to the Field of Psychology	11
	The Group Process	13
	1. Methods and Techniques	13
	2. Leadership and Ethics	15
	3. The Outcomes of Groups	17
	Summary	18
	A Categorization of the Chief Encounter Technologies	19
	Characteristics of an Encounter Group . .	23
	The Contribution of this Study	25
	Encounter Groups in Education	27
III	MARTIN BUBER: HIS PHILOSOPHY AND ITS RELATION TO ENCOUNTER	28
	Martin Buber: His Philosophy and Encounter	28
	Critique	37

Chapter		Page
IV	ENCOUNTER: A HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT IN THERAPY	41
	The Historical Roots	41
	Encounter: Its Development in Therapy . .	47
	Freud	48
	Other Psychoanalysts	49
	The English Branch	50
	Existential Analysis	52
	Moreno	52
	Psychodrama	54
	Social Psychology	56
	Human Relations	57
	Counselling	58
	Gestalt Therapy	59
	Conclusion	60
V	THE PRESENT-DAY ENCOUNTER GROUP: RESEARCH AND ISSUES	61
	Research in Encounter: Special Problems and Scope	61
	Group Leadership: Standards, Research and Issues	67
	Certification and Training	67
	Research	71
	The Design	71
	The Findings	73
	Summary of Findings	79
	Implications for the Leader	80

Chapter	Page
Hazards of Encounter Groups	83
Research Concerning the Incidence of Casualties	83
Findings of Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973)	85
Implications for the Composition of Encounter Groups	89
Outcomes of Encounter Groups	90
Research Concerning Outcomes	90
Findings of Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973)	92
The Group as an Instrument of Learning	96
Summary	97
VI ENCOUNTER: ITS VALUE AND APPLICATION TO EDUCATION	100
A Summary of the Development of Encounter through History, Therapy and Philosophy	101
The Encounter Group in Practice	103
The Encounter Group in Education	109
Conclusion	121
REFERENCES	125

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Sincere thanks are due to my committee chairman, Dr. Margaret McHugh, whose advice and encouragement have been invaluable. I also gratefully acknowledge the contribution of Dr. Vance Peavy, with whom the framework of this study was originally outlined and discussed, and that of Dr. Roger Beehler, whose constructive criticisms have been very helpful.

Without the encouragement of my husband, Colin, this thesis would not have been undertaken, and without his unstinting willingness to share the responsibility of our children's care, it would not have been completed. I give him my especial thanks.

Finally, I extend thanks to the typist, Mrs. Eleanor Lowther, who has worked very hard to complete the manuscript by the due date.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Today there seems to be scarcely anyone who has not heard of the encounter movement and a considerable number of those who have, whether accurately informed or totally misinformed, hold some opinion with regard to the existence, operation, purpose, and effectiveness of encounter groups. Certainly, public interest in, and curiosity about the phenomenon is widespread, but the range of opinion covers as wide a spectrum as do the group experiences themselves. While some proponents insist that encounter will be the salvation of civilization, opponents see it as a new form of "brain-washing" which will result in the undermining of morality, individuality, and even of democracy itself. Which of these views, if either, is accurate, or is there a third image which will emerge from a rational, dispassionate assessment of the movement?

Further confusing the picture is the proliferation of names under which the many and varied "small groups" operate: encounter group, marathon, sensitivity group, T-group, Synanon, personal growth laboratory, non-verbal sensitivity group, self-analytic group and so on, it would seem, ad infinitum. While the movement as a whole is referred to as

the Human Potential Movement, there seems to be a dearth of specific definitions of the term "encounter group." As William Eddy and Bernard Lubin (1971) point out, there has been no systematic attempt to specify methods, processes or outcomes; the term is often used to refer to any small group where "intensive interaction, honest communication, and self revelation [Eddy & Lubin, 1971, p.626]" is emphasized.

Statement of the Problem

In spite of the diversified nature of the encounter group experience, and the lack of empirical research concerning its validity and effectiveness, however, the phenomenon is increasingly coming to play a significant part in the lives of large numbers of people in North America, and, indeed, in many other parts of the world. What implication does encounter have, then, for our society, and can it have a place in our educational system? In view of the need for answers to such questions, this thesis will review certain aspects of encounter and the related research, and thus attempt to assess the value of encounter groups to our society, and particularly to the educational system.

The Significance of the Problem

Its dangers, indeed, are obvious. Fritz Perls himself warns that ". . . we are now entering a new and more dangerous phase. We are entering the phase of turner-oners; turn on to instant cure, instant joy, instant sensory awareness.

We are entering the phase of the quacks and the con-men, who think if you get some break-through, you are cured--disregarding any growth requirements, disregarding any of the real potential . . . [1969, p.1]." Again, Dreyfus and Kremenliev (1970) fear that many group leaders apply techniques indiscriminately and because they are "in," rather than to engage participants in real relationships. Such people may in fact have an underlying fear of closeness, warmth and intimacy and under their direction "group behaviour can become a new form of phoniness [p.281]." They feel, therefore, that "our present concern should be first for containment and next for accelerated--but responsible--and supervised training of leaders [p.282]," for, as Peavy (1971) concurs, the safety of the encounter group is directly related to the skill and sensitivity of its leader.

In view of the "fashionable" nature of encounter groups, Mahler sees the necessity of pointing out that it is naive to believe that the mere placing of individuals in a group is good for them. He cautions that a group leader needs a frame of reference, an adequate repertoire of techniques, and special training in group, as opposed to individual, counselling.

Carl Rogers (1970) acknowledges that individuals may be left with strong feelings that need to be worked through. He also admits that some psychotic breakdowns have resulted from participation in groups, but feels that the more

positively the group process has been proceeding, the less likely it is that any individual would be psychologically damaged through membership in a group.

He warns, moreover, that there is a certain danger for married couples if only one belongs to a group. Changes in the behaviour of this individual may be considerable and this may be threatening to his or her partner. Sometimes, too, intimate, warm feelings may be generated between members of a group which may endanger a marriage relationship.

There is, in fact, a consensus among psychologists and group leaders that more research into almost every aspect of the encounter group field is necessary. In the meantime, however, the number of professionally qualified people involved in, and even dedicated to the use of encounter groups, continues to grow. Not one of them believes that the risks posed by the phenomenon outweigh the benefits.

In view of this position, then, the benefits provided by the encounter group, as seen by its practitioners, must indeed be great. William Schutz, for instance, views the "encounter culture," as he terms it, as offering a real alternative to the dominant American culture, to which so many recent objections have been raised. He maintains that to a large extent we have lost the capacity for joy, the feeling that comes from the fulfilment of one's potential. "Joy," Schutz feels, "requires a vital, alive body, self-contentment, productive and satisfying relations with others

and a successful relation to society [1967, p.15]." It is towards the recovery of joy, the attainment of full human potential, that the encounter movement is directed. The goals of encounter, however, are in general not those of society which, as Schutz points out, "seems to place a premium on relationships featuring hypocrisy and superficiality--relationships that are tolerated rather than sources of happiness. Child rearing practices, sexual attitudes, much religious dogma, attitudes toward material achievement, confusion about maleness and femaleness--all coalesce to make it difficult for an individual to learn to know himself, to like himself, to become acquainted with his real feelings and desires, and to learn to use himself effectively and joyously [p.16]."

Again, Carl Rogers (1970) is convinced that the encounter process provides a means of fulfilment which our materialistic, impersonal world cannot otherwise give. He cites, for instance, an implicit goal of the group process, the determination to live life more fully in the here and now, which is consistent with the movement's predominant existential philosophy. Thus the individual learns a greater awareness of his sensory input of sound, taste, hearing, sight, and smell and his life becomes fuller, richer, as a consequence.

The encounter group, moreover, can alleviate loneliness, for it teaches people how to achieve closer, warmer, deeper,

relationships with others. Rogers sees the rapidity with which such relationships can grow as of especial benefit to our society (increasingly mobile and transient); temporary relationships, he feels, will achieve the richness and meaning found previously only in friendships of lifelong duration.

Carl Rogers, finally, sees the group process as providing a possible solution to one other problem of modern man--the incredible rate of change which we each have to try to assimilate. He believes that the encounter group, which permits a person to grow, to risk, to change, can help him cope with "future shock."

If the encounter group, then, has so much to offer to society in general, how great a benefit it would offer to our educational system, deemed by many to be rigid and conservative, and struggling as it is to adapt itself to this rapidly changing modern world! In the increasingly materialistic, depersonalized society in which we live, there is all the more need for young people to learn to build deep, meaningful relationships with others, yet it was reported at the 1968 Systematic Observation Conference held at the University of Florida that less than one-half of one per cent of a teacher's talk was directed to the child's feelings, either negative or positive. Small wonder, then, that Robert D. Myrick (1969) concludes that "loneliness and self-alienation might be considered a major product of our contemporary

schools [p.38]." For years psychologists (Blocher, 1966, 1968; Dinkmeyer, 1966; Erickson, 1963) have emphasized a developmental approach to counselling. A truly developmental approach, Myrick asserts, should focus on the feeling organism, and in this respect, the use of growth groups in the schools could be invaluable.

The educational system is, indeed, beleaguered, by forces both within and without, and all indications are that change is necessary and inevitable. Still, however, there remains a general vagueness concerning the precise meaning of the term "encounter group," the therapeutic and philosophical origins of the movement, and the values, objectives and methods which encounter groups embrace. In view of the risks involved in the use of growth and encounter groups, then, it is of especial concern to educators to ensure that, as Birnbaum (1969) warns, they are not used in the school setting without proper forethought, leadership and follow-up.

Specific Purpose and Framework of this Study

This writer proposes, therefore, through a review of the literature, to describe the historical, philosophical and therapeutic origins of the concept of "encounter." By tracing the historical development of the group concept, isolating the precise meaning of the term as it is used today, and distinguishing between, and categorizing, the various types of small groups in existence, the term "encounter group" will be defined.

The philosophical basis of the concept of encounter will be discussed, with particular reference to that "Existentialist of Dialogue," Martin Buber; and the use of encounter as a technique in therapy, as it first came to be developed by Moreno, will also be described. In view of the length of this dissertation, discussion of the philosophical basis of encounter will be limited to the influence upon it and contribution to it, of Buber's philosophy of dialogue and "social anthropology," excluding other aspects of his work and the ideas of other philosophers. Similarly, Moreno's work, rather than the methods developed by any other leader in this field, will be isolated and discussed since, as the "Father of Psychodrama," and thus of role-playing, his contribution to the field of encounter techniques is a major one. Lastly, in an attempt to assess the content and meaning of the encounter movement, the influence upon, and contributions to its development will be traced in the fields of psychoanalysis, existential analysis, social psychology, human relations, counselling, and Gestalt therapy.

Further, an effort will be made to define and analyze, from the examination of the literature and research, the structure and functioning processes of encounter groups as they presently exist. However, in view of the large amount of material involved, discussion will be limited to the areas deemed by this writer to be most crucial to the assess-

ment of the value of sensitivity training; the issues are those of the leadership, outcomes, and hazards of encounter groups.

Finally, examples of the use of encounter groups in the education system will be sought in the literature and examined for their appropriateness, effectiveness, potentialities and limitations. Their possible contribution to the educational environment will also be discussed.

The dissertation will then have sought to

- a) define what encounter groups are;
- b) interpret them in terms of the concept of encounter described in Martin Buber's philosophy of dialogue;
- c) trace the influence and contributions to their development of various fields of therapy;
- d) ascertain certain aspects of their structure and functioning processes;
- e) examine their relevance to the educational environment.

Hopefully, this research will have illuminated and dispelled some of the myths surrounding the movement, and also enabled some objective evaluation of encounter as a means for improving the well-being of both students and society in general, to be achieved.

CHAPTER II

A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

In view of the general vagueness surrounding the field of encounter group practice, it will be as well, initially, to extrapolate from the literature a definition of the term, and thus isolate the precise area of research to be covered.

Historical Development of the Encounter Group

The origin of the phrase "encounter group" is easily traced. It derives from the term "basic encounter group," used by Carl Rogers, to differentiate a new kind of experience from the traditional T-group. T-groups, which were initiated by the National Training Laboratories in 1947, originally concentrated primarily on group process, that is, on phases of group development (how the group operates), group roles (the roles as facilitator, blocker, scapegoat and so on which participants adopt), the functions of leadership, and the decision-making process. About five years later, however, the T-group began to pay more attention to the psychology of groups, focussing on the individual's personality and personal development.

T-groups today, then, can belong either to the personal growth area or can relate all personal learning to the organizational context, depending on the stated purpose of

the group. Encounter groups, however, are concerned first with individual growth and development; as Max Birnbaum (1969) affirms, they belong in the "para-therapeutic area," that is, parallel to therapy, and involve "therapy for normals [p.96]."*

Its Relation to the Field of Psychology

The word "therapy," however, is in itself controversial. C. A. Mahler (1971) distinguishes between group guidance, group therapy, and group counselling, and considers that "sensitivity training and encounter groups can best be classified as variations of group counseling [p.603]." Group therapy, he stipulates, is aimed at the more disturbed individuals, is concerned with unconscious motivation and may continue for months and even years. Group guidance, on the other hand, is primarily a class or educational experience, involving the giving out of information; topics are discussed generally rather than being specifically directed to each individual, and the major responsibility rests with the teacher. Group counselling, finally, Mahler asserts, is a "social experience that deals with the developmental problems and attitudes of individuals in a secure setting [p.603]."

*As a further refinement of the term "encounter group," it should be observed here, perhaps, that marathons are a variation of encounter groups, the main difference being that marathons are concentrated into a short period of time, such as a weekend, where there is an attempt to achieve an "unremitting intensity of experience [Max Birnbaum]."

It focusses upon the individual and the changing of his behaviour.

Like Birnbaum and Mahler, I. Yalom (1970) also makes a distinction between therapy groups and encounter groups. He notes that the development since 1950 of both groups has been rapid, at times the progress and direction of the two being parallel and at times overlapping. He observes, however, that the therapy group is "a method for effecting therapeutic change in individuals rather than being primarily a vehicle for human closeness and contact [p.385]" as is the encounter group.

Arthur Burton (1969), himself trained as a Freudian, compares and contrasts the therapy of encounter with that of psychoanalysis. Psychotherapy, he feels, is in the long run an intellectual exercise, divorced from life. Encounter, on the other hand, has a wider universality because it is not founded on insight, but upon experiencing. Although this often offends the intellectual, Burton maintains that the "knowing" of the body may be as inherently important as any cognitive closure; that "empathy, intuition, synchronicity, phenomenological intentionality [p.17]" move mountains every day; and that "becoming a joyous adult means that one must learn to transcend reflexes, instincts, drives, and biological programming for beauty, hope, tenderness, love, and compassion [p.18]." In summary, while he feels that the pioneers of encounter offer no great insights to match those

of the founders of psychoanalysis, the "community healing," the joy and growth which people experience as members of encounter groups, might provide the revitalization which the psychoanalytic tradition needs.

The Group Process

When an attempt is made to define the term specifically, however, in terms of methods, processes or outcomes, we discover a lack of stated theory, great diversity of leader styles and little or no research in many areas. These circumstances led Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1970) to conclude that "our analysis to date strongly suggests that a view of encounter groups as a uniform activity is incorrect. It thus appears that the generic title 'encounter groups' covers a wide range of operations by leaders that lead to many kinds of group experiences, and perhaps to many types of learnings [p.496]."

1. Methods and Techniques

Jane Howard, the author of the book Please Touch, in travelling across the United States in an attempt to experience a large variety of encounter groups at the various growth centers now in existence, discovered as many different methods as there are groups and leaders. There is in fact a continuous experimentation with new methods, such as the deepening of sensory awareness, muscular tension and relaxation, guided fantasy, nonverbal games, physical contact,

nudity, meditation, symbolic movement, psychodrama, and role-playing.

V. Peavy (1971) distinguishes between body and sensory awareness groups, which "stress physical awareness and expression through the use of movement, dance, massage, concentration, and sensory stimulation and deprivation"; "sensitivity groups," which "usually combine elements of the encounter group, T-group, and sensory awareness groups"; "Gestalt groups," which "utilize a Gestalt therapeutic approach with a 'therapist' focussing on one person at a time from a diagnostic point of view"; and "Synanon groups," originally constituted specifically to treat drug addiction but now directed towards the general development of honest relationships and new life styles, and which employ "games" involving "direct, unrelenting attacks on the defences and self-defeating behaviours of group members [pp.245-246]."

Significantly, William Schutz (1971) describes the type of group he leads as the "open encounter group" since it is "open to all sorts of methods," "the method is always changing and evolving," and finally, the adjective "open," also "underlines the basic ingredient of the technique, openness and honesty [pp.xiv-xv]." These three conditions, it would seem, are common to almost every type of encounter group.

Each encounter group aims at facilitating personal change and growth and there are varying amounts of pressure towards total self-disclosure. A. H. Maslow (1962) notes

that many participants expect to achieve "peak experiences." As for the duration of a group, here there is no consensus, rather there is constant experimentation, ranging from setting a limit to the group's life at the start, to allowing the process to continue as long as members want.

Furthermore, it can be observed that the cognitive aspects of behaviour are usually devalued, the "intellectualizing" and "distancing" of feelings being frowned upon while a more honest and open expression of emotion is encouraged. Ellis (1969) is an exception in this respect.

In summary, while certain beliefs and goals are shared, the methods and techniques of encounter group practice cover a wide range of experiences and are constantly being experimented with and enlarged upon. On the whole, it would seem that the members of encounter groups seek their own hegemony and set their own conditions of growth.

2. Leadership and Ethics

The position of the leader is a central one in the group's activities and experience but the professional and educational background of these facilitators or trainers, as well as the techniques which they employ, are extremely varied. The group leader accepts responsibility for the safety of the participants, but his function is chiefly one of facilitator, since most encounter groups are relatively unstructured, choosing their own goals and personal directions.

