

THE EFFECT OF SELF-
DISCLOSURE AND PSEUDO-
SELF-DISCLOSURE....

E. Rothenberg, 1969

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

18928

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

This dissertation has been
microfilmed exactly as received

70-10,131

ROTHENBERG, Eugenia, 1923-
THE EFFECT OF SELF-DISCLOSURE AND
PSEUDO-SELF-DISCLOSURE ON SOCIAL
ADJUSTMENT OF INSTITUTIONALIZED
DELINQUENT GIRLS.

The University of New Mexico, Ed.D., 1969
Education, guidance and counseling

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

THE EFFECT OF SELF-DISCLOSURE
AND PSEUDO-SELF-DISCLOSURE ON SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT OF
INSTITUTIONALIZED DELINQUENT GIRLS

BY
EUGENIA ROTHENBERG
B.A., University of Illinois, 1952
M.A., University of Illinois, 1954

DISSERTATION

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Education
in the Graduate School of
The University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

June, 1959

This dissertation, directed and approved by the candidate's committee, has been accepted by the Graduate Committee of The University of New Mexico in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION
THE EFFECT OF SELF-DISCLOSURE
AND PSEUDO-SELF-DISCLOSURE ON SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT OF
INSTITUTIONALIZED DELINQUENT GIRLS
Title

EUGENIA ROTHENBERG
Candidate

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING
Department

Wayne P. Moellenberg
Dean

May 20, 1969
Date

Committee

L. C. Bernardino
Chairman

Gordon A. Zick

Kaufman

Kelvin A. Danford

XX
LD
3781
N564R743

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to thank the Board of Trustees of the Girl's Welfare Home for permission to conduct this study; Mr. Manuel Armijo, Mr. Dan Ely, Mr. Joseph Macaron, Jr., Mrs. A. N. Spencer, and Mrs. J. Peter Wakeland.

Sincere appreciation is extended to the staff counselors of the Girls' Welfare Home who participated in the investigation with interest and enthusiasm: Mrs. Martha Flenniken, Mrs. Harriet Frenkel, Mrs. Martha Goodman, Miss Loy Sue Siegenthaler, Mrs. Mary Smith, and Mrs. Marlene Venardos.

The writer is particularly grateful to Professor Louis C. Bernardoni, chairman of the graduate committee, for his patience, generous extension of time for consultation and encouragement, and many excellent suggestions. Appreciation is also extended to the other members of the committee: Professors Louis Bransford, Ralph Norman, Sidney Rosenblum (who substituted for Professor Norman who was on sabbatical leave in the early planning stages of the dissertation), and Gordon Zick for many helpful suggestions and insights.

A note of special thanks is in order for the writer's secretary, Miss Evelyn Garcia, for her help in test administration, scoring, and typing, and to Mr. Everett Medeiros for assisting with test administration and scoring.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM	1
Introduction	1
Statement of the Problem	9
Definition of Terms.	10
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	11
Research Relating to Effects of Group Therapy.	11
A Group Method with Alcoholics	14
A Group Method with Drug Addicts	15
Summary	17
Theories of Genuineness, Truth and Self- Disclosure.	18
Summary	22
Relevant Research in Self-Disclosure	23
The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire.	23
Cultural Differences in Self-Disclosure.	27
Grades and Self-Disclosure	29
Self-Disclosure as an Index of Social Distance	30
Personality Traits and Self-Disclosure	31
Self-Disclosure in Psychotherapy	32
Summary	33
Research Relating to Self-Concept.	34
Self-Concept of the Juvenile Delinquent.	34
Self-Evaluation Among Adolescent Girls	36
Self-Concept of the Disadvantaged Child.	36

CHAPTER	PAGE
Self-Concept Related to Achievement	37
Self-Concept and Maladjustment	37
Acceptance of Self and Others	39
Susceptibility to Change of the Self-Percept	39
Summary	40
III. METHOD, INSTRUMENTS, AND HYPOTHESES	41
Method	41
The Jesness Inventory	46
The SAQS Chicago Q Sort	54
Null Hypotheses to be Tested	56
Design and Analysis	56
IV. THE FINDINGS	58
Introduction	58
Analysis of the Data	58
Summary of the Results	61
Relationship of the Results to the Hypotheses	66
Staff Counselor Evaluations	67
Daily Cottage Logs and Lock Reports	68
V. INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS	71
Discussion	71
Conclusions	74
Recommendations for Further Research	76
BIBLIOGRAPHY	79
APPENDIX	85
VITA	145

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. F Values Derived From Analyses of Variance (one way) of Pretest Posttest Means Differences on All Scales of the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort	59
2. Analysis of Variance (one way) for Means of Control Group on the Manifest Aggression Scale of the Jesness Inventory	60
3. Analysis of Variance (one way) for Means of All Subjects on the Withdrawal Scale of the Jesness Inventory	62
4. Analysis of Variance (one way) for Means of All Subjects on the Denial Scale of the Jesness Inventory	62
5. A Comparison of the Means of the Pretest and Posttest on the Jesness Inventory.	63
6. Fisher's z Coefficients (converted from Pearson's r's) for Pretest Means and Posttest Means on the SAQS Chicago Q Sort	65
7. Counselor's Rating Scale.	67
8. Daily Cottage Logs and Lock Reports. Total Numbers of Infractions by Groups for Sixteen Week Period.	70

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Our modern society has two major institutions for socializing the child--the family and the school. These serve to train individuals to play the age, sex, and occupational roles they shall be obliged to play throughout their lifetimes in our social system. Delinquent youth constitute the dropouts from the family and the school. Hoghughi (1966) states that there are many interrelated connections between juvenile delinquency and educational failure. In the socialization process, it is important that the child develop an extensive, meaningful relationship with his parents. As a result of poor relationships with authority figures in the home, children may develop hostile attitudes toward all authority figures, especially teachers.

The majority of delinquents experience family break-up problems. Konopka (1966) found that most female delinquents came from economically deprived homes. Many of the girls grew up in homes where no father was present. Fine (1955) states that the factor of family rejection is the most common cause of delinquency.