The extremely wide variety of leadership type and style is easily perceived from the excellent verbatim and phenomenological accounts of their own participation in groups which have been provided by some of the best known of encounter group leaders; for example, "Fritz" Perls (1969), Carl Rogers (1970), Terry Banion and April O'Connell (1970).

Arthur Burton (1969) notes, however, that "By and large such groups are not led by psychoanalysts or psychiatrists but by people trained in the social and behavioural sciences [p.8]." There are, in fact, as yet no guidelines laid down regarding the necessary qualifications for encounter group leadership and no license is required to practice. Some encounter leaders are teachers, artists, businessmen, visionaries, and self-healed laymen, all without formal professional ethical indoctrination.

However, even when leaders are highly qualified academically and experientially, it has been shown that they can contribute to the mental breakdown of group members. A study of encounter group casualties, conducted by I. D. Yalom and M. A. Lieberman in 1971, found that "the number and severity of casualties and the manner in which the casualties sustained injury are all highly dependent upon the particular type of encounter group. Some leadership styles result in a high risk group [p.28]." Particularly stressful, it was seen, is "leader style which is characterized by intrusive, aggressive stimulation, by high charisma, by high challenging

and confrontation of each of the members, and by authoritarian control [p.28]."

3. The Outcomes of Groups

In assessing the outcomes of encounter groups we are handicapped by the fact that until recently most practitioners believed that there was no need for normal evaluation since the outcome of such groups was self-evident. There is, in fact, almost no research on the effectiveness of encounter groups or on the duration of effects. A. Burton (1969) reported that his attempt to uncover follow-ups which had been made of encounter group experiences had been nil. Again, the American Psychiatric Association Task Force Report (1970) stated that on the subject of group interrelationships and outcomes there is ". . . distressingly little data [p.16]." The available evidence consists almost entirely of anecdotal reports and loosely designed studies which lack a post group follow-up.

One follow-up study which has been reported however, is that conducted by Carl Rogers (1967) from 2 to 12 months later on 481 individuals who had been in his groups. His results showed that less than one-half of one per cent felt there were changes in their behaviour which they did not like; fourteen per cent saw no change; another fourteen per cent reported change at the time of the group meetings but only a small residual positive effect; and fifty-seven per cent observed a continuing positive difference in their

behaviour.

Further, the results of a long-term follow-up study planned by the Talent in Interpersonal Exploration (TIE) Project at Berkeley, should be forthcoming, and a study conducted by Lieberman et al. has now provided data on the effectiveness of various encounter group methods.

Summary

In summary, however, it can be observed that while there is great diversity in the field of encounter, most encounter groups and leaders share one common factor, and that is a general view of man which grows out of the existentialist-humanist tradition. Eddy and Lubin (1971) state that, "Encounter group practitioners believe that man functions at a small fraction of his potential and that methods which remove blockages and release this potential enable him to integrate at substantially higher levels of functioning [p.329]."

Existentialism and phenomenology, in fact, brought consciousness back into the centre focus of being so that "the client today forces an emphasis upon his phenomenological situation, relatively ignores his specific neurotic symptoms, and will not be put off by analytical interpretations alone [Burton, 1969, p.21]." Thus encounter groups are viewed both by the professional psychologists who lead and write about them, and by the people who choose to belong to such groups, not as a means for psychic treatment, but as

a way of humanizing the dehumanized in marriage, work, recreation, education, and even melioration. Fritz Perls (1969) states this view of the process of the basic encounter group at once more simply and more dramatically: "To suffer one's death and to be reborn is not easy [unpaginated]."

A Categorization of the Chief Encounter Technologies

The practice of "encounter" then, described above in general terms as the development of human potential, is undertaken in groups which adopt a variety of names, techniques, theoretical constructs and emphases. These terms and orientations (compiled with reference to Schutz, 1967; Rogers, 1970; Gibb, 1970; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973) are categorized as follows:

1. National Training Laboratory

(Variously termed the Human Relations Group, T-Group, Sensitivity Training Group.) T-groups originally emphasized human relations skills but they now have a much broader scope. The leader's role is seen as helping members to understand themselves and others within and through the group process. The focus generally is on the group as a whole and on the members' transactions with each other (Rogers, 1970; Schutz, 1967; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

2. Gestalt Therapy

The emphasis is on the Gestalt therapeutic approach,

that is, the wholeness of the individual. Fritz Perls, the founder of the school, established a method whereby the leader concentrates on each individual in the group in turn, but from a diagnostic and therapeutic viewpoint. The goal is to help participants to achieve change by getting them quickly in touch with their feelings and fantasies. Much emphasis is placed on heightened emotionality, on understanding what the body is telling one by its posture and by its numerous autonomic and muscular skeletal messages (Rogers, 1970; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

3. Transactional Analytic

Similar to the Gestalt groups in that the leader "works" with each of the group members in turn. The group process is based on the method of transactional analysis, a term coined by Eric Berne in 1961 which refers to transactions between ego states (parent, child and adult) and the emphasis is usually on identifying such transactions within one individual rather than among individuals (Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

4. Esalen

(E.g. William Schutz's Open Encounter Group, Sensory Awareness Group, Body Awareness Group, Body Movement Group.) The primary aim is the experiencing and deepening of interpersonal relationships and on the liberating of somatic restrictions. The group leader focusses on both the individ-

ual and interpersonal relationships within the group. The emphasis is on physical awareness and expression through movement, spontaneous dance, etc.; on doing and experiencing; the cause, the meaning of blocks, tensions, restrictions is of minor consequence. (Schutz, 1967; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

5. Personal Growth

(E.g. Carl Rogers' Basic Encounter Group, Encounter Group, Western Style NTL Group.) The emphasis is on personal growth rather than on group process. The influence of Carl Rogers' philosophy and experience as a non-directive therapist in one-to-one relationships is strong. The goal is personal growth and development and improvement of interpersonal communication and relationships. This is facilitated by a leader who provides warmth and empathy (Rogers, 1970; Gibb, 1970; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

6. Marathon

George Bach first introduced the idea of a group which meets for twelve, twenty-four or sometimes forty-eight hours almost uninterrupted. In such groups the pace and intensity of interaction is often accelerated, partly through the participants' constant exposure to each other and partly through sheer physical exhaustion. Interpersonal honesty, involvement and confrontation are stressed (Schutz, 1967; Rogers, 1970; Gibb, 1970; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

7. Synanon

The Synanon Group or "game" was developed in the treatment of drug addicts. The game is "put" on each member in turn, when the other participants almost violently attack his defences; once over, the atmosphere changes to one of warm support (Rogers, 1970; Gibb, 1970; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

8. Psychodrama

Some encounter group leaders use predominantly psychodramatic techniques such as role-playing to promote growth. Members of the group act the part of significant others in the life of the chosen individual and also take the place of an audience, and the group leader becomes the director of the drama. Thus each group member in turn is able to act out critical aspects of his life experience; emotions previously hidden or repressed are brought into the open and explored in the safety of the group (Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

9. Psychoanalytically Oriented

Such encounter groups are led by analytically oriented clinicians who focus on the dynamics and the individuals in the group, especially from the perspective of his personal historical development. The emotional intensity of the group tends to be lower and more emphasis is placed on the intellectual mastery of group dynamics as well as inter- and

intra-personal forces operating within the group (Gibb, 1970; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

10. Self-Directed

Some encounter groups are leaderless. Elizabeth Berzon has developed a set of tape recordings which the members may play during group meetings. The tapes use a variety of structured exercises to construct a cohesive, "warm," and unthreatening group climate. The participants are taught through doing as well as through explanations to emphasize relationships, feedback, and reflection (Gibb, 1970; Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973).

11. Inter-personal Skill Group

This approach is the one least concerned with a therapeutic experience and most interested in the study of group functioning and dynamics. Such a group is frequently instituted as part of an academic course in the study of groups, by industry in order to develop more closely knit and effective working teams, or by professional groups for the learning of leadership skills (Rogers, 1970; Gibb, 1970).

Characteristics of an Encounter Group

As can be determined from the above, and as Jack Gibb (1970) has pointed out, the varieties of encounter groups stretch along a continuum from therapy-like groups to groups closely resembling educational instruction. However, in all these encounter technologies with their different emphases

and divergent activities certain common characteristics can be identified. An encounter group:

- 1) Is usually comprised of six to twelve people whose primary purpose is personal growth. The group members are usually not emotionally "sick" in the sense of being psychotic or seriously neurotic; they are, like the large bulk of our population, normals, or normal-neurotics.
- 2) It is relatively unstructured, choosing its own goals and personal directions. It uses the feelings and interactions of group members as the focus of attention. A strong effort is made by members to create an atmosphere of openness and honesty in communicating with each other in order to promote the process of personal growth. Usually a feeling of group solidarity develops and group members are able to use each other very profitably.
- 3) The leader's purpose is to help group members to attain their growth goals. To this end he tries to facilitate the expression of both feelings and thoughts on the part of the group members; he may be silent, supportive, challenging, informative, tough, confrontive, disclosing, tender, insightful, or use any means he judges necessary to promote understanding and change.
- 4) The experience often, though not always, includes some cognitive input.

The intensive group experience occurs as an integral part of the small group process and is common to many differ-

ent approaches (Egan, 1971; Gibb, 1971; Rogers, 1970; Schutz, 1971), it evidences emotional openness, self-disclosure, risk-taking, trust, intimacy, behavioural enactment, feedback, that is, a chance to find out others' usually hidden perceptions and feelings about oneself, an arena in which considerable catharsis can occur, and a willingness to engage and confront others and perhaps to change.

In the literature the terms "T-group" (T for training) and "sensitivity training group" are commonly used for this type of group. In general they are used synonymously with "encounter group." However, "T-group," the original term used by the National Training Laboratories, refers to a number of different types of groups including those oriented more toward organizational dynamics. "Encounter group" is the term more in favour on the West Coast and usually refers more specifically to groups oriented towards individual growth and development. The term "sensitivity training" is used in both senses.

The Contribution of this Study

It is not the purpose of this study to contribute any new research data to the field of encounter groups. Rather, the writer proposes to describe and analyze in more detail that which already exists regarding the processes, method and outcomes of groups. An attempt to synthesize the findings, assessing the benefits and dangers of encounter groups will be made. Considering the small amount of empirical

data as yet available, conclusions will be very tentative and incomplete. However, it should at least be possible to see in which direction the greatest need for further research lies.

The study will also attempt to clarify the general picture of the encounter group scene by tracing the historical development of encounter in the field of therapy, and examining the various theoretical strands in the areas of education, business, psychotherapy, psychodrama and counselling which have contributed to the evolution of the encounter group practice.

The writer believes, too, that the exploration of the concept of encounter as developed by Martin Buber, and its application to the group process, will help to clarify the methods and purpose of encounter groups, and give an indication of what those involved in the encounter movement feel it can achieve in terms of human development. In pursuance of this end, Martin Buber's own works will be cited, in particular, I and Thou (1923, 2nd edn., 1958), the mature expression of his philosophy of dialogue; Between Man and Man (1947) and especially the essays on "Dialogue" and "What Is Man?"; and Buber's The Knowledge of Man (1965), including the introductory essay by Maurice Friedman.

Friedman's book entitled Martin Buber: The Life of Dialogue (1955) and certain sections of the volume entitled To Deny Our Nothingness (1967) also help to elucidate

Buber's idea that every individual has within him the possibility of reaching an authentic human existence in the special way peculiar to him. Finally, M. Diamond's work, Martin Buber: Jewish Existentialist (1960) sheds some light on Buber's outlook as a way of apprehending and deepening every form of experience.

Encounter Groups in Education

The foregoing description and analysis of research, philosophical concepts and techniques related to encounter groups hopefully will enable the appropriateness and value of such groups to education to be assessed. Many writers concerned with the areas of human growth, counselling, and education, such as Carl Rogers (1967), Birnbaum (1969), and Mahler (1971) have endorsed the use of encounter groups in schools and colleges, though occasionally with some reservations and warnings as to their use. The opinions of such psychologists and educators will be reviewed and existing examples of encounter group practice described and evaluated whenever possible.

Certainly, change is inevitable, and if, as E. A. Gendlin (1970) predicts, "we are close to the time when every school system will teach skills of personal problem solving and helpful interacting to everyone, [p.553]" an assessment of the encounter group as an instrument of such education is both necessary and appropriate.

CHAPTER III

MARTIN BUBER: HIS PHILOSOPHY AND ITS RELATION TO ENCOUNTER

Martin Buber: His Philosophy and Encounter

Martin Buber, philosopher and existentialist, was early influenced by the giants of German idealism and romanticism, and by the German mystics, Meister Eckhart and Jacob Boehme; by Hassidism, both its mystical and existential strains; and he enjoyed a complex and many-sided intellectual relationship with such nineteenth century figures as Kierkegaard, Dostoevsky and Nietzsche. Yet Buber's philosophy of dialogue bears the mark of his unique personality and life experience in a way that can be said of the thinking of few other men. Moreover, as T. Banion and A. O'Connell point out (1970), his particular vision "captures in a beautiful way the quality of that unique event we now call 'encounter,' and seems to speak directly to us who live in the late twentieth century [p.130]."

Martin Buber expressed an interpersonal philosophy that is at the root of the search for meaning in group life:

In our age, in which the true meaning of every word is encompassed by delusion and falsehood and the original intention of the human glance is stifled by tenacious mistrust, it is of decisive importance to find again the genuineness of speech and existence as We. . . . Man will not persist in

existence if he does not learn anew to persist in it as a genuine We [1965, p.108].

The heart of Buber's teaching is that all real living is meeting; that "man's being is contained only in community, in the unit of man with man [1947, p.136]."

If the fundamental fact of human existence is "man with man," dialogue is what constitutes the "with" and represents the sphere in which man relates. Buber (1947), however, points out that much dialogue is inauthentic and he distinguishes between three types: genuine dialogue, whether spoken or silent, in which "each of the participants really has in mind the other or others in their present and particular being and turns to them with the intention of establishing a living mutual relation between himself and them"; technical dialogue, "which is prompted solely by the need of objective understanding"; and monologue disguised as dialogue, "in which two or more men, meeting in space, speak each with himself in strangely tortuous and circuitous ways and yet imagine they have escaped the torment of being thrown back on their own resources [p.19]." Buber maintains that the tendency towards "seeming" which prevents true dialogue from being achieved, has its roots in the social wish for confirmation, but also in our social structure and in social customs and habits which demand that we address others in ways which are not meaningful and cause us to relate to others on the basis of our relative status. Thus, for example, a policeman and a radical student might label each

other "pig" and "hippy" respectively, and as a consequence are unable to relate to each other as individuals; the unique person is hidden beneath the appearance, the role, and the status. Too often our values and attitudes stem from the social attitudes of the groups to which we belong rather than from what we genuinely feel to be true, and thus we fail to relate to others honestly because we cannot relate as whole persons.

Buber (1947), therefore, sees the great task of our days as the need "to be a person again, to rescue one's real personal self from the fiery jaws of collectivism, which devours all self-hood [p.111]," and the means to such wholeness and authenticity is genuine dialogue. In this he differs from some of the recent psychologists such as Jung who see individuation and self-actualization as the goal, rather than as the by-product. Buber (1965), rather, affirms that "the inmost growth of the self does not take place as people like to suppose today, in man's relation to himself, . . . but in the making present of another self and in the knowledge that one is made present in his own self by the other [p.71]."

It is in this belief, also, that the encounter group movement functions and, affirming Buber's philosophy, is "concerned with the differences between mere existence and authentic existence, between being human at all and being more fully human, between remaining fragmented and bringing

the conflicting parts of oneself into an active unity, between partial and fuller relationships with others. No one ever becomes a "whole person. But one may move in the direction of greater wholeness through greater awareness and fuller response in each new situation [Friedman, 1967, p.291]."

Buber distinguishes between two types of relation of which men are capable. They are expressed in the primary words I-Thou and I-It and they refer not to the object of the relation but to the nature of the relation itself, or, more explicitly, I-Thou is the primary word of relationship while I-It is the primary word of experiencing and using. I-Thou points to a relation of person to person, of subject to subject, a relation of reciprocity involving "meeting" or "encounter" and is "characterized by mutuality, directness, presentness, intensity, and ineffability [Friedman, 1965, p.12]." I-It, on the other hand, points to a relation of person to thing, subject to object, involving some form of utilization, domination, or control, even if it is only so-called "objective" knowing, and is always mediate and indirect.

Thus the I of I-Thou and the I of I-It are fundamentally different; "In the I-It posture the 'I' holds back, measuring, using, and even seeking to control the object of its attention, but never, as in the I-Thou relation affirming the other just as it is in itself [Diamond, 1960, pp.20-21]."

While the I-Thou relation is one into which man can enter only with the whole of his being, as a genuine person, the I-It relation involves not the whole of a man's being but only a part. Chronological time, therefore, exists only for the I-It relation; the I-Thou experience is concerned wholly with the moment of encounter. When encounter and concentration lessens, the Thou again becomes It. "Meaning," says Buber (1957), "is to be experienced in living action and suffering itself, in the unreduced immediacy of the moment [p.35]."

The I and the Thou of the two primary words, however, can both refer to three spheres, to persons, nature, and "intelligible forms" (works of art, philosophical systems, etc.); it is the relation formed by the 'I' which distinguishes the nature of the primary word. Thus in the I-Thou relation, the relation itself is primary and underived; but in the I-It relation, the components, as it were, precede the relation, and the relation is secondary.

Nevertheless, we cannot experience the I-Thou relation constantly, and neither is the I-It posture evil or negative. It is, in fact, necessary and appropriate to many activities; "through knowledge acquired in detachment, man is able to achieve a reliable perspective on the world and a considerable degree of control over nature [Diamond, 1960, p.22]." The I-It relation must not be used to the exclusion of or even have predominance over the I-Thou, however, for then

man remains absorbed in his own purposes and concerns, regarding individuals as objects to be used rather than confirming and responding to the uniqueness of the people he meets. "Without It man cannot live; but he who lives with It alone is not a man. . . . All real living is meeting [1958, pp.34, 11]."

The I-Thou relation which Martin Buber has described, then, contains the essential elements of the experience known generally as "encounter." In summary, the I-Thou relation, as in encounter, is: mutual, a shared process, an empathy, a feeling of being part of what is happening to someone else: it involves recognition and confirmation of the other in his essential integrity and uniqueness, a Thou: the I-Thou relation, or moment of encounter, occurs only when the whole being is involved, when masks and defences are dropped and when the I and the Thou are united in their mutuality and trust of each other: chronological time, the past, the future, has no significance; only the lived moment is of the essence: dialogue is real and direct; games, pastimes and extraneous matters are discarded and the partners talk of relevant concerns, not avoiding what might be painful or embarrassing: and, finally, every real relation with a being is exclusive, it cannot be shared fully with those who did not actually experience what occurred; it cannot be described completely or defined, only indicated. All in all, the I-Thou relation requires responsibility, and responsibility

". . . means hearing the unreduced claim of the hour and answering it out of the fullness of one's being. [The situation] demands nothing of what is past; it demands presence, responsibility: it demands you [1947, p.114]."

Although Buber's formulations regarding the I-Thou sphere were derived primarily from dyadic relationships, the essay "What Is Common to All" makes clear that his thought is not limited to the relation between one person and another, but encompasses the larger realities of community living. "A man is truly saved from the 'one' not by separation but only by being bound up in genuine communion [1947, p.177]." Buber affirms, moreover, that the uniqueness of man lies not in his ability to reason, but in the fact that he is capable of entering into living relation with the world and things, with men both as individuals and as the many, and with what he terms, "the mystery of being"--which is dimly apparent through all this but infinitely transcends it.

True community, however, only comes about when independent people have come together in essential relation and directness. Thus the "essential We" includes the Thou potentially for "only men who are capable of saying Thou to one another can truly say We with one another [1947, p.176]."

Buber carefully distinguishes between the "interhuman" which is relationship built on true dialogue, the common "speech with meaning," and the "social," which includes all

relationships formed between individuals in a group and which involves the I-It relation very often to the exclusion of the I-Thou, one person treating the other as an object to be manipulated and used rather than as someone to be experienced and confirmed in his being. As Maurice Friedman (1955) points out, "In an era in which the direction of the group in general has been towards the suppression of these elements of personal relation in favour of the elements of pure collectivity, this distinction is of the greatest importance [p.25]." Friedman, like Buber, views collectivism whether that of the left (Communism, or, to a lesser extent, the Western Socialist states) or that of the right (Nazism), as being the "last barrier raised by man against a meeting with himself [1947, p.201]." Such a regime is dehumanizing since it robs the individual of truth and personal responsibility.

It is this tendency towards isolation of the individual in society, depersonalization and lack of real communication between individuals that the encounter group movement has sought to alleviate and overcome. By forming a group where real listening as well as real talking can take place, people strive to find themselves through authentic dialogue with another, the Thou. "Through the Thou, a man becomes an I [1958, p.28]." As Martin Buber affirms, "The true community does not arise through people having feelings for one another (though indeed not without it), but first, through

their taking their stand in living mutual relation with a living Center, and second, their being in living mutual relation with one another [1958, p.45]."

In one final respect Buber's philosophy shows particular relevance to the concerns of modern man and his efforts to find meaning in his personal existence. Buber's "philosophy of dialogue" is concerned essentially with real questions rather than with philosophical problems, that is, questions which engage the total person rather than the intellect alone and that involve important issues, the very nature and destiny of mankind. At a time when Western man is enjoying more material wealth and leisure time than ever before these fundamental issues of human existence are becoming an ever greater concern.

Buber defines his "philosophical anthropology" as the study of "the wholeness of man," and lists the following as among the problems "which are implicitly set up at the same time by this question"; ". . . man's special place in the cosmos, his connexion with destiny, his relation to the world of things, his understanding of his fellow men, his existence as a being that knows it must die, his attitude in the ordinary and extraordinary encounters with the mystery with which his life is shot through [1947, p.45]." Thus his philosophical anthropology poses the "problem of finding the human in the constant flux of individuals and cultures [Friedman, 1965, p.15]" and gives a twofold answer to what

man is; "Man's existence is constituted by his participation at the same time and in the same actions, in finitude and in infinity; man's uniqueness is determined by the particular, existential characteristics of his relation to 'mystery,' cosmos, destiny, death, things, and man [Friedman, 1965, p.15]."

Buber's approach, then, is one of passionate engagement with regard to life's fundamental issues and he asserts the primacy of actual experience over intellectual speculation. His ethic is a situational ethic of responsibility; "Genuine responsibility exists only where there is real responding [1947, p.16]"; and thus the dialogic man is the man who thinks "existentially," that is, the man "who stakes his life on his thinking [1947, p.81]." Finally, Buber's outlook is existential in that he sees the central task for the individual as striving to achieve authentic selfhood by means of resolute decisions. For "only he who knows relation and knows about the presence of the Thou is capable of decision, [and] he who decides is free [1958, p.51]."

Critique

The question will inevitably be raised, "Why has Martin Buber been singled out as the philosopher whose work contributed most directly and forcefully to the growth of the Human Potential Movement, and particularly to the theory and practice of Encounter?" To some extent this query has already been answered in the body of this paper but the

overall view of the range and nature of Buber's thought compared with that of other philosophers, scientists and psychologists has been stated succinctly by Leslie H. Farber (1957).

The medical and biological sciences were asking, What is man in his relation to nature--to natural history, the evolution of organisms, and the physical forces regulating his body? They were asking, What is man as a natural object, a physical or biological organism? And it was upon this natural basis that all other sciences of man--anthropology, sociology, political science, and finally, the new Freudian science of psychoanalysis--asked their question, What is man? What is the natural man, what is the primitive man, as opposed to the man created by socio-political, cultural and economic forces? What is man in his natural inheritance, in his prehistory as the human animal or primate or primitive, as opposed to his more recent history as a civilized and social being? Thus none of the sciences were asking the whole question, What is man? Nor were they asking the unique question, Who am I, in my uniquely human essence? . . . These are not smaller or more personal questions; they are larger and more comprehensive than the ones which science has been asking. They include a larger view of man, as well as a larger view of history. They include man's personal being--my personal experience and knowledge of myself--as well as my philosophical and scientific knowledge of what "man is" [p.95f.].

Thus Farber has stated Martin Buber's contention, that none of the sciences has asked the question about man in his wholeness that is the central concern of his philosophical anthropology. As Maurice Friedman has pointed out, "Scientific method, in fact, is man's most highly perfected development of the I-It, or subject-object, way of knowing. Its methods of abstracting from the concrete actuality and of largely negating the inevitable difference between observers reduces the I in so far as possible to the abstract

knowing subject and the It in so far as possible to the passive and abstract object of thought [1965, pp.19-20]." Thus the task of discovering the uniqueness of man as man is lost to science, for its concern is with "objective" criterion, comparing men in their similarities and differences with other men and objects but not with man in his wholeness; the I-It, but not the I-Thou.

Buber's philosophy, however, has been criticized from just this point of view, that his lack of an objective criterion for distinguishing between authentic and delusory I-Thou encounters prevents his forming valid judgements with regard to these great issues. But Buber says there is and can be no objective criterion which will establish universal standards of judgement regarding the fundamental issues of human existence, because there are no philosophical arguments, grounded in logic and appealing to sense experience, which can coerce men into uniformity on these matters. It is only the knowing of the I-Thou relation that makes possible the conception of the wholeness of man. This is Buber's "human truth," which "becomes real when one tries to translate one's relationship to truth into the reality of one's own life. And human truth can be communicated only if one throws one's self into the process and answers for it with one's self."*

*Quoted by M. Diamond (1960, p.34) from M. Buber, Israel and the World, Essays in a Time of Crisis (New York: Schocken Books, 1948), p.46. See also Between Man and Man, pp.108ff., 116f.

This standpoint is the "narrow ridge" of which Buber talks, and embodies a reassertion of personal authenticity and an authentic existential relation to truth without falling into irresponsible individualism on the one hand and a doctrinaire absolutism on the other. This is the truth, Buber asserts, which men may live authentically but which they cannot express conclusively. So also "meaning" in his philosophy of dialogue cannot be defined, only indicated. "That meaning is open and accessible in the actual lived concrete does not mean it is to be won and possessed . . . through any type of reflection upon the lived concrete. Meaning is to be experienced in living action and suffering itself, in the unreduced immediacy of the moment [1957, p.35]."

In the final analysis, Buber's thought itself can be appreciated fully only as part of an I-Thou relation, for everything that comes from him bears the mark of his unique personality and life experience and can be understood only in the light of our own wholeness as individuals. M. Diamond (1960) concludes: "Buber uses existential language to call attention to dimensions of existence that we often experience but fail to notice. His thought deepens our recollections of previous I-Thou encounters and points the way to new ones. In the end, the many insights combine into a unified perspective, so that his philosophy of dialogue itself stands before us as a Thou [p.38]."

CHAPTER IV

ENCOUNTER: A HISTORY OF THE MOVEMENT AND ITS DEVELOPMENT IN THERAPY

The Historical Roots

We tend to regard encounter as a modern phenomenon but the roots of sensitivity training are buried very far back in time; it must, in fact, have begun when the first band of men met to resolve their differences through verbal confrontation, that is, through an attempt to understand other men, rather than settling the dispute through physical combat. The basic elements of psychodrama, one of the major techniques in the sensitivity training movement, and one which provides for direct expression of a person's emotional disturbance through a process of "acting-out," were well known to witch doctors and native healers. They would use such methods to create an intense state of excitement and the release of powerful emotions; the 'acting-out' of repressed emotions was practiced and also the sublimating of these feelings in tribal ritualistic ceremony. Similarly, forms of psychodrama and other techniques of group training proved effective in religious conversion and faith healing. As Hendrik M. Ruitenbeek (1970) has observed, "The differences between the revival meeting and the marathon group

therapy, the Living Theatre, a weekend at one of the new institutes such as Esalen, and other forms of therapeutic encounter are largely limited to ideology; otherwise, the quality of the human experience is markedly similar [p.45]."

Human beings, then, have always felt the need for interpersonal sharing and communication, and in different ages these needs have been variously met through such devices as that of Greek drama, the medieval miracle plays, public confessions, religious retreats for the discussion of problems and sins, leaderless groups such as the Quakers instituted, and nineteenth century discussion clubs and societies. More recently, however, an impetus for group discussion and training came from the new emphasis in education. Under the influence of John Dewey, William James, and other leaders of progressive education, the emphasis in learning shifted from the expert-student relationship to a situation of free discussion and give-and-take of ideas and opinions within small groups. Students, increasingly, were encouraged to consider and evaluate their goals and ideals and this led to the development of discussion groups concerned with all areas of life.

Turning peer-oriented discussion groups into a training technique came with the development of the Human Relations Management training programme of the 1920's, from the pioneering work of Elton Mayo and his associates. Consultation services to business, industry, education and social

and religious organizations were developed. The aim was to improve the services of these organizations through greater awareness, appreciation, and the employment of human relations principles. These practices were based largely on an atheoretical, liberal, and pragmatic philosophy, until the impact of Kurt Lewin and his students became prominent in the 1930's and 1940's. Lewin's research was directed by a desire to answer some of the important social needs of the day, and from his and his associates' pioneering studies emerged the group dynamics movement.

It was in 1946 that the first well known forerunner of the present-day encounter group took place. The State of Connecticut had asked a team of social psychologists and educators led by Kurt Lewin to conduct a workshop to train leaders to deal effectively with community interracial tensions. Participants were assigned to small groups for the discussion of problems which the group members had experienced in their home communities. Since an equally important aim of the researchers was to develop techniques in conducting face-to-face groups and to learn more about how they function, in each group recorders kept process records which fed back to the workshop staff in evening planning sessions. One evening three of the group members stayed behind to join in the discussion and it was quickly discovered that their perception of the occurrences in the daytime groups could aid the researchers in their under-

standing of group dynamics, and at the same time the interchange gave the participants insight into their own behaviour and its effect on others and their group problems.

The staff realized they had discovered a powerful technique for human relations training and from this grew the multitude of workshops, laboratories, training programs, books, and tapes, which, in the intervening decades, have promoted the work on feedback, group confrontation, encounter, and process-analysis. The first T-group, then, occurred almost by accident and yet it seemed to encapsulate many of the aspects of the movement whose emergence it announced. As Kurt W. Back has interestingly remarked, "In this incident ideology, pragmatism, opportunism, transcendence, and scientific method form a curious combination which has given its stamp to the movement [p.9]."

The following year at Bethel, Maine, shortly after Lewin's death, the first Human Relations Leadership Conference was held. It was led by Lewin's original workshop staff members, Kenneth Benne, Leland Bradford, and Ronald Lippitt, all of whom became prominent in the sensitivity training movement. The success of the Bethel group in employing group dynamics, psychodrama, and group therapeutic techniques in training leaders quickly stimulated a large following. As a result the National Training Laboratories were established in Washington, D.C., and summer workshops were continued at Bethel. For the most part the group

leaders, or trainers as they are called in T-groups, tend to come from academic rather than clinical settings.

Since 1946, the present-day encounter group has developed in several stages and has derived from many sources. One major development was the growth of the laboratories of the West. Paul Sheats, one of the original staff members of Bethel, left after the first year to go to UCLA and there started the Western Training Laboratory in Group Development. Here the limitation of the use of human relations training to the acquisition of interpersonal and leadership skills began to be questioned. Gradually the goals of the groups were redefined and the emphasis put on "personal growth, development of the full potential of the individual, and the discovery and enjoyment of hidden, untapped resources. The emphasis shifted from learning about people in groups to learning about oneself [Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973, p.5]."

The development of the movement was spurred on by social conditions arising in the aftermath of World War II. As the institutions such as the Church and family which had traditionally provided stability and intimacy broke down, the encounter group became a "social oasis where people could drop the facade of competence demanded by a fast-moving, competitive society, and let loose their doubts, fears and disappointments [Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973, p.5]."

Other forces of impetus derived from the newer psycho-

logies of such men as Rogers and Maslow, which offered a positive, humanistic view of man. As early as 1946 and 1947 Carl Rogers at the University of Chicago had been leading groups oriented primarily towards personal growth and development and the improvement of interpersonal communication. Later he had a leading part in the establishment of the Western Behavioural Science Institute (WBSI) at La Jolla, California, which, primarily through Rogers' influence, became a centre for encounter groups.

At the same time the more traditional psychotherapists were increasingly employing the group method, sometimes simply because of the pressure of people requiring therapy, at others out of a belief in the efficacy of the group as a powerful curative force. The Tavistock (England) brand of sensitivity training influenced by the theories of Bion and Melanie Klein and seen in the U.S. mainly in the work of Margaret Rioch, a clinical psychologist, no doubt contributed to the spread of the movement since her aim was primarily to help professionals in understanding group activity. Rioch's clientele was very restricted, therefore, but consisted of persons who would in turn have influence within the movement.

The 1960's saw a great expansion of the activities of the National Training Laboratory, but the biggest impetus for change and expansion came from the West Coast. In 1962 Esalen was founded in Big Sur Hot Springs and the emphasis was laid on personal growth, the expansion of human potenti-

ality, and encounter. Other derivative streams rose simultaneously but independently: Synanon, Gestalt therapy, the Marathon, alternate life systems, and others, sprang into being.

Thus by 1967 the T-group, rechristened by Carl Rogers as the basic encounter group, movement had reached epidemic proportions. Not until 1971 were there any signs that the different branches of the movement thought it necessary to assess the effects of this sudden expansion and change. Now, however, sensitivity training has arrived as a cultural force, and at last the process of assessment and evaluation is underway.

Encounter: Its Development in Therapy

A pertinent question at this point would seem to be, why did sensitivity training arise when it did? One obvious answer lies in the needs of society; alienated and confused by the rapidly changing world in the aftermath of World War II, people began to search for an antidote to the ills and miseries which accompanied this time of social reconstruction, affluence, and mobility. As Kurt W. Back (1972) postulates, "Sensitivity training may be more a symptom of what ails society than a cure for its ills [p.46]." At the same time, however, the movement was spurred on by an increase in the knowledge of social psychology and the techniques that had developed in the field of therapy, and it is these influences on sensitivity training which will now be

traced.

Freud

Freud, in the direct sense, had little to do with the growth of group psychotherapy; he wrote little directly on group interaction and social psychology, and indeed, his philosophy is in part quite opposed to that of sensitivity training; all branches of sensitivity training, for instance, are much more accepting of the unconscious drives in man which Freud felt needed to be controlled. However, Freud's influence while often indirect has become so pervasive that all the theories in sensitivity training recognize the importance of his findings.

Many of his theories have, in fact, become so generally known and accepted as to become a part of the culture, especially of social science; the fact, for instance, that a person does not necessarily mean what he says, that acts and words or mistakes in words can be seen as a revelation of the person, that a person may be acting out in therapy an unresolved problem, and that this acting out will occur in an interpersonal context.

Another general Freudian influence can be seen in the frank acceptance of both sexuality and aggression in current society. However, an important distinction between Freudian theory and the work in sensitivity training is that the latter "would not accept all attractions as sexual and, rather than equating aggression with the death instinct,

would accept aggression as an important concomitant of positive effect [Back, 1972, p.90]."

On the one hand, then, while many of the human potential centres express a great contempt for theory, and put marked emphasis on the here-and-now as opposed to the past, early memories, or anything outside the group, Freud's influence remains, if only as a standard to measure oneself against, or as an old idea to be overcome.