The typical delinquent's family also manifests other disabilities. The family shows less organization than the average; there are lower percentages of legal marriages and legitimate childbirths. There is more material privation and greater dependence upon community agencies (Tait and Hodges, 1962).

In some comparisons between delinquents and non-delinquents, the Gluecks (1950) came up with some interesting data regarding leisure time and after school activities. In regard to a place to play at home, 41.6% of delinquents had such facilities, and 93.2% of non-delinquents. Fifty-six per cent of delinquents admitted to membership in a gang as opposed to 0.6% of non-delinquents. Ninety-five per cent of delinquents were truant from school whereas only 10.8% of non-delinquents were truant. In addition, 59% of the delinquents had run away from home at one time or another, and only 1.2% of the non-delinquents had done so. Furthermore, delinquent youngsters chose delinquent companions! The ratios here are significant, too. Ninety-nine per cent of the delinquents chose delinquent companions, and only 7.4% of non-delinquents had friends who were delinquent.

Social theorists observe that there are gross differences in delinquency rates by class, ethnic affiliation, rural or urban residence, region, nation, and historical epoch (Matza, 1964). Therefore, there are many cultural and social determinants. According to Matza, the delinquent is a normal youngster, except that he belongs to what is essentially a different though related culture. Subculture is the central idea of the sociological view of delinquency. The image that Matza sees is one of drift. The delinquent is neither compelled to deeds nor freely choosing them. The delinquent in his daily life drifts between criminal and conventional action.

Shoham (1966) maintains that the main predisposing factors for delinquency are considered to be inadequate primary socialization by the family because one or more of its members are offenders; divorce, death or separation has disintegrated the family structure; or tense and unsuitable domestic relations prevail.

In 1960, authorities brought formal complaints against 7,713 delinquents in County Court of Philadelphia. Eighty-nine per cent were living in their own homes with both parents, one parent, one parent and a substitute parent, or in adoptive homes. Of those living in their own homes, only 43% were living with both natural parents. In California, the respective courts committed 3,888 juveniles to the Youth Authority in 1961. Ninety-three per cent were living in their own homes with both parents, one parent, one parent and a substitute parent, or in an adoptive home. Thirty-four per cent were living with their own natural parents; 27% with mother only; 20.9% with mother and stepfather; 6% with father and step-mother (Lunden, 1964).

Nearly all delinquent children present behavior problems in the school setting. Tait and Hodges compiled statistics while making a study of juvenile delinquency in the Washington, D. C. schools. With a sample of 179 children, they found that two-thirds had academic difficulties and one-third had attendance irregularities. Average daily non-attendance was 18% as compared with 12% for the school as a whole. In academic work, 57% of the sample was below

grade placement for their years as compared with 31% of non-delinquent children (41-42).

Lunden made a comparison of age and grade of 458 public school children and 200 juvenile delinquents in Iowa institutions to ascertain the degree of school retardation. Of the non-delinquents, 49.5% were in-grade or normal for their age. Only 12% of the delinquents were in their proper grade. Five per cent of the non-delinquents were retarded two years, and 25.5% of the delinquents. Two per cent of non-delinquents were retarded three years, and 20% of the delinquents. One per cent of the non-delinquents were retarded four years, and 20.5% of the delinquents. To summarize, 87% of the delinquent boys and 45% of the delinquent girls were retarded more than one year. Of the non-delinquent population, only 7.3% were retarded more than one year (83-86).

Another factor in delinquency is the "multi-problem" family. In San Mateo County in California, over half of the children on probation came from the less than 2% of the community's multi-problem families--those that require repeated aid from various community agencies. The New York City Youth Board found that 75% of the city's delinquents came from about 1% of its families (Tait and Hodges, 95).

Correctional institutions need to take on the training obligations left unfulfilled by the family and school. The main function of a correctional institution for juvenile offenders is to change the behaviors, attitudes, and value systems of the offenders

to conform in greater degree to the prevailing social norms. In connection with this overall goal there is a continuing need for evaluation of the treatment program as well as the delinquent's behaviors, attitudes and values.

Group psychotherapy is frequently used as part of the treatment program in correctional institutions for juvenile offenders (Gilman and Gorlich, 1968).

Hersko (1962) maintains that group psychotherapy is effective in changing behavior of delinquent adolescent girls, but that improvement is slow.

While Gersten's group therapy experiment (1951) with delinquent boys did not show changes in attitudes toward society and authority, there were marked changes in school achievement, with the experimental group gaining eighteen months in a six month period on achievement tests while the control group gained only three months in the same length of time.

Despite mixed reports regarding the value of group psychotherapy with character-disordered delinquents, group techniques are often recommended as appropriate corrective measures in socializing the delinquent child. Schulman (1966) maintains that the most productive therapeutic work with delinquent youngsters results from a program that includes individual and group psychotherapy combined with a planned "therapeutic" environment. He also reasons that group therapy provides an atmosphere not encountered in individual treatment in which intellectual insight

can be stimulated by others and in which reality testing can occur.

One commonly used variant of group psychotherapy is guided group interaction. An example of the use of this technique is provided by the self-help organization for curing drug addiction, Synanon, which has self-disclosure and social reintegration as its specific goals (Yablonsky, 1967).

"The so-called big cop-out (telling all) was a potent experience....The copping out started to gather momentum...each revelation created more tension in someone else to talk up....They all opened up. It was a turning point."

Mowrer (1964) maintains that people become maladjusted because they do not disclose themselves to the people in their lives. In psychopathology we are dealing not so much with biology as Freud would have maintained, but with sociology, or with the fear of censure from others.

Jourard (1964) states that self-disclosure is a factor in the process of effective counseling, and that people become clients because they have not disclosed themselves to the people in their lives. Yet, disclosure of the truth about ourselves is often penalized. Impossible concepts of how man ought to be--what Jourard calls the "tyranny of the should"--is a factor which keeps man from making himself known as he is. Yet, when a man does not acknowledge to himself who, what, and how he is, he is out of touch with reality. Jourard further states that no man can come to know himself except

as an outcome of disclosing himself to another person. In this way, he increases his contact with his real self.

In our society, we are punished or rewarded, not only for what we actually do, but also for what we think, feel, or want. From childhood, the individual learns to display a highly expurgated version of his self to others. Jourard coined the term "public self" to refer to the concept of oneself which one wants others to believe. Obviously, our assorted public selves are not accurate portrayals of our real selves. In our various social roles, played behind the masks of our public selves, our public selves may become so estranged from our real selves that self-alienation occurs (11).

Societies have socialization factories and mills--the families and the schools--which serve the function of training people to play their various age, sex, and occupational roles. A person who plays his roles well may be regarded as a more or less normal personality. However, normal personalities are not necessarily healthy personalities. A healthy personality is a person who plays his role satisfactorily and at the same time derives personal satisfaction from role enactment (13).

Another principle of mental health as described by Jourard maintains that "real-self-being" is an aspect of healthy personality. Neurotic people are persons who display varying degrees of self-alienation. These people have repressed or suppressed much of their own real and spontaneous reaction to experience. Spontaneous behavior is replaced with carefully censored behavior which conforms to a role-definition or a limited self-concept. They behave as they

"should" behave, and feel what they "should" feel. When roles and self-concepts exclude too much of the "real self" a person may experience anxiety, depression, and boredom (115).

Jourard's method for promoting a self-disclosive therapeutic relationship involves a willingness on the part of the counselor to be equally humanly self-disclosive. Psychotherapy is viewed as a situation where the therapist, a redeemed or rehabilitated dissembler, invites his patient to try the manly rigors of the authentic way. The patient is most likely to accept the invitation when the therapist is a role-model of uncontrived honesty (153).

Jean-Paul Sartre (1953) relates neuroses and psychoses to an individual's being in bad faith with himself:

"attitudes of negation toward the self permit us to raise a...question: What are we to say is the nature of man who has the possibility of denying himself?...bad faith is a lie to oneself."

In their investigations into factors of personality, Pierson, Cattell, and Pierce (1966) identify a Q3 factor; an attitude about the "self" and the degree to which an individual has incorporated his "ego-ideal" which governs behavior. Delinquents have low scores on the Q3 factor. These findings tie in with Jourard's ideas of self-alienation, and a limited self-concept.

Lively, et al., (1962) maintain that the direction of socialization and a favorable or unfavorable self-image are the most tangible components of insulation against or propulsion toward delinquency.

Glasser (1965) states that a common characteristic of deviants is that they "deny the reality of the world around them," and that therapy will be successful when clients are able to give up denying the world; that reality exists, and they must fulfill their needs within its framework. While Glasser does not explicitly emphasize self-disclosure, yet this must naturally follow in any therapeutic relationship involving honesty, responsibility, and integrity.

Statement of the Problem

This study will investigate the effect of guided group interaction, structured to promote self-disclosive biographical material, versus the effect of guided group interaction, structured to promote pseudo-self-disclosive biographical material on the behavior of delinquent girls.

This study will involve sixty adolescent, adjudicated delinquent girls in an institutional setting; the Girls' Welfare Home in Albuquerque, New Mexico.

The differential effects of the treatments will be measured through the use of a pretest and posttest consisting of the Jesness Inventory, a personality measure standardized on delinquent and non-delinquent populations, and the Chicago Q Sort, a self versus ideal self measure.

In addition, a count will be made of the actual infractions of rules for all subjects in the study based on the cottage reports which are written daily by each cottage parent. Differences among groups experiencing differential treatments will be measured.

Definition of Terms

Self-disclosure. The act of disclosing something significant and real about one's self to another person.

Pseudo-self-disclosure. Pretended experience which will avoid punishment and win unearned approval which consist of saying that we feel things we do not feel; we did things we did not do; we believe things we do not believe (Jourard: 1964: 11).

Public self. The concept of oneself which one wants others to believe. This is not always an accurate portrayal of the real self (10).

Real-self-being. An individual's authentic self--the person knows his self and is willing to be it (22).

CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Research Relating to Effects of Group Therapy

While it is not the purpose of the present investigation to assess the effectiveness of group therapy in general, a discussion of the findings of other researchers would seem to be appropriate here. As was noted in Chapter I, studies utilizing group counseling as a variable which hopefully results in positive change, yield mixed results. Hersko (1962) states that group psychotherapy with delinquent adolescent girls results in improvement, but improvement is slow. Gersten (1951) found that twenty sessions of group psychotherapy with delinquent adolescent boys did not produce significant changes in attitudes toward society and authority, but there were significant gains in school achievement!

Statistical research in group psychotherapy is a complicated enterprise. Of all the material published in group psychotherapy in recent years, only 2% can be designated as experimental research, according to Kotkov (319). Of these studies, 60% reported on effects, 20% on process, 10% on selection, and 10% on the therapist.

Taking Kotkov's definition of group psychotherapy (1966) to be:

"the development of verbal and emotional interactions and part-identifications in an initial collection of unrelated malfunctioning individuals, led by a qualified psychotherapist, purposely motivated toward the common goal of the alleviation of reality problems on a conscious level" (319)

the investigator concludes that the guided group activities proposed in this investigation could perhaps not qualify as "pure" group psychotherapy. Rather, the investigator sought to promote self-disclosure and pseudo-self-disclosure to ascertain if these variables of behavior had an effect on social maladjustment as measured by a personality inventory, a self-concept measure, and differences in reported misbehaviors in cottage living.

However, Kotkov's "goal" certainly seems to be achieved in the self-report of one of Rogers' clients. When excerpts from a "self-appraisal" essay (Rogers, 1965), written before entering therapy, are compared with an interview after the nineteenth and final group meeting, it would seem that group psychotherapy had a positive effect, as subjectively evaluated by the client:

"The group helped in a lot of respects in what I think of myself. I may not have solved certain problems, but it has been worth while...the group just gives you the motivation to think more constructively about yourself...And it's a funny thing. I'm not very old, but I don't feel as young as I felt in February. I was only 23; I'm still only 23, but in February I felt about 16" (296-300).