Other Psychoanalysts

A more direct psychoanalytic influence was exerted by some of Freud's less orthodox followers. Before World War I there were several physicians in the United States who began independently to use group psychotherapy approaches. E. W. Lazell, who worked with schizophrenics in groups, L. Cody Marsh, who employed religious revival techniques with psychotics, and Trigant Burrows, one of the early founders of psychoanalysis proper in the United States, all became dissatisfied with the emphasis placed on the individual and felt a need to use the therapy of a group as an essential part of the analysis.

More importantly perhaps, Wilhelm Reich altered classical psychoanalytic theory in two ways. In the first place, he stressed the necessity of sexual enjoyment for a full life, emphasizing in his work bodily, sensual, and sexual expression. It is on the work of one of Reich's students, Alexander Lowen, that the regime of physical exercise in

encounter centres is partly based.

Secondly, Reich concerned himself with the study of the character rather than with narrowly defined neurotic symptoms. This shift in emphasis is reflected in the diagnosis of behaviour within the group as revealing a person's character, his difficulties, and his potentialities. Furthermore, it is Kurt W. Back's contention (1972) that the origins for the claims of sensitivity training "to bring about social change and release physical and mental creativity can be seen in Reich's interest in social conditions, especially the influence of social repression on family and on personal and sexual development [p.92]."

The English Branch

Some interesting theories and practices were being developed at the same time by psychologists in Britain. Links with the new encounter techniques can be seen, for instance, in the work of Melanie Klein and her colleague, W. R. Bion. One characteristic of Klein's technique was a lack of emphasis on childhood experiences and a concentration on feelings during therapy sessions: from this developed the here-and-now orientation of the Tavistock Institute.

Bion, although an admirer of Freud, became dissatisfied with the prevailing psychoanalytic conception and understanding of groups, and developed a series of rather complex hypotheses concerning the processes he believed present in all groups. He considered that balance, and the ability to

function properly, for a group as for an individual, depended on a balance of leadership, pairing, and aggression. Bion provided his groups with no direction or structure, and the patient's reactions to this lack of structure, his anger or confusion, was the material initially used for exploration. This, as Ruitenbeek (1970) points out, "comes very close to situations that arise in current encounter groups, where structure or directions are ignored and where material is produced right there and interpreted on the spot [p.23]."

Bion's technique, heavily informed by psychoanalytic thinking and developed as a method to study men under stress, is at variance with, and perhaps opposed to, the T-group approach. The T-group method, based on group dynamics principles, was originally aimed at training men to work more cooperatively and democratically with one another, perhaps often at the cost of their understanding of why the tensions were generated in the first place. However, as we have seen, the T-group approach has in different centres developed a greater emphasis towards personal growth rather than on group dynamics. Again, the Kleinian influence and the Reichian have led to extreme differences in their techniques of sensitivity training. While in England the movement has been on the whole restricted to professional activity and to the treatment of specific problems, Reich's influence on American encounter has been towards its popularization and recruitment to a social movement.

Existential Analysis

In one way or another, then, it was becoming clear that traditional psychotherapy was not meeting the needs of modern man. In many ways existential analysis, as developed by Binswanger, Boss, Merleau-Ponty, and in America by Rollo May, has served to bridge the gap between orthodox analysis and the crisis of man in Western society in mid-century. These men recognized the despair, alienation, the ontological insecurity (as R. D. Laing has called it) and the deeper identity crisis which has beset us in the last decades. They paved the way to the encounter therapies which recognize the desire of the patient to be himself, a person, who can choose and decide for himself and himself alone. Thus the new therapies do not necessarily reject the old ones, but they do offer some new and unorthodox ways of dealing with a person's problems.

Moreno

No discussion of the influences on encounter therapy would be complete without mention of Jacob Moreno, an early psychotherapist and rival to Freud, who developed his own unorthodox concepts and novel techniques. Moreno claims that his use of group therapy dates as far back as 1910 and he is believed to have coined the terms "encounter" and "role-playing." Certainly, while he and his followers have always stayed apart from the orthodox movements in psychoanalysis and in sensitivity training, he has influenced both

and has been active as a link between psychiatric treatment and small group techniques. Back (1972) states that Moreno was "one of the precursors of sensitivity training both in specific techniques and in general underlying philosophy and has prepared the theory for much of what goes on today in encounter groups and sensitivity training [p.96]."

As early as 1912 Moreno published in Vienna the first of a series of poetic writings entitled "Einladung zu einer Begegnung" (Invitation to an Encounter), which is evidently the first literary definition of encounter. In his early writings, too, an awareness of the sensitivity concept is already evident where he writes, for example:

There are actors who are connected with one another by an invisible correspondence of feelings, who have a sort of heightened sensitivity for their mutual inner processes, one gesture is sufficient and often they do not look at one another, they communicate through a new sense as if by a medial understanding [1947, p.68].

Moreno himself feels that his concept of encounter, developed as early as 1914, was the forerunner of Austrian existentialism but also of the creative movement of group psychotherapy and psychodrama. As he states, "The meaning of the encounter definition indicates confrontation, a positive correlation between encounter and sensitivity; sociometry, psychodrama and group psychotherapy have served as instruments to facilitate them [1969, p.8]."

Furthermore, Moreno has some direct influence on many of the people connected with sensitivity training. Gott-

schalk and Pattison (1969) point out that three of the leaders at Bethel, Leland Bradford, Ronald Lippitt and Kenneth Benne, had been exposed to and influenced by J. L. Moreno's methods of psychodrama and had experimented with various role-playing procedures in community educational projects directed towards effecting social change.

Psychodrama

Moreno's work in the United States began in the early 1930's in Saint Elizabeth's Hospital, Washington, D.C., where the first American psychodramatic stage was built and since then large numbers of people have had at least some contact with it. As Moreno points out, the psychodramatic method of training groups and individuals has its roots in the drama of ancient Greece. "Drama," he states (1947), "is a transliteration of the Greek word which means 'action', or a thing done. Psychodrama can be defined, therefore, as the science which explores the Truth by dramatic methods."

Moreno has developed the psychodramatic method and used it in a number of ways, from individual psychotherapy to situations called "sociodramas," in which he had tried to induce the American nation to resolve its guilt over the assassination of J. F. Kennedy and Russia to repudiate the crimes of Khrushchev.

Psychodrama uses mainly five instruments, the stage, the subject or patient, the director, the staff of therapeutic aides, or as they are termed, auxiliary egos, and the

audience. The stage provides an opportunity for the direct expression of the patient's emotional disturbance, for he is encouraged to act out the various life situations related to his difficulties. The director serves as a kind of producer and therapist. He must keep the actor in rapport with the audience, he must relate to the patient, and must interpret. The auxiliary egos are extensions of the director, portraying the imagined or real persons in the patient's life drama. The audience, finally, is a sounding board of public opinion, and may well be called upon to participate in the action. Thus, in a theatrical setting, the patient is able to share feelings about himself and others which he was previously unable to communicate, and also appropriately to modify or justify them.

The technique of role-playing developed from psychodrama, though Moreno regarded the two techniques as an inseparable whole, and has been incorporated into most of the other group training approaches such as T-group, Gestalt group, Marathon groups, Encounter groups and so on. Moreno also emphasized the need for spontaneity, believing that it could be developed by various techniques, including the acting-out of feelings; he felt that the more spontaneity in action the patient showed, the more clearly his problems could be demonstrated to the psychiatrist and be influenced by him.

Early sensitivity training designs made extensive use

of sociodramatic procedures, including role-playing, role reversal, soliloquy, and so forth, as originally described by Moreno. Today, however, the psychodramatic school stands somewhat separate from the work in sensitivity training; psychodrama in many ways seems to be more like therapy than like sensitivity training, that is, a psychiatric technique including specific rules of procedure, of initiating therapy, choice of techniques at different stages of the process, the procedure of termination, and, finally, the therapist being responsible for the whole process.

Nevertheless, Back (1972) contends "Psychodrama, sociometry, the cult of spontaneity, the notion of encounter, the term 'here and now,' and the acceptance of psychotic states as valid states of the individual all seem to be derived from Moreno's work [p.97]." There can be no doubt that the influence of Moreno on both sensitivity training techniques and theory is considerable.

Social Psychology

The theorist who most directly influenced sensitivity training from a social psychology point of view is Kurt Lewin, whose work in establishing the National Training Laboratory has already been outlined. His field theory was applied to the use of groups and provided a conceptual base for handling groups as units and for seeing the individual as part of a group. He also developed a general theory of change which he applied in groups. After Lewin's death, two branches of

group dynamics founded by him could be distinguished, one of which, as Back (1972) pointed out "adhered to more theoretical formulations such as communication, influence, cohesion, group structure and power; and the other which ventured into industrial applications and finally led to sensitivity training [p.98]."

Human Relations

In the late 1920's and early 1930's new theories of management began to emerge which foreshadowed the principles of sensitivity training. Back (1972) has pointed out that it was largely as a response to the Hawthorne (Westinghouse) studies, which showed that increase in production was related more to the workers' motivation than to physical conditions, that the new school of human relations began to emphasize mainly the motivations of the workers, their integration into the business, and a concern for the problems of the workers as human beings. One of the early theorists in the human relations field whose ideas had a direct influence on the start of the National Training Laboratory, was Douglas McGregor. He put into practice the new emotional techniques of teaching such as role-playing, discussion groups and unguided problem solving, all of which were also adopted originally at Bethel. The human relations approach to management thus paved the way for the treatment of large-scale organizational problems in small groups.

Counselling

At the same time new theories of counselling, particularly the work of Carl R. Rogers, began to obscure the line between therapy and sensitivity training. He felt that a great many of his patients, many of whom were above average college students with minor problems, could best be helped by giving them a chance to express themselves in a warm supportive climate provided by the counsellor. In such an atmosphere, he believed, the essentially normal but frequently disturbed, lonely, or alienated individual, could achieve insight into his problems and better self-expression.

Carl Rogers himself had been applying such ideas to work in groups since immediately after World War II when he and his colleagues at the University of Chicago Counseling Center became involved in training personal counsellors for the returning GI's. The emphasis in these Chicago groups was placed on personal growth and development and the improvement of interpersonal communication and relationships, rather than these being secondary aims. They also had more of an experiential and therapeutic orientation than the NTL groups at Bethel. As Rogers himself states (1970), "the emphasis in the Chicago experience has gradually become imbedded in the whole movement involving the intensive group experience. . . . Over the years this orientation towards personal and therapeutic growth has become merged with the focus of training in human relations skills, and the two combined

form the core of the trend which is spreading so rapidly [p.4]."

Gestalt Therapy

It was in the 1960's that the influence of Gestalt Therapy came to be strongly felt in sensitivity training for it has taken precedence over the work now being done at Esalen. Gestalt therapy has its roots in the early work of Kurt Goldstein, but also draws significantly from the work of the existentialists; both sources stress the here-and-now situation and emphasize the relation to one's self rather than to the past or future.

Three people stand out in the Esalen experience and as exponents of Gestalt therapy: Fritz Perls, whose book Gestalt Therapy Verbatim (1969) describes Gestalt-type encounter sessions, William Schutz, whose book Joy (1967) has become one of the standard works for Esalen and for the whole encounter experience in the United States, and Bernard Gunther, whose book Sense Relaxation (1968) completes the threesome. While the techniques used by the Gestalt therapists are varied and include psychodrama, relaxation exercises, touching and de-emphasis on life history, the aim of all is to get patients to react to their feelings in a here-and-now situation. Thus the influence of Gestalt therapy in sensitivity training has been to move the emphasis from the verbal to the non-verbal approach and to a preoccupation with the Now.

Conclusion

As it has been illustrated, the origins of sensitivity training in the field of therapy are many and varied and perhaps it is still too soon to single out specific influences and pioneers in this field. Some of the historical roots of the new group therapies could no doubt be traced to sources as diverse as the nature of the American character or the events of the immediate past. However, as Ruitenbeek (1970) concludes;

The historical roots of a lot of the group therapies is not so much a matter of the trends of the past but much more the failure of individual therapy to come to terms with the new trends of society, especially in terms of the new patients. . . . The designs of society and character have changed considerably over the past fifty years, and it is no wonder that each new decade brings us new openings, inventions, and opportunities in the field of psychotherapy in general [pp.55-56].

CHAPTER V

THE PRESENT-DAY ENCOUNTER GROUP: RESEARCH AND ISSUES

Research in Encounter: Special Problems and Scope

By its very nature, the field of encounter with its emphasis on spontaneity and experimentation, and its anti-intellectual flavour, is uncondusive to rigorous research. Many leaders and participants in encounter groups consider that the very attempt to define and analyze the phenomenon would destroy the experience. In addition, sensitivity training research suffers the problems evident in studies in education, counselling, and therapy; that is, problems of when to measure, how to measure, and what to measure.

However, as the proliferation of encounter groups snowballed in the 1960's, there was evidenced among professionals an increasing concern for the definition and assessment of developments in the movement. In 1969 the American Psychiatric Association established a task force to survey the present state of knowledge in the area. The task force report ("Encounter Groups and Psychiatry," 1970) emphasized that, despite strongly held opinions, there was virtually no controlled research in the field. The literature consisted primarily of anecdotal reports or non-systematic evaluations lacking even meagre follow-up study. The little available

outcome research, and that often without adequate controls, involved National Training Laboratory groups generally led by trained professional behavioural scientists; there had been no attempt to assess the effects of the new encounter group formats.

In 1970, J. R. Gibb reviewed one hundred and six such sensitivity training studies and concluded that, "When [sensitivity training research is] compared with the standards of research in the psychological laboratory and with the desirability of definitive statements about the effects of training, the methodological impurities of the studies loom large and the results are disappointingly equivocal [p.842]." He emphasized too that new methods remained untested and that there was a lack of cross-fertilization between sensitivity training theory and practice, and research. He condemned also the unsystematic nature of the research, describing much of it as "opportunistically empirical," and lacking an "integrating or programmatic directionality [p.842]."

The research design, Gibb felt, was often hampered by the fact that training group environments are determined by training criteria rather than research criteria. In most cases the researcher had settled for the best of poor design alternatives or outcome measures which were permitted by such factors as "expense, training conditions, participant resistance, and imprecise instruments [p.842]."

A further design problem which Gibb noted was the difficulty in finding or constructing adequate control groups. If the interpretation of results is to be accurate, then the random assignment of subjects to the experimental and control groups is highly desirable. One effective practical solution to this problem was first used by Miles (1960), and later by others (Bunker, 1965; Valiquet, 1964). Each participant in the training group was asked to nominate a "control" person who occupied a similar organizational role and who had not participated in training. Again, in a study involving marathon groups, Yalom and Lieberman (1971) solved the control group problem by randomly assigning subjects to experimental and control groups from a large initial sample of volunteers for the same type of experience.

A final deficiency in the training designs reviewed by Gibb was a lack of "representativeness"; that is, researchers reduced the generality of their results by studying only one trainer, one organization, or one training environment. A related problem was noted by Foster, Marks and Conry (1972). They commented that objectivity was reduced by the multiple role of E as investigator, as part of the treatment (group leader), and as judge and scorer of the criterion measure, as in a study by J. F. Guinan, and M. C. Foulds (1970).

The final problem area which Gibb pointed out in his review was that of measurement. He states that the more reliable measures are often of trivial outcomes; that the

reliable measures are often not validated against acceptable indices of mental health, personal growth or personal effectiveness in a natural setting; and that the measurement often affects the process itself in indeterminable ways.

Nevertheless, in spite of all the shortcomings of the existing research, Gibb felt it was possible to make some statements about the practice and outcomes of sensitivity training. He believed that the research evidence indicates that the reputed dangers of sensitivity training are greatly exaggerated. Gibb's own bias can be seen here, however, since he cites as part of the support for his statement a study reported by Batchelder and Hardy (1968). He states that out of twelve hundred YMCA directors who had intensive experiences in sensitivity training, only four cases could be found to have negative outcomes. On closer investigation, however, it becomes clear that only sixteen of the twelve hundred who participated were interviewed and no systematic inquiry into negative reactions was in fact undertaken by the original investigators. Some outcome studies do, in fact, show negative results (Wedel, 1957; Kassarjian, 1965; Kernan, 1963) or negative effects (Yalom & Lieberman, 1971), including the most recent and most rigorous research study (Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973) which will be discussed in a later section of this chapter.

Gibb further points out that the group, qua group, according to the research evidence, can be a change-inductive

milieu and that the training group is something more than training individuals in a group setting. The studies show that groups grow under a variety of conditions, with or without leaders, and when this growth occurs, behaviour change can happen. The behaviour of the trainer, however, can make a difference. Gibb concludes that his influence is determined in part by the amount of self-disclosure, help-orientation, participation in person-oriented feedback, and process interventions which occur. The latest research (Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973) has been able to make specific measurements and predictions concerning leadership behaviour and of the effects of trainer styles, data for which was not available at the time of Gibb's review. Other gaps in our knowledge were also pointed out by Gibb; these concerned the optimum duration of training, the best temporal patterns to be followed in planning sessions, the composition of groups, and whether membership should be restricted and participants screened.

In summary, then, the research problems and needs in the field of encounter are many and great. Vast areas remain unexplored; these need to be defined, specific questions formulated, and the subsequent investigation conducted in a disciplined and rigorous manner. The collection of data should err on the side of too many to be handled rather than too few to be meaningful; the consequent "data bank" can then be drawn upon as issues and questions which might

have been unanticipated in the planning stage arise out of the analysis.

The evaluation of the encounter group experience should be through multiple measures of change; that is, not only through the eyes of participants, but also through those of the leaders, the co-participants, and friends of participants who might be sensitive to some of its effects upon group members. Such assessment should, moreover, be conducted at various time intervals, so that both the immediate impact and the long-term maintenance of learning and change can be measured. Finally, the measurement of the relevant phenomena which has tended to be "imprecise, uncertain, incomplete, and difficult [Thoresen, 1969, p.268]" must be improved. Many good measurement instruments have already been developed and others will have to be developed as the necessity occurs.