A study by Peres (1947) based on the analysis of one group which met for nine sessions found that when the group was divided into a "benefited" group (the individuals who felt they had gained considerable help) and a "nonbenefited" group (the individuals who felt they had gained little), real differences could be objectively demonstrated between these two groups. The benefited group made an increasing proportion of statements indicating understanding

and insight while the nonbenefited group engaged in more "prodding" statements chiefly directed at the other members of the group, and with no emphasis on their own problems and feelings.

Mehlman (1953) reported on a project involving three matched groups of mentally retarded institutionalized children with an age range of 5 to 12 years. One group engaged in non-directive play therapy; the second watched movies; the third was inactive. Posttests showed a statistically significant increase in adjustment after a six week period in the play therapy group as measured by the Haggerty-Olsen-Wickman Rating Scale. Bills (1950) effected changes in reading ability among children classified as slow learners through the use of group play therapy. Sheldon and Landsman (1950), in an investigation of the effects of group psychotherapy with students experiencing academic difficulty, found that there was a significant increase in grade point averages when group counseling was substituted for study periods. A study by Chenven (1953), using brain-injured subjects requiring speech therapy, indicated that the subjects who had speech therapy and group therapy improved significantly more than the subjects who had speech re-education alone.

Caplan's study of the effect of group counseling on the self-concepts of junior high school boys found that the counseled group showed an increase in self and ideal self correlations whereas the non-counseled group showed no significant changes in behavior (1957).

Baymur and Patterson (1960) compared the effects of individual counseling, group counseling, and control group membership in high school students. The criterion was to be academic success since the experimental group consisted of underachievers. The gain in grades for the members of the counseled groups was significant, with the group therapy subjects showing the greatest gains.

Another study involving group counseling in the school setting was conducted by Clements (1966). One-hundred eighty college-bound high school seniors were studied to determine whether small group counseling would affect their anxiety level. Two instruments were used to evaluate self-confidence. These were the Bills Index of Adjustment and Values and an unpublished Self-Concept Inventory (Faust and Daane, 1964). Significantly less anxiety was exhibited by the experimental groups as compared with the non-counseled control group.

A Group Method with Alcoholics

The self-help organization, Alcoholics Anonymous, claims some success in treatment of dysfunctional behavior. Through the efforts of alcoholics themselves, A.A. developed as a spontaneous group phenomenon. It originated among lay people at approximately the same time that group therapy was taking root as a new psychotherapeutic technique in the early 1930's (Brunner-Orne, and Orne, 1966). Alcoholics Anonymous was founded by two alcoholics; one a physician, and the other an engineer. The basic philosophy exhorts

the alcoholic to "surrender to a power greater than yourself," and to disclose fully and freely regarding past experiences.

A Group Method with Drug Addicts

The organization for curing drug addiction, Synanon, has particular relevance to this investigation because drug users are defined by our laws as criminals, even though psychologists may be more likely to consider these individuals emotionally ill.

Synanon is a social movement and approach to life that has helped more than five hundred people overcome a severe past of crime and drug addiction. Synanon was founded in 1958 by Charles E. Dederich, a layman. The word "synanon" originated when an addict tried to say "symposium" and "seminar" in the same breath and blurted out "synanon" (Yablonsky, 1967).

Synanists espouse a new kind of group therapy; attack therapy. No professionals are involved. Laymen who are ex-addicts treat addicts mainly through the technique of an intense verbal attack, and an insistence on truth. Ridicule, insult, and confrontation are used freely and effectively in the group meetings. A group meeting is described as follows:

"The group was loudly arguing philosophical concepts and amateur psychology into all hours of the night while a hi-fi blared out jazz music in the background....An addict (was) going through drug withdrawal pains on a living room couch in the center of this bizarre scene" (Yablonsky, 1967: 3).

Synanon at first consisted of a small band of former addicts who lived together in an old beach house in Santa Monica. While

any behavior, with the exception of physical violence, was acceptable in the group meetings, there was insistence on decent behavior in the group living situation.

"In one sense, we don't really give a damn if your grandfather was an alcoholic, your mother hustled and your father slugged you daily. None of it is an excuse for bad behavior in Synanon" (149).

Synanon's system has been set up at the Nevada State Prison, on the theory that the same personality weaknesses that drive some people to narcotics, also are present in many non-addict prisoners. Synanon in the prison depends heavily on group therapy. Absolute truthfulness is demanded, and is given. An inmate known as "Shotgun" wanted to obtain membership in the group:

"'Why do they call you Shotgun?'
'Well, I pulled lots of robberies with a shotgun.'
He then proceeds to describe in detail, and with glee, how he would carry out a robbery. He waits for the subtle approval of the usual criminal group after he has told his crime story. None seems to be forthcoming from the Synanon group. As he becomes increasingly aware of the fact that his story isn't a big hit, he becomes more nervous. The Synanon group lets him go until his story runs out. They then drop him cold with what was for Shotgun an unanticipated reaction: 'You mean you ran around with a shotgun like a nut, scaring people and stealing dimes and quarters'....The group laughs at him and ridicules his claim to fame" (349).

Synanists feel that their establishment is educational. Old patterns of behavior are censured, ridiculed, and punished. New ways of reacting are rewarded, in that group members can progress in the status ladder provided within the organization itself. Since these lay individuals do not consider themselves therapists, they

are totally unconcerned with the fact that their approach is unconventional. Their main concern is with results, and their rate of success.

Thorpe (1966), in his contention that the institutions where addicts are treated encourage dependency, points up the current feeling of hopelessness in the psychiatric treatment of addicts, while Glasser (1962) maintains that the only place in the world that narcotics addicts seem to be successfully rehabilitated is in Synanon.

Summary

Group psychotherapy is a recognized part of the treatment programs in clinics, schools, hospitals, and institutions. There are many practical reasons for employing group therapy, none the least of which is that one therapist may serve several clients in the same hour. There is, however, a paucity of research to substantiate the effectiveness of group therapy. One important reason for this small trickle of research is that research procedures become more difficult and complicated as variables multiply. One skeptic suggests that present psychotherapeutic theories do not provide research paradigms at all (Kiestler, 1966). Others suggest that the technology of measurement is not up to the demands that may be made on it by psychotherapy researchers (Goldstein, Heller and Sechrest, 1966). Perhaps the only statement that can be made with certitude is that group psychotherapy seems to be effective some of the time. In

addition, perhaps there are outcomes of therapy that may be of considerable importance that cannot yet be measured with any great precision.