Since Gibb's 1970 review of the research, one large-scale, comprehensive research investigation of the intensive group experience which meets most of the above stated requirements has been conducted and published (though others are being conducted, for example, the Talent in Interpersonal Exploration [TIE] project) and it is this study (Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973) which will be examined in detail in the following sections of the chapter. In view of the large amount of material involved, discussion will be limited to the areas deemed by this writer to be most crucial to the

assessment of the value of sensitivity training; the issues are those of the leadership, outcomes, and hazards of encounter groups.

Group Leadership: Standards, Research and Issues

Certification and Training

Recent years have seen growing preoccupation in the encounter group movement with self-examination. Partly in response to public criticism and efforts by governmental and other public bodies to develop and enforce legal standards, and partly as a result of internal pressure towards achieving a more certain direction, purpose, and improved results, the establishment of professional standards of leadership has become an issue of especial concern.

Although the National Training Laboratory network "in some sense performed a circumscribed certifying function [Massarik, 1972, p.74]" it did not establish itself as a far-ranging standards-setting instrument; it was the International Association of Applied Social Scientists or IAASS, founded in 1971, which undertook this difficult task.

The problems inherent in setting standards for encounter group leaders reflect the newness and complexities of the movement itself. Sensitivity training encompasses a wide variety of groups and group methods, and a correspondingly vast number of associated source disciplines including such diverse fields as social psychology, sociology, cultural

anthropology, philosophy, theology, and sometimes political science, economics, physiology and others.

Furthermore, as William Schutz (1971) points out, effective licensing depends on knowing how to evaluate group leaders, which in turn relies on the knowledge of how to train group leaders. Owing to the paucity of research in this area Schutz, in spite of his own experience, confessed that his own ideas on this subject were vague and that others, he believed, had no more knowledge than he. "Not only are criteria of group leader competence unclear," he maintains, but "it's not even certain that there should be one criterion for qualifying leaders without considering the jobs they are to do [1971, p.251]"; that is, whether it be a weekend workshop, a couples group, a group for high school and college students, or for professionals, or perhaps a black-white encounter group. In other words, perhaps different leadership skills, competencies and personalities are required for different types of groups.

However, in spite of the difficulties, many encounter group leaders such as Massarik (1972) and Schutz (1971) have tentatively suggested a set of guidelines and requirements for leadership training and certification and IAASS is exploring the concept of constructing a portfolio on each applicant based on data from several sources. On examination, the suggested standards criteria form a constellation of requirements; these include:

1. Conceptual knowledge. Massarik maintains that the appropriateness and breadth of the applicant's conceptual knowledge must be considered, together with his formal education and its current relevance to his work, and also non-formal educational experience possibly resulting in conceptual learning. Schutz suggests that a group leader should have an intellectual understanding of the major schools of psychotherapy, the major personality theories, group dynamics and group therapy, psychosomatic medicine, anatomy and physiology, and inductive logic.

2. Training experience. This should include participation in groups as a member, as a leader under supervision, and as a co-leader with an experienced professional.

3. Technical skill. The many methods of encounter all have their skills and techniques that are applied to effect the desired outcomes. Schutz recommends that the prospective leader undergo experiences, workshops and readings which include psychodrama, fantasy, bioenergetic exercises, Rolf treatments, body movement workshops, breathing, sensory and body awareness, theatre games, hypnotism, psychomotor therapy, massage, gestalt training, mysticism, meditation and yoga.

4. Humanness. This is the word Massarik uses to describe the individual's "presence-as-a-person, the essence of his existential sense-of-being, interpersonally manifest [p.79]" which, he believes, is the crucial force in the

group situation. Through his "total personness," Massarik maintains, "he communicates significant values and behavior styles, possibilities for change and demonstrates potential change modalities [p.79]." The selection of trainees, Schutz too believes, should be determined by the individual's personal qualities, such as self-insight, intelligence, mental health, sensitivity to others, and perceptiveness.

The evaluation procedures, finally, must draw on many data sources, such as the leader's own evaluations, the evaluations of his peers, the evaluations of group participants, and "objective" inputs, for instance, information on formal education, training experience and so on. The IAASS has already taken some steps towards establishing such certification criteria and procedures. A charter member category has been created, based on peer nominations and using the following criteria: outstanding professional competence in the practice of applied social science; professional practice, to which he or she devotes a large proportion of time, and which reveals high standards of ethical and responsible conduct; and an active and substantial contribution to the training of other professionals. From this group a standards and admissions committee has been chosen.

Unfortunately, no institution as yet offers such a comprehensive and exhaustive training as that described above as desirable for an encounter group leader; as William

Schutz points out, not even Esalen can provide so complete an experience. Moreover, many aspects of encounter group leadership remain vague and undefined; what, for instance, are the precise functions of a leader in the group, are they mainly direct through the influence of his personality on individuals or perhaps indirect as a facilitator of group process and social interaction; how far is success in a group related to a particular theory or technique; which particular leader behaviours, if any, affect outcomes; and how much responsibility does the leader have for the safety of group members?

Only when such questions have been satisfactorily answered will the training and certification of leaders be truly meaningful. Progress in this area, then, requires rigorous and comprehensive research and it is to this we must now turn for greater clarification of the role and responsibility of an encounter group leader.

Research

The most recent, comprehensive and rigorous study of encounter groups is that by Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973), the detailed account of which can be found in their published work "Encounter Groups: First Facts," and the most significant findings of which will be described and discussed here.

The Design

The experiment was undertaken at Stanford University,

California, where two hundred and ten students were assigned to eighteen encounter groups with a control group of sixty-nine students. Sixteen leaders, mostly psychiatrists or psychologists, and all experienced group leaders, were retained to represent nine widely used group technologies; for the tenth type, a Tape group, no leader was required. A time limit of thirty hours was set but the choice of format was left entirely to the discretion of each leader. The ten group types (detailed descriptions of which can be found in chapter II of this dissertation) were as follows:

1. National Training Laboratory
2. Transactional Analysis
3. Gestalt Therapy
4. Esalen Eclectic
5. Personal Growth (NTL groups, Western style)
6. Synanon
7. Psychodrama
8. Marathon
9. Psychoanalytically Oriented
10. Tape Group (Leaderless).

The goal behind the design was "to generate the sort of data about leadership differences that would allow the development of an empirical taxonomy of encounter leadership methodologies. The resulting typology might ultimately be related to differing types or degrees of personal learning or change [p.226]."

The Findings

1. Leader behaviours and functions. The researchers originally established twenty-seven variables describing leader behavior which, when factor analyzed, formed four clusters. It was found that much of what the leaders do, as both participants and observers see them, can be subsumed under four basic functions: emotional stimulation, caring, meaning attribution, and executive behaviour.

a) Emotional stimulation is a dimension centred in the person of the leader; through the force of his personality and by his example, the group is moved to take risks, express anger, warmth, or love. Thus the very presence of the leader is a salient feature of the group experience. Personal challenge and confrontation is valued as a primary learning condition. Members are made to feel that they should be like the leader in style, values, behaviour, and beliefs.

b) Caring: a warm/cold, love/not-love dimension (the members' feelings about the leader are not associated with caring. Liking the leader is more related to emotional stimulation than caring). Such leaders are seen by members as symbolizing giving, understanding, genuineness, warmth, caring, sympathy, and kindness.

c) Meaning attribution represents cognitive behaviours which offer the participants ideas, concepts, or values about change. These leaders offer explanations of behaviour for consideration, they explain and interpret and provide

frameworks for how to change.

d) Executive function involves limit-setting (setting rules, limits, norms, goals; managing time; stopping) and command response (inviting, eliciting, questioning, suggesting procedures). Behaviour directed towards management of the group as a social system and the use of structured exercises as a means of goal achievement.

The researchers believe that these four dimensions may constitute an empirically derived taxonomy for examining leadership in all types of groups aimed at personal change, and that they can produce discriminations among leaders of highly varied orientation.

2. Relationship between leader behaviour and outcome.

At the end of the experience each participant was classified as having been a high-learner, a moderate-changer, having been relatively untouched by the experience, as showing predominantly negative changes, or as having dropped out of the group prior to termination for psychological reasons or as having become a psychiatric casualty.*

The most effective leadership style, it was found, would combine moderate stimulation, high caring, high meaning attribution, and moderate use of executive functions. Conversely, the less effective leaders were either very low

* A definition of the term "casualty" can be found on p.85 and an investigation of types of learning provided by encounter groups on pp. 94-96.

or very high on stimulation, low in caring, used very little meaning attribution, and displayed too little or too much executive behaviour. The two crucial functions for successful leadership, then, are caring and meaning attribution; that is, a combination of high levels of affectional behaviour and high levels of cognitive input is critical.

3. Behaviour and school of orientation. Results showed clearly that leaders with similar theoretical orientation, for instance Gestalt, T-group and so on, do not necessarily behave similarly. Marked similarities, it seems, do exist in how leaders approach the task of running an encounter group, but these similarities are not associated with schools of thought.

4. Leader types. In view of the above finding an empirical typology of leaders was derived from the twenty-seven behavioural variables. Six leader types emerged.

Type A: Energizers

The most charismatic, they used intense emotional stimulation. Moderate-to-high executive function was shown and with the exception of the Synanon leaders, these leaders were high on caring. A religious quality of behaviour was seen in that they were strongly attached to a belief system and emotionally tied to the founder of their school of thought.

Type B: Providers

They were high in caring and meaning attribution. They

showed moderate use of emotional stimulation and executive function. They were individually focussed; they exuded an atmosphere of enlightened paternalism

Type C: Social Engineers

These leaders were group oriented, high in meaning attribution. They were not personal in style but they showed a moderate amount of caring. They were low on emotional stimulation. Their executive function use varied from little to frequent. While low in charisma, they were high in peer orientation.

Type D: Impersonals

These leaders were distant, aggressive stimulators. They were low on caring and executive function; impersonal. They were moderate on meaning attribution.

Type E: Laissez-faire

These leaders had the lowest scores on emotional stimulation, caring and executive function. They were moderate to high on meaning attribution. They were technicians who were low on input.

Type F: Manager

This leader was distinguished by being very high on the executive dimension. Frequent structured exercises were used. Unusual degrees of control were exercised on how, about what, and for how long, members interacted with one another.

5. Leader types related to outcome. Results show that the groups with leaders of types B, C, A and the tape groups,

showed a relative gain in outcome, while the groups led by types D, E, and F all produced a relative loss, that is, a higher percentage of negative than positive or neutral outcomes. Types D and F produced no high learners at all, while type E produced a few high learners but an equal number of casualties and a large number of dropouts; as for type F, not one group member showed evidence of positive change. Type B was by far the most effective in producing positive changes while minimizing the number of participants who had negative outcomes.

It has been popularly supposed that high risk in encounter groups is associated with high learning; the results of this study would seem to refute this idea. While types B and C, not especially associated with risk produced much high learning, type A, the highest risk leaders, produced many fewer high learners.

The high risk leaders, type A, in fact, produced the highest number of casualties. From a case examination of casualties it emerges that the contributing factors to casualty status were overstimulation by the group leader and failure of the group leader to protect adequately someone under attack by other members of the group. Types A and D, both with high casualty rates, were characterized by aggressive stimulation and relatively high charisma. Type B, on the other hand, aside from the tape groups the leader type which produced the smallest number of casualties, combined

high support and moderate structuring with lower levels of stimulation.

The tape groups, it will be noted, produced no casualties. Observer reports indicated that the groups tended to avoid intense conflict, there was an absence of high leader-induced stimulation, but a high degree of structure, all of which perhaps combined to make them safe.

The relation between leader types and behaviours with member outcomes is highly significant and may be important in tracing guidelines for leadership training. It is perhaps noteworthy that a high level of enthusiasm for the encounter group experience was claimed at its conclusion, particularly by members of types A, B and F leader groups. Clearly leaders, not only those who produced chiefly positive change, but also those who are particularly charismatic and those who use a large number of structured exercises ("games"), play an important role in creating a self-perpetuating movement by producing converts who wish to induce others to undergo the experience. Even some participants who suffered intense psychological harm from being in an encounter group were still quite willing to endorse encounter groups and saw them as useful to others.

6. Psychological opportunities. The study showed that there were important differences in what the groups felt like to participants under different leader types. Participants' evaluation of the nature of the group experience

varied uniformly from group to group and they stressed widely differing opportunities for experiencing various aspects of encounter such as feedback, for knowing others deeply, for open and honest encounter with their peers, for novel experiences, and for opportunities to express trust or anger or for being direct. Clearly, the types of leaders did have some impact on this experience as seen through the eyes of participants.

Summary of Findings

The behaviour of leaders does make a real difference in the relative benefit or harm which group members experience. What leaders do in their groups, however, is unrelated to their theoretical orientation or school of thought. There are four basic dimensions which were found to underlie a variety of leader behaviour: stimulation, caring, meaning attribution, and executive function. Caring, and particularly meaning attribution were seen to be associated with positive effects, whereas excessive stimulation and inordinate attention to executive function were associated with negative outcomes. Using the four basic dimensions of leader behaviour a typology was developed describing six leadership styles. Three of these styles, Provider, Social Engineer, and Energizer were found to be successful while those described as Laissez-faire, Manager, and Impersonal were unsuccessful. Finally, the leader styles were seen to have consequences for the type of experience members have in

encounter groups and what they take away from such groups.

Implications for the Leader

While the abstractions of leader behaviour described above are still complex, and further refinements of the research will bring even more specific findings, this study has provided answers to some pressing questions, exploded certain myths, suggested areas for further enquiry, and involves important implications for encounter group leaders.

One observation which should prove significant in designing leadership training is that encounter group leaders often have mistaken ideas about what makes a group successful. As a result, when teaching others to lead, they stress behavioural characteristics which in fact have little to do with successful outcome. Some leaders, for instance, were committed to particular theoretical constructs such as Gestalt therapy or Transactional Analysis, and felt that it was a particular technique such as the "hot seat" approach (focusing the entire energy of the group on one person for long periods of time), or structured exercises, total here-and-now focus, emphasis on the expression of anger, or high self-disclosure, on which a positive outcome was strongly dependent. In fact all of these techniques were found to be unrelated to outcome; one Transactional Analytic leader, for instance, led a highly successful group while the other Transactional Analytic leader led a highly unsuccessful group; and one Gestalt Therapy leader led a high-yield group

whereas the other Gestalt Therapy leader led the lowest-yield group.

On the other hand, the study made clear that cognitive input by the leader is strongly correlated with change and learning in the group. It would seem, then, that while no particular theory has more merit than another, it is important for the leader to have a theoretical framework in which he believes and from which he operates. Such a reflective, self-conscious attitude towards coping provides an invaluable model for group participants and helps participants to organize their personal experiences.

The study emphasized, too, that the leader looms very large in the emotional life of the group. Transference (the surplus meaning that the leader has for participants) could not be avoided even by those leaders who tried to minimize their personal impact. It is important that leaders are aware, then, that their words and actions have considerable power to help or to harm. High challenges and high confrontation by the leader was found to be not only unnecessary for changes but negatively correlated to outcome. Moreover, those individuals harmed during the group meeting are unlikely to show any benefit from the experience six months later, a supposition which has often been used to justify the "shaking up" of a group member.

The high-confrontation and high-risk leaders, in fact, used behaviour that would seem to be contrary to the concept

of encounter, which stresses the value, potential and uniqueness of every human being. These leaders showed an unswerving faith in their product, technique and importance; they were impatient to have change now, and failed to make allowances for individual differences; they failed to see that for some individuals their defence systems are so important that change could only be achieved very slowly and painfully; when unable to produce "the breakthrough," these participants were made to feel a sense of failure or worthlessness. It is obviously necessary, then, that leaders have much experience with the process of inducing change in people, have acquired certain clinical attitudes and perspectives and have a large degree of perceptiveness and tolerance.

It is noteworthy that the most successful group leader in the study assumed personal responsibility for what happened in the group. Consequently, he checked continually with each member to see how far he wanted to go in exploring his feelings and respected the decision of the participant to stop if he wanted rather than forcing an issue to its conclusion. The necessity for such checking-out behaviour becomes clear in the light of the fact that leaders were very poor predictors of those who had suffered negative effects as a result of group interaction.

In some ways, however, leaders overestimated their impact on the group, for the study showed that the group

itself, and certain highly valued members, are also powerful agents for change. A leader's effectiveness, therefore, can be increased if he is aware that his role is one not only of direct personal interaction with each member, but also indirect in his function as a social engineer. By being aware of those individuals who have a positive growth inducing effect on the group, and others who as deviants from the group norms could impede group growth or become casualties, he can help to construct a group which is an effective agent of change.

Hazards of Encounter Groups

Research Concerning the Incidence of Casualties

As with other aspects of encounter group practice, the question of its hazards and adverse effects has been largely a matter of speculation. Rumours abound with accounts of suicides, psychotic breaks and incidents of gross irresponsibility while newspaper and magazine articles recount lurid tales of immorality and decadence. Similarly, among mental health professionals can be found those who, having seen or heard of encounter group members who have suffered damage as a result of a group experience, have generalized and branded the whole field as dangerous (Gottschalk & Pattison, 1969; Jaffe & Sherl, 1969). Again there are others who hold the extreme opposite view and deny the existence of any risk to participants; some of these concur with R. D. Laing (1967)

that a psychotic experience may permit an individual to realize his potential more fully.

However, enough valid data have appeared to permit an examination of the dangers of encounter groups. A National Training Laboratories Report (1969) indicated that of 14,200 participants in industrial and summer programs only 33 participants (0.2 per cent) had to leave the programs because of disruptive personal reactions. Rogers (1970) reported that of 600 participants of some forty groups only two (0.3 per cent) developed psychosis. Neither Mintz (1969) in a follow-up study based upon a sample of 173 respondents and the observation of 279 participants, nor Bach (1967) in a study of 400 marathon group participants, reported any occurrence of psychosis. In one systematic study, Sata (in Yalom et al., 1970) indicates that, in a two-week residential training laboratory, overt psychosis or need for psychiatric consultation occurred in only 0.5 per cent of the participants.