Theories of Genuineness, Truth and Self-Disclosure

Jourard's theory (1964) regarding effective therapy has truthfulness, and the disclosure of self to another, as its central theme. He states that self-disclosure is a symptom of personality health--a person who displays many of the characteristics that are concomitant with healthy personality will also display the ability to make himself fully known to at least one other significant human being (25).

May (1967) comments on the therapeutic variable of truth:

"We can demonstrate at every moment of the day in our psychotherapeutic work that only the truth that comes alive, becomes more than an abstract idea, and is 'felt on the pulse,' only the truth that is genuinely experienced on all levels of being, including what is called subconscious and unconscious and never excluding the element of conscious decision and responsibility - only this truth has the power to change a human being" (17).

In his article relating healthy personality and self-disclosure (1959a), Jourard maintains there is a connection between positive health and the disclosure of self. Speaking from the standpoint of a stable social system, it is probably enough for people to be normal personalities. But it is possible to be a normal personality and be absolutely miserable. Normality in some social systems reliably produces ulcers, hypertension, paranoia, and compulsiveness.

When we consider that value orientations of Americans include neutral affectivity characterized by the concept, "duty before personal feelings," (Parsons, 1951) we can understand high incidences of diseases caused by stress.

Maslow's comments on the "normal" are quite appropriate within Jourard's context of normal versus healthy.

"What we call 'normal' in psychology is really a psychopathology of the average - so undramatic and so widely spread that we do not even notice it ordinarily. The existentialist's study of the authentic person and authentic living helps to throw the general phoniness, living by illusions and by fear, into a harsh clear light which reveals it clearly as sickness, even though widely shared....The loss of illusions and the discovery of identity, though painful at first can be ultimately exhilarating and strengthening" (Maslow, 1967: 60).

No social system can exist unless the members play their roles. It's possible, however, to be involved in a social group, such as a family or a work setting, playing one's roles nicely with the other members and never getting to know the persons who are playing the other roles. Roles can be played personally and impersonally.

In his moving and somewhat poetic book entitled Loneliness, Moustakas (1961) makes the following comments:

"In modern life, much social interaction is between surface figures or ghosts rather than real persons....The separation of self from others and from nature constitutes the primary condition of loneliness anxiety in modern societies. The unhappiness, misery, fakery, pretence, the surface meetings, the failure to find genuine human contact often result in a fear and dread of loneliness" (26).

Konopka states that delinquent girls resent what they term the "phoniness" of adults—their insincerity—not practicing the ideals they preach to the girls. "If only the adults themselves would get faces, not just blank masks on top of judgment gowns" (61).

Self-disclosure, affirms Jourard, is letting another person know what you think, feel, and want, and is the most direct means by which an individual can make himself known to another person. Personality hygienists place great emphasis upon the importance for mental health of what they call "real self-being," "self-realization," "discovering oneself" and so on. An operational analysis of what goes on in counseling shows that the clients discover themselves through self-disclosure to the counselor.

Self-disclosure is a symptom of personality health and a means of ultimately achieving healthy personality. It is not until I am my real self and I act my real self that my real self is in a position to grow. People's selves stop growing when they repress them. Jourard expands his thesis to state that every maladjusted person is a person who has not made himself known to another human being, and he resists being known. In order to do this, a false public self must be constructed. The strain of maintaining this facade evokes anxiety, heightened muscle tension, and visceral changes that occur when an individual is under stress.

In his study on "Self-Disclosure and Other-Cathexis" (1959b) Jourard found that intimate self-disclosure begets intimate self-disclosure, and impersonality begets impersonality. Certain

Konopka states that delinquent girls resent what they term the "phoniness" of adults—their insincerity—not practicing the ideals they preach to the girls. "If only the adults themselves would get faces, not just blank masks on top of judgment gowns" (61).

Self-disclosure, affirms Jourard, is letting another person know what you think, feel, and want, and is the most direct means by which an individual can make himself known to another person. Personality hygienists place great emphasis upon the importance for mental health of what they call "real self-being," "self-realization," "discovering oneself" and so on. An operational analysis of what goes on in counseling shows that the clients discover themselves through self-disclosure to the counselor.

Self-disclosure is a symptom of personality health and a means of ultimately achieving healthy personality. It is not until I am my real self and I act my real self that my real self is in a position to grow. People's selves stop growing when they repress them. Jourard expands his thesis to state that every maladjusted person is a person who has not made himself known to another human being, and he resists being known. In order to do this, a false public self must be constructed. The strain of maintaining this facade evokes anxiety, heightened muscle tension, and visceral changes that occur when an individual is under stress.

In his study on "Self-Disclosure and Other-Cathexis" (1959b) Jourard found that intimate self-disclosure begets intimate self-disclosure, and impersonality begets impersonality. Certain

implications follow. Therapists, in order to maximize disclosure in their patients, need to go beyond impersonal technique, and disclose what they are experiencing during the therapy hour as freely to their patients as they expect the latter to disclose to them.

In The Transparent Self, Jourard outlined some signs of resistance in the therapist:

1. Having fantasies in the session, and not disclosing them.
2. Giving chronically technical responses rather than spontaneous responses.
3. Lying to the patient about one's opinions, attitudes, or feelings.
4. Withholding expressions of like, dislike, boredom, and irritation (72).

While Rogers (1967) does not advocate self-disclosure as such, he comes very close when he cites his own experience:

"I started from a thoroughly objective point of view. Psychotherapeutic treatment involved the diagnosis and analysis of the client's difficulties, the cautious interpretation and explanation to the client of the causes of his difficulties, and a re-educative process focused by the clinician upon the specific causal elements. Gradually I observed that I was more effective if I could create a psychological climate in which the client could undertake these functions himself...the most important ingredient in creating this climate is that I should be real....Only when I am able to be a transparently real person, and am so perceived by my client, can he discover what is real in him.... The essence of therapy, as I see it carried on by

myself and by others, is a meeting of two persons in which the therapist is openly and freely himself and evidences this perhaps most fully when he can freely and acceptantly enter into the world of the other" (87-88).