A few reports, however, do suggest a higher incidence of pathology. Yalom and others (1970) indicate that ten to fifteen per cent of all participants in a National Training Laboratories group consulted the laboratory psychiatrist for a wide range of disturbances. Reddy (1970) in a controlled study comparing T-groups, group psychotherapy, and control participants, found that exacerbation of pathology increased significantly following the sensitivity training groups. In

his survey of several groups, Parloff (1970) reports that mild to moderate emotional disturbances occurred during group experiences for 0.5 per cent to 28 per cent of participants. From 0.6 per cent to 6 per cent of group members reported emotional disturbances after the experience.

From the above data, the low incidence of pathology reported would lead one to conclude that at least when the sponsors of encounter groups are reputable, competent organizations, there is no evidence of gross irresponsibility or high incidence of pathology. The study by Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973), however, seems to contradict this statement. Their research, designed to give careful attention to hazards, found that of 206 participants starting the groups, sixteen (7.8 per cent of the total and 9.1 per cent of those who completed 50 per cent of the group meetings) suffered significant psychological injury. Yet the overall effect of the research design, the researchers believed, acted to reduce the potential casualty rate.

It is to this study, both the most rigorous and comprehensive to date, to which we now turn for a more detailed analysis of the findings.

Findings of Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973)

1. Methods of identifying casualties. A casualty, for the purpose of the study, was defined as an individual who, as a direct result of his experience in an encounter group, became more psychologically distressed and/or employed more

maladaptive mechanisms of defence. And this negative change was not to be transient, but enduring as judged eight months after the group experience. The methods of identifying casualties were several: a request for emergency psychiatric aid, dropout from the group, peer evaluations in answer to the question at the end of the group, "Who got hurt?", a drop in self-esteem, low testimony, therapy begun during or within six months of the end of the group, low leader ratings and sometimes accidental identification.

It was found that by far the most successful method was peer evaluation. Lieberman, Yalom and Miles felt justified in making the statement that if a subject is perceived as having been hurt, by more than one member of his group (or so perceived himself) it is highly probable that he represents a casualty of the group experience. It is somewhat disturbing that the leaders were particularly insensitive in casualty identification; only two out of sixteen casualties were recognized as such by the leaders. It seems that if potential casualties are to be identified by leaders in order that they may be either helped or screened out of the group, more checking out with the group members is very necessary.

2. Method of injury. For some, the failure to achieve unrealistic goals precipitated casualty status. These individuals usually had needs and goals which were so extensive they could only have been met in a psychotherapy group or

individual analysis. However, it is significant and disturbing that the casualties were not randomly distributed through the seventeen groups. Six groups had no casualties; seven groups had one casualty in each; and four groups had more than one casualty. Furthermore, three of the four high risk groups were led by leaders of the Energizer type; that is, whose style was characterized by aggressive stimulation practices, high charisma, high support and confrontation and who focussed on the individual participant rather than the group. Participants in these groups who became casualties reacted negatively to attack, either by the leader or other members of the group from whom he was inadequately protected by the leader. Some felt rejected, and others were unable to meet the leader's or the group's demands for emotional display; others, traumatized by overstimulation by their encounter group, were unable to cope with such "stirring up," and unable to work things out. It is noteworthy that some fragile, frightened individuals, and others who displayed remarkably tenacious protective defences, were able to emerge unscathed from the group experiences since they found themselves in groups led by leaders who established tolerant, non-demanding norms where they could participate to the degree optimal for their safety.

It was found also, however, that in spite of all the variations that occurred among the groups, certain qualities of a person, his expectations, attitudes and values, and how

he viewed others and himself, made a difference in how he utilized the group experience. Both casualties and high-learners, for instance, showed patterns of inadequate coping, low self-esteem and low self-regard; the major psychological difference lay in the degree of pathology and in their conception of others. The casualties held an extremely negative and discriminatory view of others which perhaps made it difficult for them to utilize an experience which is basically interpersonal. Moreover, while high-learners held an initially cautious view of encounter groups, the casualties expressed opinions of encounter which were totally positive and uncritical. This leads one to surmise that perhaps those individuals who were casualties expected the encounter group to hold the "magic" answer to their problems, to provide "the quick cure."

3. Screening participants. These findings indicate that despite the wide variety of experiences participants had in the encounter groups, and the range of leader styles to which they were exposed, it is possible to arrange conditions so that the fewest possible number will reap a negative yield. Based on an assessment of attitudes, expectations and personal qualities, high risk people could be identified and either screened out or at least advised of their high risk position.

Other studies have also found the necessity to screen out certain types of individuals such as psychotics, hysterics

and individuals in crisis (Kuehn & Crinella, 1969); participants who might achieve a deviant role in an encounter group (Schachter, 1951; Asch, 1958; Sherif, 1958); and those with a history of psychosomatic illness (Stone & Tieger, 1970). For these individuals an encounter group is unsuitable or insufficient for their needs, and could be positively harmful. It has also been suggested (National Training Laboratories, 1969) that the encounter group experience be limited strictly to volunteers.

Implications for the Composition of Encounter Groups

Screening methods. Brochure statements, application completion, interviews, psychometrics, and small group sessions, can all be used to screen potential participants. Advertising should do nothing to suggest a "magic" cure and should clearly indicate that the encounter group is not designed for therapeutic purposes.

In view of Lieberman, Yalom and Miles's study (1973) applications which ask open-ended questions regarding motivation for joining an encounter group and expectations of the group could be enlightening in assessing a person's suitability for the group experience. Psychological and medical histories should also be established, and where possible personal interviews and personality tests could also be a requirement. Reddy (1970) suggests that at the immediate start of the encounter group a final pathology and interpersonal behaviour screening be initiated in the form

of a short, unstructured group session. The information thus obtained could be used as a final de-screening measure, and also to pre-compose groups in order to increase learning by participants (Harrison, 1965; Harrison & Lubin, 1965a, 1965b; Reddy, 1971a).

In summary, then, while there is any danger of individuals suffering psychological harm from an encounter group experience (and Lieberman, Yalom and Miles's study indicates the likelihood is high) the preselection of leaders and participants and their assignment to appropriate groups could do much to reduce the incidence of casualties. As W. B. Reddy (1972) points out:

Certainly the time and sophistication have come when we do not have to refer to all variables as "encounter group." The appropriate questions to ask today are: what kind of encounter group, conducted by leaders with what characteristics and purpose, for what kind of population under what circumstances? [p.67].

Outcomes of Encounter Groups

Research Concerning Outcomes

Encounter groups exist for the purpose of transforming their members in some hoped for ways, but does the experience in fact change people, help them to realize their potential, or improve their interpersonal relations? Many small-scale studies are available, and most of their findings are positive (Gibb, 1971), though some outcome studies do show negative results (Wedel, 1957; Kassarian, 1965; Kernan,

1963), or negative effects (Yalom & Lieberman, 1971).

However, the complexities of the human character and behaviour patterns make it very difficult for researchers to measure changes, and most small studies are directed toward one or two specific variables (such as increased sensitivity or self-acceptance). Gibb (1971) identified six major rubrics for organizing the effects of human relations training: sensitivity (greater awareness of the feelings and perceptions of others); managing feelings (awareness and acceptance of the feeling component of one's own actions); managing motivations (e.g. clear communication of one's own motives to others); functional attitudes towards self (self-acceptance, self-esteem); functional attitudes towards others (e.g. decreased authoritarianism; prejudice, collaborative orientation); and interdependent behaviour (e.g. interpersonal competence, teamwork). Criteria such as these overlap somewhat with, but are not identical to, criteria used in the assessment of psychotherapy and also overlap but are not identical to outcome variables of concern in education.

Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973) designed their research to measure a multiplicity of conceivable learnings, ranging from those which might be diffuse and general changes in the person as a whole, to discrete behavioural changes. Changes were viewed and assessed from several perspectives, objective measures on a wide range of variables, as well as others'

views and the participants' own view of change in himself; and the criteria used to assess change were stringent.

Findings of Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973)

1. Number of participants who changed. The researchers developed an index based on the variety of perspectives on change as well as a series of indices developed from test measures covering a number of types of changes. This showed that one-third of those who participated in the groups benefited from them; a little over one-third remained unchanged, and the remainder experienced some form of negative outcome. It is interesting to note that, as seen by those in their social network, participants and controls alike were perceived as changing, leading the researchers to conclude that change in a college community is endemic.

At the long-term follow-up, six to eight months later, three-quarters of those who experienced positive benefit maintained it. A similar percentage held for those who experienced negative outcomes, and only ten per cent of those who showed no positive change at the end of the encounter group showed benefit six months later. The popular idea that the good effects of encounter are often not felt until some time after the experience is, it seems, a fallacy.

The areas of change which proved to be most important and stable were those of Values and Attitudes and in Self. It was observed that participants, after the group experience, were more likely to shift their value-structure in the

direction of being more change-oriented and more growth oriented. Members' self-images moved towards perceiving themselves as more lenient and towards an increased congruency between their ideal images and self. Behavioural changes however appeared to be less stable. While at the end of the group participants saw an increase in their coping adequacy and perceived their behaviour as more interpersonally adequate, only the latter maintained the significant difference six to eight months later.

The researchers concluded that overall encounter groups show a modest positive impact, much less than that claimed by supporters of the movement and significantly less than the participants' view of their own change would lead one to assume. However, it must be remembered that the wide variety of groups studied, to a considerable extent, explains this general impression, for while some groups provide a very good learning environment, others made little impact, and still others appeared to be, on balance, destructive. The differences among the groups were more substantial both in the number of people affected and in the type of area of change than were the differences between those who participated in them and those who did not. Clearly, an encounter group can be a very potent instrument of change but its potency is related to various group conditions such as leadership behaviour, norms, level of cohesiveness, type of emotional climate and temporal arrangements. While Lieberman,

Yalom and Miles, however, were able to establish a positive relationship between outcome and the above mentioned group characteristics, their study, because of the number of groups involved, could not assess statistically the independent contribution of each of these group conditions as they affect outcomes, so interrelated and associated are they. Here, then, is one area where further research is urgently needed if the value of encounter groups is to be established and maximized.

2. Possibilities for learning and change in encounter groups. The effects of a destructive group experience have already been described; in order to have a complete picture of the value of encounter we must try to assess both the extent (previous section) and the type of positive change that can occur.

Types of learning. Many others have described far-reaching positive changes. Carl Rogers (1970), for instance, mentioned altered concepts of self, the realization of one's own full potential, the choosing of a new life direction, improved communication with others and closer, warmer relationships with family and friends as among the changes which he himself had seen occur in group members. Lieberman, Yalom and Miles provided a more detailed analysis of the changes which the High Learners in their groups experienced:

a) Interpersonal Openness. Many High Learners changed in their methods of relating to others. They behaved in a more

trusting, open, honest manner; they hid less of themselves; they expressed opinions more forthrightly; they gave feedback to others and requested it for themselves. They perceived also that adaptive openness is curvilinear; that is, that too much as well as too little can jeopardize human relationships.

b) Conception of Self. Some showed a significant positive shift in self-esteem. They became more self-directed and less other-directed; they based their opinions of themselves more on their own self-perceptions than on the perceived appraisals of others.

c) Assumption of Responsibility for Self. A few felt more in charge of themselves; they realized that others cannot really manipulate one's own feelings unless they are allowed to bother them, put them down, frighten them, belittle them and so on.

d) Acceptance of Others. Several High Learners reported a greater respect for the ways, opinions and foibles of others. For some this was reflected in improved relationships with their parents who they began to see as struggling, uncertain, but nonetheless caring individuals.

e) Coping. Some found that they were able to deal much more effectively with personal dilemmas. Often the previous attitude had been one of denial or evasion of the problem; now they were able to confront the issue, usually by setting up an observing, diagnosing ego.

f) Value Shift. The shift was generally towards a greater commitment to humanistic aims and greater resistance to confinement by the technocratic establishment. This was often evident in important life decisions which these individuals now made. Some of these decisions, however, such as that to evade the draft, or to drop out of college or out of competitive sport, were no doubt viewed by the authorities as negative ones, yet the individuals themselves were quite sure they were positive. Clearly, change and growth will often introduce turbulence into the life of the individual, and if society and institutions remain unchanged, some conflict is inevitable.

3. The group as an instrument of learning. These are some of the changes stressed by the High Learners themselves, but it is clear from their own accounts that every individual experiences the group in a uniquely human way and even a comprehensive research design is unable to capture all the subtleties of human behaviour. Similarly, various aspects of the group experience were stated by the participants as being important in helping them to learn.

The intensive group experience itself was cited by many as an important factor in their achieving a positive outcome. The feeling of being part of the group, the honesty, closeness, the chance to discover others' usually hidden perceptions and feelings about oneself, a safe, trusting atmosphere in which one might reveal hidden parts of oneself and still

be accepted and where considerable catharsis can occur; all this meant that the group provided for many "a warm haven, an emotional atmosphere reminiscent of the primary family [Lieberman, Yalom & Miles, 1973, p.157]."

However, the learning stimulated by such a group experience was maintained by certain other behaviours such as that of modeling; that is, by associating a particular insight with some person or event in the group, the individual was able to recall the substance of what he had learned, in future times of need. Furthermore, it was not only the experience itself which was valuable to some participants; the examination and reflection on that experience provided some sort of cognitive framework which had generalizability and which therefore offered meaning for the future.

Summary

The study confirmed the reports of group leaders such as Rogers and Schutz that the encounter group can be a potent vehicle of change. The rather small number of participants in the study who showed aspects of positive change can to a considerable extent be explained by the diversity of the groups and the fact that some of them were notably unproductive while others were extremely beneficial. Presumably with more research into what makes a group and a leader successful, and more stringent controls over such elements as leader certification and training, the screening of participants for suitability, and better education of the

public regarding the purposes and methods of groups, the effectiveness of encounter groups can be greatly increased.

The wide variety of learning experiences described by the participants in this study again confirm those described by others who are leaders in the field and who have experienced an encounter group. They include cognition, feedback, a sense of community, being accepted, expressing strong emotions, taking responsibility for oneself, a sense of mastery, and the sheer pleasure of being close to others and being cared for by them.

There is evidence that some groups involve a high risk of psychological harm for certain kinds of individuals. To some extent, however, this fact does no more than emphasize the desperate need of many people for help with their psychological problems, anxieties and hang-ups, their alienation and inability to communicate. For many the encounter group is the last hope in a world where family, church and local community either no longer exist for them or have lost their meaning and potency.

Moreover, the preceding review of research has made it clear that, with the initial fever of excitement and experimentation giving way to a period of consolidation and assessment in the encounter group field, answers to pressing questions concerning goals, effectiveness of groups, outcomes, leadership requirements and so on are already being found. Each of the preceding sections, also, has indicated

areas where further research is necessary, and, while it is important not to lose the spirit of spontaneity, excitement and experimentation which has characterized encounter group practice to date, there is no doubt that more research will bring greater knowledge, safety, and effectiveness to the group experience.

It may be concluded, then, as Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973) report, that "A well-balanced intensive group experience, with the accent on reflection as well as on experience and with a focus both on the present and on the future application of the present experience, may be a potent vehicle for change [p.439]."

CHAPTER VI.

ENCOUNTER: ITS VALUE AND APPLICATION TO EDUCATION

It was the original intention of this author to attempt to discern from among the welter of information, misinformation, magic, and myth associated with encounter, the essential ingredients of the intensive group process and thus to evaluate its intrinsic contribution to the life of modern man and to his education system in particular. From the foregoing description and discussion of the historical development of encounter, its roots in philosophy and therapy, and the research findings regarding the chief encounter technologies as they actually operate, I believe it is now possible to make an assessment of the values, methods and objectives of the sensitivity training movement.

In view of the limitations of time and space, however, the application of encounter to the field of education can be explored only in a very general manner. It will be possible, that is, to compare the methods, purpose, and outcomes of an encounter group with the principles and philosophy of today's education system as a whole and to cite examples of its application at various age levels, but its suitability to a particular stage in the educational hierarchy (whether elementary, secondary or collegiate) will not

be considered.

A Summary of the Development of Encounter
Through History, Therapy and Philosophy

We have seen that, since the initiation of the first sensitivity training session at Bethel, Maine, in 1947, to present-day, the encounter group has developed in several stages and has derived from many sources. Since the early years, when the emphasis was primarily on the sociology of groups and group process (the roles and functions of leadership and membership), the encounter group has become a place where the individual personality, personal development and interpersonal communication is stressed. From a time of first cautious enthusiasm the sensitivity training movement exploded in the 1960's into a period of expansion and experimentation, until now, in the mid-1970's, we have reached a stage of consolidation, validation and assessment.

Drawing on various aspects of the psychoanalytic theories (though the direct influence of Freud himself is small); the newer emphases of such psychoanalysts as Reich and Melanie Klein and the existential analysts such as Rollo May; the theories of Kurt Lewin in the field of social psychology; the ideas of Carl Rogers in counselling; and most recently the Gestalt therapy popularized by Fritz Perls, the encounter group came to emphasize the direct expression of feelings in the here-and-now, to devalue the cognitive aspects of behaviour, to elevate the importance of sensory

and bodily awareness and to stress the rapid freeing of growth processes and pushing down of personal defences in a climate of honesty, openness and caring. The techniques used to facilitate personal freedom and growth are many and varied. The work done at Esalen has perhaps been the most innovative and exploratory, especially the area of improving sensory awareness. The most pervasive influence however must be that of Jacob Moreno, for various aspects and methods of psychodrama are used in almost all of the encounter technologies today, no matter what the differences in their theoretical constructs may be. His aim was to encourage spontaneity and through role-playing to enable an individual to realize and express more easily and immediately his feelings about himself and the significant others in his life.

Among the diversity which the encounter movement displays, however, there is a common, binding factor, and that is a general view of man which grows out of the existentialist-humanist tradition. This viewpoint, stated rather matter of factly by B. Lubin and W. B. Eddy (1970) is ". . . that man functions at a small fraction of his potential and that methods which remove blockages and release this potential enable him to integrate at substantially higher levels of functioning [p.329]."

More particularly, encounter is heir to the philosophy of Martin Buber whose contribution has, on the whole, been

inadequately acknowledged. Buber gives vivid and beautiful expression to the need of modern man "to be a person again," to establish genuine dialogue between man and man; he describes in detail the I-Thou relationship through which real communication is established. Buber's philosophy, espoused by the encounter movement, is an attempt to re-integrate man in his wholeness, to make more human his humanness and to render fuller his relationships with others.

The Encounter Group in Practice

In theory, the above stated rationale, values, and purpose of encounter, its intertwining strands derived from therapy and philosophy and developed through time, can hardly be faulted; its growth is marked by a high degree of idealism and human endeavour. In practice, however, how well does an encounter group work? Does it fulfil its promise; does it in fact develop the human potential of its members; does it produce individuals who are more honest, open to change, and in better communication with each other? Is it dangerous?

In some ways the encounter group movement seems to represent both the best and the worst elements of our modern world. In society in general and in some personal growth-oriented groups we can see a frantic search for easy answers, for "something for nothing." People often seek a "cure" or instant intimacy not realizing the giving, the pain, and the hard work on their own part which is necessary to achieve

such returns. This to a certain degree is the result of irresponsible advertising by some leaders and growth centres that are more concerned with personal or financial gain than the well-being of group participants.

In general there seems to be a lack of training and professionalism among group leaders. Some group leaders are irresponsible, the goals of the group and the leader are often not clearly defined, and in many cases the result differs from the original aim. A participant in a group may have an intense experience, but may not be provided with the theoretical concepts by which to understand or to make meaningful what has happened. If an individual is hurt in a group, the leader may be unaware of it, and follow-up help may not be provided. Certainly, as Schloss, Siroca and Siroca (1971) warn, "when groups have unclear goals, unprofessional standards, or untrained leaders, they should be avoided [p.9]."

On the other hand, some of the more extreme criticisms directed at encounter groups as encouraging the worst of our "permissive society" can also be refuted. M. P. McNair (1957, pp.15-22), for instance, condemns sensitivity training on the basis that it allows the individual "to feel sorry for oneself," "to slough off responsibility," "find excuses for failure," "indulge in emotional binges," and "act like children." People indulging in such behaviour, however, in a group where honesty is valued, would receive

mixed reactions from the other members, and at least some of those reactions would be critical. Rather, a person who does behave in this way is made to realize it for himself and to see how it affects his relationship with others. Furthermore, examining the past for "excuses" for behaviour is given little emphasis in such a group; it is present behaviour, feelings and attitudes which are mainly discussed and the participants' own responsibility for them which is stressed.

For a better validated and more balanced assessment of the effects of encounter groups we must turn once again to the work of Lieberman, Yalom and Miles (1973). Their conclusion is that, compared with psychotherapy, encounter groups are less successful in positively changing people and are more likely to induce deteriorative effects than psychotherapy. Although some people make important changes as a result of their experience in some types of encounter groups, the effects of encounter groups are not massive in number or substantially different in kind from those reported as experienced by college students generally.

The researchers state the belief that the failure of encounter groups to be more successful as agents of change is a failure of theory and technology rather than of skill. While most of the leaders in their study were very skilful in the use of their chosen techniques, the results were often questionable. In other words the assumptions made by

the leaders about what operations make for positive change in human beings were ill-founded. In order for an encounter group to become a more effective agent of change, there needs to be a better definition of how people change and of the requisite techniques to achieve this end.

However, while encounter groups have only a limited effectiveness in this respect, it must be noted that they are in fact very successful in another; they do provide a brief, intense experience which participants enjoy and regard as true human encounters. Every report collected in the Lieberman, Yalom and Miles study suggests that the technology used by encounter leaders does create caring for one another among participants. At the same time, the experience is a transitory one, and unlike membership in the family or church, does not demand a long-term commitment to people or ideas in order to enjoy the sense of warmth and communion.

Lieberman, Yalom and Miles, therefore, conclude that the value of encounter lies not in its ability to change people but in its ability to relieve man's alienation, the curse of our modern world. Back (1972) reports a personal interview with Richard Farson who has been active in the encounter movement in industry and was for a while the director of the Western Behavioural Science Institute, in which he too espouses this view; the intensive group experience is an aesthetic pleasure and should be valued as such for itself alone rather than for any changes it might

precipitate in the individual.

The distance of a decade is not a very wide one from which to evaluate the worth of such an important new social instrument as that of the encounter group; yet already it seems possible to see that it is the extremes of the movement--the more colourful and faster technologies designed to produce more warmth, more intimacy and more change--which have taken the movement to places where the original purpose is no longer served. The underlying principles of encounter, however, are simple and still meaningful:

- 1) The small intensive group can provide a meaningful emotional setting in which individuals can learn about themselves through receiving feedback from others.
- 2) It is a place where a person can receive affirmation of self through overt comparison with others.
- 3) The encounter group provides an individual with a group of peers who become important to him through the expressing and experiencing of emotions.
- 4) Such an experience is a basic process for enhancing human potential.
- 5) In an encounter group issues may be overtly considered which were previously regarded as prohibited.

A group which fulfils this promise, as an encounter group can, is clearly an important means for facilitating human progress, for relieving some of the pressures of the modern world, and for overcoming the loneliness and aliena-

tion of our society. In the past decade, however, the encounter movement has been saddled with spiralling demands and expectations and when both group members and group leaders share this perception there is considerable risk to the individual. An encounter group cannot cure all the ills of society and it cannot even help those individuals whose suffering and illness is more than "normal."

However, it can provide warmth, intimacy, and even some measure of change for many individuals which is not provided otherwise in daily living and which is desired and, indeed, needed by a great number of people. The basic principles of encounter, derived from various therapies, from the philosophical precepts of Martin Buber and other existentialist-humanists, and the fundamental discoveries about the potency of the small group for change, are indeed sound and hold some promise for the future. In summary we can do no better than report the conclusions of Lieberman, Yalom and Miles, whose recent work has done so much to clarify the picture of the encounter group movement:

If we unburden [encounter groups] from magical expectations and unlock them from the burden of use no matter what the problem, no matter who the person, and begin to perceive them simply as an otherwise unprovided social context for humans to explore and express, then perhaps we can begin to seek more systematic and less dogmatically derived information on how that context may best be shaped to make a meaningful contribution to the resolution of human problems [p.455].

The Encounter Group in Education

Does such an instrument as that described above have a place in our educational system? It would seem that there might be three ways in which encounter groups could be used to advantage; as part of the counselling system of a school or college where the affective aspects of life could be discussed and peer interaction could be facilitated; secondly, groups for administrators, teachers, parents and students could be organized as a means of reducing unnecessary friction between generations by improving communication and fostering empathy and human objectivity; and thirdly, as a means of helping teachers to learn how to use the classroom group for learning purposes.

How well does sensitivity training, however, fit into today's theory and practice of counselling? C. A. Mahler (1969) reports on the week-long workshop attended by twenty-two leaders in group counselling which met in March, 1964, during which it was affirmed that, while participants varied somewhat in their definition of group counselling, there was a definite distinction drawn between group counselling, group guidance, and group therapy, all of which have their place in a school counselling system. Mahler himself establishes six major areas of distinction; the size of the group, the way in which content is managed, the length of group life, the responsibilities of the leader, the severity of problems, and the competencies of the leader. In each of the above

respects, Mahler (1971) concludes, "Sensitivity training and encounter groups can best be classified as variations of group counseling [p.603]."

On the one hand, group therapy is aimed at the more disturbed individuals who may be treated over months or even years and is concerned with unconscious motivation; group guidance is primarily a class or educational experience, concerned with the giving out of information or the general discussion of a specific topic where the major responsibility rests with the teacher; while group counselling focusses upon the individual and changing his behaviour. In more detail, Mahler defines group counselling as:

The process of using group interaction to facilitate deeper self-understanding and self-acceptance. There is a need for a climate of mutual respect and acceptance so that individuals can loosen their defences sufficiently to explore both the meaning of behaviour and new ways of behaving. The concerns and problems encountered are centered in the developmental growth tasks of members rather than on pathological blocks and distortions of reality [1969, p.11].

It can be seen then, that an encounter group could fit easily into the group counselling system of a school or college where the chief concern is for better self-knowledge, the expression of emotions, and improved communication among "normal" students. However, the desirability of certain constraints on the operation of encounter groups in society in general, such as thorough leadership training, the assumption of responsibility for members' safety on the part of the leader, the screening of participants, and the dangerous-

ness of undue confrontation, has already been stressed. Obviously, in an educational setting where the group participants may be young and impressionable, there is all the more reason for caution and restraint and measures such as the following are advisable in setting up an encounter group as part of an educational counselling system.

In the first instance, students need to understand the group goals before they make a commitment to join a group, membership in which should be strictly on a volunteer basis. In order to ensure this, M. M. Ohlsen (1970) suggests classroom visits by the leader to describe the purpose of the group, to discuss the roles of the counsellor and the group members, and to deal with questions arising from this. Selection should be made from those who volunteer, on the basis of some personality test and personal statement. Members of a group should have some common concerns, there should be a reasonable balance with regard to sex, ages, and race, and they should all be individuals who can function reasonably well (that is, are not seriously disturbed) in a group situation. The necessity for commitment to the group process should be stressed, and to this end the time, place, number, and frequency of group meetings should be established; also the confidentiality of the group should be noted. Finally, group goals should be discussed and Ohlsen suggests that they should include deep listening, exploring feelings, problems or concerns and, at the conclusion, a consideration

of how far such goals had been achieved. It would also seem advisable to institute effective follow-up procedures, to ensure that no member of the group suffered psychological injury or was left with feelings or concerns which they were unable to work through alone.

With the institution of such controls and safeguards, encounter groups in the classroom should be able to meet the affective needs of students. H. A. Thelen (1967) indeed maintains that informal groups of this kind, which he calls "psyche groups," always occur in classrooms as they do anywhere else in society. They are, he says, "voluntary, initiated by stress, carried on between people who choose and trust each other, having no particular agenda, and tending to have a quality of privacy, intimacy, or confidentiality [p.268]." Their function is to reduce a person's anxiety and ambivalence and "strengthen" his ego. Thelen therefore sees nothing revolutionary in the idea that students be invited to form "psyche groups" (self-selected) to talk over anything that has them emotionally aroused. He believes that such groups provide a setting where anxiety can be reduced, where participants can try out their ideas on friends, be stimulated in return by more ideas, rehearse how they are going to report their ideas to the teacher, and where they can develop a greater sense of adequacy and confidence in their participation when the class meets next as a whole. Thelen suggests that the "content" of discussion

might be called "self-knowledge," and is convinced that such groups are a "major mechanism of adjustment and adaptation for most students [p.269]."

Still, however, to most people the idea of encounter groups in the classroom is a somewhat disturbing revolutionary proposition. This view, perhaps, should be reconsidered in the light of the opinion of Wesley Huckins, who addressed the Area Counselors' Conference in Oregon in 1965; he expressed the conviction that "any practitioner who sees his role and who counsels in the same manner that he did a year ago and any school system that allows him to do so, should get with it. They probably are already far behind and they probably have already deprived youngsters of quality counseling services to a substantial degree [p.2]."

Huckins is especially concerned that we have in the past, and still do, emphasize intellectual achievement in the schools at the expense of the students' feelings and the socialization process. He quotes Julian Huxley's statement that, "Man has got to learn to live," and Ashley Montague's "Man is not alone a thinking creature. Just as he has to be taught how to think, so, too, he has to be taught how to feel." Consequently he endorses the use of groups not only for students but also for counsellors, teachers, and parents where individuals can once again get into touch with other human beings; thus education can become oriented more to the development of people as decent human beings and less to

preparing them to become cogs in an economic machine.

Birnbaum (1969), also, while advocating proper forethought, leadership and follow-up, enthusiastically supports the use of encounter groups in schools. He cites for commendation two projects already in progress: that of Bessell and Palomares who developed a series of group experiences suitable for children; they provide conditions for children to learn interpersonal skills, to learn how to share experiences, learn and develop confidence, social awareness and understanding; and that of the Ford Foundation-Esalen project to humanize education at all school levels and which makes much use of the intensive group experience. Faust (1968), too, describes "feelings classes" in operation in certain elementary schools which in many respects are adaptations of the group phenomenon. Again, as a further example of encounter methods already in operation in school settings, we can cite the report of Larry Etkin and Lester Snyder (1972) on the use of role-playing at the secondary level in an attempt to break through unsatisfying, restrictive, and repetitive social patterns of relating. They believe that through role-playing an individual's way of seeing things expands, becomes clearer, and leads to new ways of doing things and new ways of being with others.

D. J. Prediger and R. R. Baumann (1970) confirm that "developmental counselling [of which an encounter group can be a part] within the context of a developmental guidance

program is now widely recognized as a desirable alternative to ameliorative or therapy-oriented counseling in a school [p.527]." They report that the few research studies which have concerned developmental group counselling with high school students have shown results generally favouring counselled groups over control groups on several outcome measures, including grade point averages, attendance, citizenship grades, amount of tension and hostility, realism of vocational choice, self-acceptance, and valuing of others; self-adjustment, anxiety level; and academic achievement, occupational aspiration and vocational maturity. However, it was noted that results were positive only when the group was oriented to specific goals, and there were no outcomes reported with regard to more flexible, unstructured, encounter-type groups. Even so, Prediger and Baumann conclude that the results "provide a promising, albeit fragmentary picture of the potential of developmental group counseling [p.532]."

Foulds and Guinan (1969), too, have advocated the growth centre model for the provision of counselling services in educational institutions. Their work has been done mainly with college-level students and they describe a growth centre on a college or university campus as "a proactive agency that provides a wide variety of educative, developmental, and remedial services designed to foster increased levels of self-actualization and human effectiveness,

expansion of human awareness and experience, and maximum development of human potentials [p.34]." One of the activities recommended was a weekly personal growth group in order to facilitate the increased self-actualization and more effective interpersonal communication of "normal," relatively healthy, growth-seeking, college students. M. L. Foulds, reporting on his study of such a group (1970), stated that this type of group experience can assist persons to achieve positive personality changes and increased levels of personal functioning. However, he does caution that these findings are the result of a specific form of group process facilitated by a specific group leader and that the generalizability of the conclusions is limited.

Despite the paucity of research in this area, then, it can be seen that there is a growing body of informed opinion within the field of education, that asserts the need for greater emphasis on the feeling aspects of students as opposed solely to the intellectual needs of the individual. However, professional implementations of innovations have frequently failed, largely through a lack of training programmes in depth and scope, a lack of involvement on the part of teachers, administrators and their trainers, and the failure to look at innovations relative to one's own particular situation and constraints. With this in mind, it is well to state that while some education authorities are moving towards a more flexible student-centred type of

system, the majority of administrators and society in general are still conservative and authority-centred. The norms of an encounter group, moreover, often run contrary to those of society, for unlike society, a group encourages direct comments on the appearance or behaviour of the individual, the sharing of feelings, and interpersonal closeness; they invite the reduction of "task orientation," and favour the direct expression of anger.

There seems little chance of making encounter a part of the education process, then, without giving it a much wider application, so that not only are students involved in growth groups, but teachers, administrators and parents are also part of the learning process. Birnbaum (1969) asserts that "the intensive group experience, when properly employed, can produce substantial educational change both in individuals and in organizations [p.82]."

Carl Rogers (1970) is also an advocate of such a system. He sees the encounter group as a new social invention which is capable of changing institutions and warns that "unless government, the schools, churches, industry, and the family can react with great alacrity to the necessity of change we are indeed a doomed culture [p.164]." He describes the change process which is initiated in an intensive group experience as beginning with the freedom to express real feelings, both positive and negative, the development of an atmosphere of trust, and thus a greater acceptance by each

individual of his total being, emotional, intellectual and physical, as it is. Consequently, a person becomes less defensive and more open to the idea of change in personal attitudes and behaviour, teaching techniques, and administrative methods. With more and better listening to and hearing of others, the organization, Rogers believes, tends to become a relationship of persons with common goals, rather than a formal hierarchical structure. He feels, moreover, that these changes in attitude and behaviour carry over into relationships with peers, students, and subordinates following the group experience.

However, the expectation of such results may well be overoptimistic, since, as we have seen from the research on encounter, while such changes can occur, they do not happen with any great frequency. Rogers himself did, in fact, put such a comprehensive plan into action in 1967; he instituted a series of encounter groups and interactions in an educational system consisting of a women's college, eight high schools, and fifty elementary schools. He found that there was a gradation in the ability and willingness to learn and to change in the educational structure; college administrators experienced the most difficulty in revealing their feelings while elementary students found it the easiest; and while the first effects of encounter were seen in close relationships such as those with family members, the last to be affected were organizational structure and organizational

procedures. Although Rogers reports that the process of change was often painful and created much turbulence, he felt that the program had led to better relationships and had brought about all kinds of innovative changes in the classrooms as well as greater student participation and initiative.

A study of the effectiveness of this program in the college only was conducted by an outside evaluation team led by Morton H. Shaevitz and Donald J. Barr (1972). They reported that "the number of people able to integrate a limited intensive group experience in a way that significantly affected their interpersonal behaviour was relatively small. For these individuals, however, the degree of change was highly significant [p.283]." There is, then, the possibility of rapid and intense change occurring as a result of an encounter group experience, both in individuals and in organizations, but since the numbers of participants who change is still small, there is a definite risk of merely widening the rift between those who want change and those who find it threatening.