The investigations of Fiedler (1950) indicate that the therapeutic relationship may be but a variation of good interpersonal relationships in general, inasmuch as empathy and rapport are important characteristics of the ideal therapeutic relationship.

Dreyfus (1967) in his discussion of the meaning of openness and its relationship to responsibility delineates three variations of the term; openness as atmosphere, as receptivity, and as self-revelation. Openness is a willingness to explore with oneself and with another, with honesty and responsibility.

Robb (1967) theorizes that unless the counselor realizes in his own life the full import of the search for meaning and self-understanding, he will be unable to empathize adequately with the struggles of another person who also seeks to realize his highest potential.

Summary

Various theorists maintain that the therapeutic process must be based on genuineness, openness, truthfulness, and a willingness to be as self-disclosive as the therapist expects the client to be. Self-understanding and self-revelation are considered necessary for the therapist as well as the client.

Relevant Research in Self-Disclosure

The Self-Disclosure Questionnaire

Jourard and Lasakow (1958) devised a Self-Disclosure Questionnaire which touches on six general categories of information about the self. These are: (1) Attitudes and Opinions (2) Tastes and Interests (3) Work (or Studies) (4) Money (5) Personality

(6) Body. Questions that were investigated included the following:

1. Do subjects vary in the extent to which they disclose themselves to mother, father, male friend, female friend?
2. What is the effect of the subject's marital status on self-disclosure to parents and friends?
3. Are there differences between categories of information about the self (aspects of self) with respect to self-disclosure?
4. What are the differences between Negroes and whites with respect to self-disclosure?
5. Are there sex differences regarding self-disclosure?

Results of these investigations revealed that:

1. Whites disclosed more than Negroes.
2. Females disclosed more than males.
3. Subjects varied in amount of self-disclosure. They disclosed most to Mother, and in lesser amount to Father, Male Friend, and Female Friend, unless the subject was married in which case the subject concentrated self-disclosure upon the spouse and became more reticent toward

other persons.

4. Some aspects of self--Tastes and Interests, Attitudes and Opinions, and Work, are disclosed more than information about Personality, Money, and Body.
5. A significant correlation was found between parent-cathexis and self-disclosure to the parents. The more the parents were liked, the more disclosures were made to them.

Another study made by Jourard (1958) corroborated the findings listed above. Differences were found by topics, sex, race, and marital status. A study made by Jourard and Landsman (1960) using a sample of nine male graduate students explored the relationship between self-disclosure, degree of liking, and degree to which each knew each of the others. The amount of self-disclosure was highly correlated with the degree to which the subjects knew the others and with the amount the others had disclosed to them. Liking was only slightly correlated with disclosure. The males in this study disclosed significantly less than did a sample of nursing college faculty in a previous study.

Jourard found a link between religious affiliation and self-disclosure. His study explored whether affiliates of the Baptist, Methodist, Catholic, and Jewish faiths differed in "closeness" to their mothers, fathers, same-sex friend, and opposite-sex friend. Females of different denominations did not differ, but Jewish males were significantly higher total disclosers than male members of the

other denominations, none of which differed significantly from each other. A comparison of men and women on total disclosure scores showed women to be higher disclosers (1961b).

Jourard investigated "Age Trends in Self-Disclosure," (1961d). He hypothesized that as late adolescents grow into later maturity, they will reduce the amount that they confide in their parents and same-sex friend, and show an increase in the extent to which they confide in the person of the opposite sex who is closest to them. Furthermore, in the mature years, the amount disclosed to spouse will exceed the amount disclosed to either parent or the same-sex friend at an earlier age. In other words, the relationship between a person and his spouse is "closer" insofar as self-revelation is concerned than any other everyday relationship a person has entered up to that time. The results of the study indicated a gradual decrease in disclosure on the part of males and females to both parents and to the same-sex friend. The scores for disclosure to opposite-sex friend or spouse increase with age. However, for unmarried older women mean scores for disclosure were substantially lower than means for the rest of the female sample. It seems they were relatively lonely people.

Beginning with age range 23-24 years, mean disclosure to opposite-sex friend or spouse was higher than the mean for disclosure to either parent or same-sex friend at any age level. The oldest female group was the sole exception to this trend.

The data confirm the significance of marriage. The fullest disclosure of self occurs with the spouse. Jourard suggests a

correlation between loneliness and unexpressed self with higher morbidity rates for most illnesses and suicide rates, which tend to be higher among unmarried people.

Jourard found that self-disclosure begets self-disclosure in his study of disclosure inputs and outputs of college students (1963). Subjects who reported they revealed a great deal of personal information to their parents and closest friends, likewise report that those target persons disclosed a lot to them. Those subjects who reported they disclosed relatively little about themselves to significant others indicate these others have not revealed much about themselves either. The "dyadic effect" describes the contingency between disclosure output and input. This dyadic effect seems to be a general phenomenon extending to many types of interpersonal relationships. It is Jourard's contention that in the patient-therapist dyad, patients will disclose themselves more fully when the therapist is likewise "transparent" and "congruent"—that is, disclosing his experience to the patient as fully as he expects the latter to reveal his experiencing to him.

Pederson and Breglio (1968) did a validity study on two measures of claimed self-disclosure by Jourard (SD-60 and SD-25), and a measure of actual self-disclosure using 52 undergraduate subjects. Each measure yielded scores for disclosure to mother, father, best male friend, best female friend and total disclosure. Correlations between Jourard's scores and actual disclosure scores indicated that (1) total depth was highly correlated with total

amount, (2) total depth and amount were correlated with mother, father, etc., and (3) disclosure was consistently related to claimed disclosure.

Cultural Differences in Self-Disclosure

A study by Jourard compared British and American college females. American girls were higher disclosers than British girls. However, the same patterns as previously observed in other studies prevailed in that both groups tended to disclose more to other females than to males, and both groups disclosed in some areas more readily than other, more personal aspects of the self (1961c).

Melikian (1962) attempted to determine whether self-disclosure, as measured and identified by Jourard, could be investigated cross-culturally with non-American groups. Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire was administered to 158 students (all unmarried males), coming from different parts of the Middle East, and attending the American University of Beirut. The subjects included Afghans, Armenians, Ethiopians, Greeks, Iranians, Jordanians, Lebanese, Pakistanis, and Sudanese. Christians and Moslems were represented.

Differences among groups were not found to be significant either in regard to target or aspect of self which was disclosed. The absence of differences seems to indicate the possibility that, in spite of the linguistic, ethnic, and religious differences among the subjects, there seemed to be a common factor which influenced readiness for self-disclosure. In all probability, this common element was the traditional authoritarian family structure which was common to all the subjects.

Differences between Melikian's findings and Jourard's findings point up the differences in familial patterns. Jourard found that American subjects disclosed most to mother, with decreasing amounts to father, male friend, and female friend. Melikian's results indicate that the male friend ranks first as a target for disclosure, followed by brother, mother or father, female friend, and sister. Similarities between Melikian's and Jourard's findings occurred in the aspects of self revealed. A high disclosure cluster was found by Melikian for attitudes and opinions, tastes, and work and studies. A low disclosure cluster was found for money, personality, and body. This pattern is so persistent throughout the literature on self-disclosure that it is often referred to as the public and private aspects of self, respectively.

Another researcher, Plog (1965), compared the disclosure of self in the United States and Germany. In degree of self-disclosure, there are strong cultural differences when German men are compared with American men, and when German women are compared with American women, or when sex groups are combined for total cultural comparisons. Americans are consistently more willing to reveal information about themselves to others than are Germans. In all cases, the high-disclosure topics are the same--habits and interests, political views, religion, occupational goals, and marriage and family. The low disclosure topics are also similar--interpersonal relationships, morality and sex, and personal concerns. For American men and women, a close friend of the same sex is the most important confidant.

German women choose their mothers as a confidant, and German men would rather reveal problems or feelings to peers, both male and female, or to an older friend, before approaching either parent. This reversal of disclosure patterns may be determined by the need of the male in a masculine and autocratic culture to appear independent of his home.

Social distance is maintained between the German father and his children. For personal information, he is selected as the fourth target by women and the fifth target by men (surpassing in the latter case only a casual acquaintance as an object for self-revelation).

Grades and Self-Disclosure

Jourard found significant positive correlations between high self-disclosure scores and high grades in nursing college. Jourard's SD Questionnaire was administered to 46 sophomore students of the University of Florida College of Nursing. The median age of this group was 20 years. By the time this group had become seniors, attrition had reduced the N to 23. Following the completion of the senior academic year, grade-point averages of these 23 subjects were calculated for (a) all nursing courses taken during the four years of study, (b) nursing courses taken in the junior and senior years, (c) all non-nursing courses taken during the four year program, and (d) all courses combined. Product-moment correlations were calculated between these grade-point averages and the self-disclosure scores obtained two years earlier. Those scoring as high total

disclosers (with high disclosure scores to mother as a target person) received high grades in nursing college. The correlations between grades in: (a) all nursing courses and disclosure scores to mother, .75; (b) junior and senior nursing courses and disclosure to mother, .78; (c) all non-nursing courses and disclosure to mother, .38; (d) all courses combined and disclosure to mother, .70.

Jourard's conclusions were that experience in communicating openly with one's mother seems to be good preparatory practice for communicating with other female authority figures such as are found on a nursing faculty. These students not only were open with the faculty, but part of their course grade was based on their facility and ease in interacting with patients (Jourard, 1961a).

A study by Powell and Jourard (1963) with forty college underachievers compared with a similar number of achieving students, pointed up the possibility of a lack of emancipation from the parents on the part of the underachievers. The achievers engaged in self-disclosure with their peers. The underachievers disclosed to their parents.

Self-Disclosure as an Index of Social Distance

Fitzgerald (1962), focussed attention on the social distance dimension of interpersonal relations. Two measures of social distance were used: (1) social distance as measured by assumed similarity to another, and (2) social distance as measured by the amount of self-disclosure--how much of the self the subject has made known to others. The results indicated that the Low Self-

Esteem groups did assume the greatest amount of social distance, and the least amount of similarity to the "average" girl in the class. There was twice as much disclosed to the girl liked best as there was to the average girl in the class; and almost twice as much disclosed to the average girl in the class as there was to the girl liked least. Significantly more was disclosed in the more "public" areas of tastes and interests, attitudes and opinions, and work and study; and significantly less disclosed in the more "private" areas of money, personality, and body.

In another study, Fitzgerald (1963) sought to determine if self-esteem might influence the freedom with which one would disclose the self to another. High and Low Self-Esteem groups did not follow any particular pattern, and no significant patterning of Self-Esteem groups emerged with reference to the amount of self-disclosure. A second hypothesis that there would be a greater amount disclosed to the girl liked best, a lesser amount to the average girl, and a still lesser amount to the girl liked least, was supported by the data. Hence, self-disclosure can be used as an index of social distance.

Personality Traits and Self-Disclosure

Mullaney (1964) investigated the relationships of personality traits and experiences in the family situation to the self-disclosure process. The major personality measure used was the Minnesota Multiphasic Inventory. An analysis of the MMPI scale scores indicated that the three disclosure groups--High, Medium, and Low--

were significantly different on the Social Introversion Scale. The Low Disclosure group was more socially introvertive than the other groups. In addition, the Low group, unlike the other two groups, was characterized by the fact that the discrepancy between self-appraisal and social ideal was significantly greater than the discrepancy between self-appraisal and self-ideal. The High Disclosure group revealed significantly more in the personal areas of money, body, and personality than the Low group.

Self-Disclosure in Psychotherapy

A study by Goodman (1962) which investigated the feelings about themselves experienced by therapists and clients in psychotherapy yields interesting insights into patterns of disclosure, as well as self-perception, and perception of the other. Using every third interview, Goodman asked that clients and therapists fill out questionnaires describing their inner feelings, outer expression, and the inner feelings and outer expression of the other individual comprising the dyad. One finding was that emotional disclosure indices increase with length of therapy. There was a sharp rise between the sixth interview and the ninth interview, and significantly more disclosure at the twenty-first interview than the third. A second finding was that both clients and therapists see the therapist as the more disclosed or genuine person in the dyad. As time passes, client and therapist see one another becoming more transparent, genuine, and emotionally revealed.