In the last analysis, the impact of encounter in education might well come to be felt rather through a pervading spirit and climate than through actual institution of groups as part of the counselling programme. In other words, those teachers who have had a valuable encounter group experience and in whom positive learning has occurred may well return

to the classroom prepared to institute a more student-centred type of teaching process. They themselves may be more receptive to new ideas, better able to listen to and understand their students, and less personally defensive and therefore able to allow greater freedom of thought, action and expression in the classroom.

Carl Rogers (1969) feels that encounter has helped him to develop such a climate of openness and creativity in graduate seminars where he gives the students freedom to express their feelings and thoughts on any personally relevant issue. He also cites the example of Barbara Shiel who put into operation in her sixth grade classroom a plan for giving her students freedom to work at their own rate at their own interests. The results were very encouraging; the teacher began to find real pleasure in working with a class that had been "difficult," the students took responsibility for themselves and their work and the parents were pleased with the progress, both social and academic, that took place.

Similar experiences occur in all levels of the education system. Elizabeth Ogg (1972) describes how a high school English teacher found that she could adapt encounter techniques such as role-playing to create involvement and interest in the study of literature among a class of problem pupils and former dropouts. Another high school teacher was constrained to give up the lecture method and, by using techniques learned in sensitivity training, to involve the

students in the process of discovery and analysis. "When I was not a participant, they did a very competent job," the teacher reported (in Scholastic Teacher, February 1, 1971), "a better one than when I was a participant. . . . I found that a lecture by me was only appropriate when I had some expertise the students were anxious to have [as quoted by Ogg, 1972, p.18]."

All of these teachers believed that their sensitivity training had helped them to become more creative. There is little to prove, however, whether sensitivity training can be equated with creativity as psychologists such as Maslow and Moustakas have claimed, or whether the enthusiasm and dedication of the teacher, ignited perhaps by an encounter group experience, was responsible for improved results. George Brown (1970), in his report on the Ford-Esalen study (which in part sought to improve creativity through encounter techniques in several schools in California) warns that half-trained leaders or purely expressive techniques may do more harm than good. It seems that while any new technique, applied with dedication and enthusiasm, may seem to produce better results than traditional methods, the application of the technique for genuine creativity remains to be proved.

Conclusion

The necessity of involving all students in a counselling programme rather than merely providing therapeutic or ameliorative services for the psychotic or seriously disturbed

individual, is generally accepted today in educational circles. Moreover, eminent practitioners in the field of counselling, such as Mahler, have advocated the incorporation of encounter groups into a developmental counselling programme. The proponents of encounter see such groups as filling a multitude of human needs. They argue that the education of the emotions is much needed in today's materialistic, overcrowded, tension-filled world; that encounter groups help individuals towards greater knowledge of themselves and others, and improved interpersonal communication, and that they thus alleviate loneliness; that they encourage the development of empathy and human objectivity; that they can help administrators, teachers and students to adjust to change which seems inevitable; that to take part in the group process is a step towards changing from the authoritarianism of the school system to a peer-group learning situation which is more meaningful; and that encounter is a means to the greater development of human potential.

There are many examples of the use and adaptation of encounter group practices at all levels of the education system, from the elementary school to the university campus. Studies and outcomes of these programmes, however, are few and far between, and until these are forthcoming, the use of encounter groups, especially in schools, must be hedged by precautionary and safety measures which will safeguard the well-being of participants.

The research related to encounter groups indicates that the intensive group experience is a real and valued one, that there are dangers for some individuals in some types of groups, and that change, while it does occur, is limited to a fairly small proportion of those participating. The philosophy of the movement has developed from a situation in which, on the one hand, economic needs became less pressing than they had been, and on the other hand, the traditional religious and cultural values were no longer accepted as relevant by a great part of the population. Sensitivity training, therefore, has become the symbol of the search for new types of positive values, for a new "centre" within man, and for similar social expressions. It rejects the traditional middle-class and technological values of productivity in the material sense, long-range time perspective, trust in institutionalized structures, and the privacy of the individual. Rather, encounter values the expression of emotions over achievement, the here-and-now, the needs of the individual, honest and open interpersonal communication, and the overcoming of conflict.

It is well to note, then, that when change has resulted from participation in an encounter group it has sometimes been what society would regard as positive (for instance, a better relationship between members of different generations), but is often, in the view of society, negative (for example, dropping out of the armed forces or school or society

itself). In the final analysis, therefore, when considering the use of encounter groups in society, as in education, we should decide, as Carl Rogers (1967) suggests, what sort of person we value. He concludes that,

If we value this type of person and this type of behaviour [open, honest, questioning], then clearly the group process is a valuable process. If, on the other hand, we place a value on the individual who is effective in suppressing his feelings, who operates from a firm set of principles, who does not trust his own reactions and experience but relies on authority, and who remains aloof in his interpersonal relationships, then we would regard the group process, as I have tried to describe it, as a dangerous force. Clearly there is room for a difference of opinion on this value question, and not everyone in our culture would give the same answer [p.278].

Whether sensitivity training provides new hope for the future and holds an answer to at least some of the problems of modern man, or whether it is merely a passing fad of the newly affluent and leisured, only time will tell. If the encounter group, the "new social invention" itself fails, or is rejected, however, there remains the intellectual striving, the idealism, vision, and enthusiasm which initiated the movement; this in itself holds promise for the development of man's human potential.

REFERENCES

- Asch, S. E. Interpersonal influence: Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgements. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb, and E. L. Hartley (eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1958.
- Bach, G. R. Discussion of paper "Accelerated interaction," by Frederick H. Stoller. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1968, 18, 244-249.
- Bach, G. R. Marathon group dynamics: II. Dimensions of helpfulness: Therapeutic aggression. Psychological Reports, 1967, 20, 1147-1158.
- Back, K. W. Beyond words: The story of sensitivity training and the encounter movement. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1972.
- Bales, R. F. Some statistical problems in small group research. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 1951, 46, 311-322.
- Banion, T., & O'Connell, A. The shared journey: An introduction to encounter. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Batchelder, R. L., & Hardy, J. M. Using sensitivity training and the laboratory method: An organizational case study in the development of human resources. New York: Association Press, 1968.
- Berne, E. Transactional analysis in psychotherapy. New York: Grove Press, 1961.
- Bessell, H. Methods in human development: Theory manual. (Rev. ed.). San Diego: Human Development Training Institute, 1970.
- Bindrim, P. Nudity as a quick grab for intimacy in group therapy. Psychology Today, 1969, 3, 24-29.
- Birnbaum, M. Sense about sensitivity training. Saturday Review, Nov. 15, 1969.
- Blocher, D. H. Developmental counseling. New York: Ronald Press, 1966.

- Blocher, D. H. Developmental counseling: A rationale for counseling in the elementary school. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 1968, 2, 163-172.
- Brown, G. Human teaching for human learning: An introduction to confluent education. New York: Viking Press, 1970.
- Buber, M. Between man and man. London: Fontana Library, 1947.
- Buber, M. Eclipse of God: studies in the relation between religion and philosophy. New York: Harper & Row, 1957.
- Buber, M. I and thou. (2nd ed.) New York: Scribner's, 1958.
- Buber, M. The knowledge of man. New York: Harper's, 1965.
- Bunker, D. Individual applications of laboratory training. Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 1965, 1, 131-148.
- Burton, A. (Ed.). The theory and practice of encounter groups. Jossey-Bass Inc., The Jossey-Bass Behavioural Science Series, 1969.
- Combs, A. W. (Ed.). Florida studies in the helping professions. University of Florida Monographs, 1969, No. 37.
- Corsini, R. Issues in encounter groups. The Counseling Psychologist, 1970, 2 (2), 28-34.
- Diamond, M. Martin Buber: Jewish existentialist. New York: Oxford University Press, 1960.
- Dinkmeyer, D. Developmental counseling in the elementary school. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1966, 45, 262-266.
- Dreyfus, E. A. The search for intimacy. Adolescence, 1967, 2 (5), 25-40.
- Dreyfus, E. A., & Kremenliev, E. Innovative group techniques: Handle with care. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1970, 49 (4), 279-283.
- Eddy, W., & Lubin, B. Laboratory training and encounter groups. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1971, 49 (8), 625-636.

- Egan, G. Encounter: Group processes for interpersonal growth. Belmont, Calif.: Brooks/Cole, 1970.
- Ellis, A. The rational-emotive encounter group. In S. Burton (ed.), The theory and practice of encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.
- Erickson, E. Childhood and society. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963.
- Ettkin, L., & Snyder, L. A model for peer group counseling based on role-playing. School Counselor, 1972, 19 (3), 215-218.
- Farber, L. H. Introduction to Martin Buber. The William Alanson White Memorial Lectures, Fourth Series. Psychiatry, 1957, XX (2), 95f.
- Faust, V. The counselor-consultant in the elementary school. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1968.
- Foster, S. F., Marks, S. E., & Conry, R. F. Critical analysis of methodological problems associated with the evaluation of marathon groups. American Psychological Association, the Proceedings, 80th Annual Convention, 1972. (Mimeo.)
- Foulds, M. L. Effects of a personal growth groups as a measure of self-actualization. Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 1970, 10 (1), 33-38.
- Friedman, M. S. To deny our nothingness. New York: Delacorte Press, 1967.
- Friedman, M. S. Martin Buber: The life of dialogue. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Gazda, G. M., Duncan, J. A., & Sisson, P. J. Professional issues in group work. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1971, 49 (8), 637-642.
- Gendlin, E. A. Short summary and some long predictions. In J. Hart & T. Tomlinson, New directions in client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1970.
- Gibb, J. R. The effects of human relations training. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behaviour change. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970.
- Gottschalk, L. A., & Pattison, E. M. Psychiatric perspectives on T-groups and the laboratory movement: an overview. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 126 (6), 823-839.

- Guinan, J. F., & Foulds, M. C. Marathon group: Facilitator of personal growth? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17, 145-149.
- Gunther, B. Sense relaxation below your mind. New York: Collier Books, 1968.
- Harrison, R. Group composition models for laboratory design. Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 1965, 1, 409-423.
- Harrison, R., & Lubin, B. Personal style, group composition and learning. Part I. Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 1965a, 1, 286-294.
- Harrison, R., & Lubin, B. Personal style, group composition and learning, Part II. Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 1965b, 1, 294-301.
- Howard, J. Please touch. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1970.
- Huckins, W. Duties and responsibilities of counselors. Area Counselors' Conference Address, Salem, Oregon, April 21, 1965. (Mimeo.)
- Jaffe, S. J., & Sherl, D. J. Acute psychosis precipitated by T-group experience. Archives of General Psychiatry, 21, 443-449.
- Joel, W., & Shapiro, D. Some principles and procedures for group psychotherapy. Journal of Psychology, 1950, 29, 77-88.
- Kassarjian, H. H. Social character and sensitivity training. Journal of Applied Behavioural Science, 1965, 1, 433-440.
- Kernan, J. P. Laboratory human relations training: Its effect on the "personality" of supervisory engineers. Doctoral dissertation, New York University, 1963. Cited by J. Bebout & B. Gordon, The value of encounter. In L. N. Solomon & B. Berzon, New perspectives on encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972, p.84.
- Kuehn, J. L., & Crinella, F. M. Sensitivity training: Interpersonal "overkill" and other problems. American Journal of Psychiatry, 1969, 126, 840-845.
- Laing, R. D. The politics of experience. New York: Pantheon Press, 1967.

- Lieberman, M., & Yalom, I. Dimensions of leader behaviour. In L. N. Solomon & B. Berzon (Eds.), The encounter group: Issues and applications. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971.
- Lieberman, M., Yalom, I., & Miles, M. B. Encounter groups: First facts. New York: Basic Books, 1973.
- Lieberman, M. A., Yalom, I. D., & Miles, M. B. The group experience project: A comparison of ten encounter technologies. In L. Blank, G. G. Gottsegen, & M. Gottsegen (Eds.), Encounter confrontations in self and interpersonal awareness. New York: Macmillan, 1970.
- Lubin, B., & Eddy, W. B. The laboratory training model: Rationale, method and some thoughts for the future. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1970, 20 (3), 305-399.
- Mahler, C. A. Group counseling in the schools. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1969.
- Mahler, C. A. Group counseling. Personnel & Guidance Journal, 1971, 49 (8), 601-610.
- Maslow, A. H. Toward a psychology of being. Princeton: Van Nostrand, 1962.
- Massarik, F. Standards for group leadership. In L. N. Solomon & B. Berzon (Eds.), New perspectives in encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- McNair, M. P. What price human relations? Harvard Business Review, March-April 1957, 15-22.
- Miles, M. B. Human relations training: Processes and outcomes. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1960, 7, 301-306.
- Mintz, E. E. Marathon groups: A preliminary evaluation. Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 1969, 1, 91-94.
- Moreno, J. L. Psychodrama and group psychotherapy. Paper presented at the American Psychiatric Association Meeting, May 1946, at Chicago. Cited by C. Goldberg, Encounter group sensitivity training experience. Science House, 1970, p.101.
- Moreno, J. L. The theatre of spontaneity. Boston: Beacon House, 1947.

- Moreno, J. L. Who shall survive? New York: Beacon House, 1953.
- Moreno, J. L. The Viennese origins of the encounter movement, paving the way for existentialism, group psychotherapy and psychodrama. Group Psychotherapy, 1969, XXII, 7-16.
- Myrick, R. D. Growth groups: Implications for teachers and counselors. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 1969, 4 (1), 35-41.
- Ogg, E. Sensitivity training and encounter groups. Public Affairs Pamphlet, No. 474.
- Ohlsen, M. M. Group counseling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1970.
- Parloff, M. B. Group therapy and the small-group field: An encounter. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1970, 20, 263-304.
- Peavy, R. V. Encounter groups. Conseiller Canadien, 1971, 5 (4), 245-249.
- Perls, F. Gestalt therapy verbatim. Lafayette, Calif.: Real People Press, 1969.
- Pfuetze, P. E. The social self. New York: Bookman Associates, 1954.
- Prediger, D. J., & Baumann, R. R. Developmental group counseling: An outcome study. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1970, 17 (6), 527-533.
- Reddy, W. B. Sensitivity training or group psychotherapy: The need for adequate screening. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1970, 20, 366-371.
- Reddy, W. B. Screening and selection of participants. In L. N. Solomon and B. Berzon (Eds.), New perspectives on encounter. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Rogers, C. R. Learning to be free. In S. M. Farber & R. H. Wilson (Eds.), Conflict and creativity: Control of the mind, Part II. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963.
- Rogers, C. R. The process of the basic encounter group. In J. F. T. Bugental (Ed.), Challenges of humanistic psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1967, Chap. 16. Also in J. T. Hart & T. M. Thomlinson (Eds.), New directions in client-centered therapy. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1970, Chap. 16.

- Rogers, C. R. Freedom to learn. Columbus: Merrill, 1969.
- Rogers, C. R. On encounter groups. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.
- Ruitenbeek, H. M. The new group therapies. New York: Avon 1970.
- Schachter, S. Deviation, rejection, and communication. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 190-207.
- Schloss, G. A., Siroka, R. W., & Siroka, E. K. Some contemporary origins of the personal growth group. In G. A. Schloss, R. W. Siroka & E. K. Siroka (Eds.), Sensitivity training and group encounter. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1971.
- Schutz, W. C. Here comes everybody. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Schutz, W. C. Joy: Expanding human awareness. New York: Grove Press, 1967.
- Shaevitz, M. H., & Barr, D. J. Encounter groups in a small college. In L. N. Solomon & B. Berzon, New perspectives on encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Sherif, M. Group influences upon the formation of norms and attitudes. In E. E. Maccoby, T. M. Newcomb & E. L. Hartley (Eds.), Readings in social psychology. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1958.
- Shostrom, E. Group therapy: Let the buyer beware. Psychology Today, 1969, 12, 36-40.
- Solomon, L. N., & Berzon, B. (Eds.). New perspectives on encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Stone, W. N., & Tieger, M. E. Screening for T-groups: The myth of healthy candidates. Paper presented at the American Psychiatric Association Meeting, San Francisco, 1970. Cited by W. B. Reddy, Screening and selection of participants. In L. N. Solomon & B. Berzon (Eds.), New perspectives on encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972.
- Tenenbaum, S. A discussion of the therapy that resides in a group. Psychotherapy: Theory, Research & Practice, 1970, 7, 253-255.
- Thelen, H. A. Education and the human quest. New York: Harper, 1960.

Thelen, H. A. Group interactional factors in learning. Adapted from E. M. Bower & W. G. Hollister, Behavioural science frontiers in education. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967, Chap. 11.

Thoresen, C. E. Relevance and research in counseling. Review of Educational Research, 1969, 39 (2), 263-281.

Valiquet, I. Contribution to the evaluation of a management development program. Unpublished Master's thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 1964. Cited by J. R. Gibb, The effects of human relations training. In A. E. Bergin & S. L. Garfield (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behaviour changes. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1970, Chap. 22.

Wedel, C. C. A study of measurement in group dynamics laboratories. Doctoral dissertation, George Washington University, 1957. Cited by J. Bebout & B. Gordon, The value of encounter. In L. N. Solomon & B. Berzon (Eds.), New perspectives on encounter groups. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1972, p.84.

Yalom, I. The theory and practice of group psychotherapy. New York: Basic Books, 1970.

Yalom, I. D., Fidler, J. W., Frank, J., Mann, J., & Sata, L. Encounter groups and psychiatry. Task Force Report No. 1. American Psychiatric Association, Washington, D.C., 1970.

Yalom, I. D., & Lieberman, M. A. A study of encounter group casualties. Archives of General Psychiatry, 1971, 25, 16-30.

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis or dissertation (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation

AN EXAMINATION OF THE ENCOUNTER GROUP PHENOMENON:

ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR SOCIETY AND OUR EDUCATION SYSTEM

Author

Margaret Wood

Signature

MARGARET WOOD

Name

April 30th, 1974.

Date