Weigel and Warnath (1968) used an adaptation of the Jourard Self-Disclosure Questionnaire for a small therapy group. The Questionnaire did not show any changes in self-disclosure or in differences between small groups. The methodology placed limitations on the study, and the conclusions were drawn that the instrument does not have the sensitivity that is necessary when working with a small sample.

Summary

Various investigators have pursued the study of self-disclosure with varying emphases on amounts of self-disclosure, the target persons, areas of the self disclosed, differences in self-disclosure between cultures, and increased self-disclosure in psychotherapy betw en client and therapist. Others found a relationship between self-disclosure and social distance in familial and social relationships.

The value of self-disclosure seems to be assumed as a foregone conclusion on the strength of a very small number of studies. Jourard's study with nursing college students, whose success was related to high disclosure to mother, had an N of 23. Powell and Jourard's study with forty college underachievers found that underachievers engaged in more self-disclosure with their parents, and less with their peers. A lack of emancipation from the parents is suggested as the variable contributing to underachievement! Disclosing with one's parent (or parents) can have good and bad effects on grades!

Mullaney with a sample of 196 male college sophomores and juniors found that the Low Disclosure Group was more socially introvertive as measured on the scales of the MMPI than the High Disclosure Group. In other words, those subjects who did not talk very much to anybody were found to be introverts!

Research Relating to Self-Concept

The investigator wishes to examine the self-concepts of the subjects involved in the study, and to ascertain if the self-concept showed positive and significant change after a course of guided group self-disclosive and pseudo-self-disclosive activities.

The Chicago Q Sort technique which investigates the area of self versus ideal self and yields a correlation score, operates on the assumption that, in general, the closer the relationship of the individual's perception of self to his perception of the ideal self, the more congruence he enjoys. Most probably, with delinquent girls, there is a tendency to devalue their selves and overvalue their ideal selves. The researcher expects that the correlations between the self and ideal self obtained with this measure will be low, reflecting this tendency to perceive the self as all "bad" and to perceive an ideal self as all "good."

Self-Concept of the Juvenile Delinquent

In a study by Robinson (1967) a comparison of 14 year old delinquent and non-delinquent girls on a measure of expressed self-acceptance--the Berger Questionnaire--was made. The positive relationship between expressed self-acceptance and acceptance of

others was confirmed; also confirmed was the difference between delinquent and non-delinquent girls on self-acceptance, with the delinquent girls being less self-accepting than the non-delinquent girls.

Allison (1957), another investigator into the self-concept of the juvenile delinquent, found that delinquents imitated more the self-attitudes of their age-associates than the self-attitudes of their mothers. The delinquent has a distorted picture of himself and those about him. He may report that he is misunderstood by his mother, but she has more knowledge of his attitudes than he has of her attitudes.

In a number of investigations, Reckless, et al., (1956, 1957a, '7b), found that a positive self-concept was an insulator against delinquency. The non-delinquent boy has a self-concept as a "good" boy--law-abiding, obedient, and with strict values about right and wrong.

In a following study Reckless, Dimitz, and Murray (1957a), investigated the "good" boy in a high delinquency area. Boys are identified as "good" boys by interviews with teachers and family members. Study of the boys, by interviews and Gough California Personality Inventory, indicates that they have been for the most part "relatively isolated" from the pervasive delinquent patterns characteristic of the area. This isolation from deviant norms and associations may be attributed in part to close maternal supervision in a relatively non-deviant, harmonious and stable family setting.

The boys' affectional needs appeared to be satisfactorily met in terms of his own perceptions of these needs.

Reckless, Dinitz, and Kay (1957b), continue in this vein of research and conclude that insulation against delinquency is related to the acquisition of a socially acceptable self-concept. The so-called insulated boys differ markedly from the potentially delinquent boys with regard to self-concept.

Self-Evaluation Among Adolescent Girls

In an experimental approach to the measurement of self-evaluation among adolescent girls, Blodgett (1953) using original paper and pencil techniques found that a healthy group shows more social and group interests, achieves higher scores on positively oriented measures, and enjoys better group acceptance. The self-evaluated "defeated" group shows feelings of inferiority.

Self-Concept of the Disadvantaged Child

McBride (1967) made a study of the relationships between the self-concepts of seventh grade disadvantaged children and the effectiveness of counseling versus motivation techniques. While neither counseling nor motivation techniques alone showed any appreciable differences in developing more positive self-concepts, the combination of group counseling, and motivation and enrichment activities did aid the disadvantaged child to grow in more positive directions.

Self-Concept Related to Achievement

In a study relating the self-concept, ideal self-concept, and achievement, Chickering (1958) found an inverse relationship between academic achievement and the discrepancy between the actual and ideal self-concept. More congruent students made better grades. Less congruent students (with greater discrepancy between self and ideal) made poorer grades.

Self-Concept and Maladjustment

In a study of self-concepts in adjusted and maladjusted hospital patients, Chase (1957) found that, using Q Sort data yielding six adjustment measures regarding concepts of self, ideal self, and average other person, that "maladjusted" subjects saw themselves as being different from their ideals and from their concepts of the average other person, while "adjusted" subjects did not.

Raymaker (1957) investigated the relationships between the self-concept, the self-ideal concept and maladjustment. An instrument for measuring the self-concept and self-ideal concept was developed and tested against MMPI scales. The three MMPI scales which showed high and significant correlations were psychasthenia, schizophrenia and depression. Raymaker concluded that subjects who show large discrepancies between the way they see themselves and the way they would like to see themselves tend to express strong feelings of self-dissatisfaction and tend to be maladjusted.

In a comparison of normal and neuropsychiatric groups, Corrie (1958) found that schizophrenics were more self-accepting than

neurotics or normals, and neurotics were less self-accepting than normals. Furthermore, the acceptance of self was significantly positively related to the acceptance of others.

Zimmer (1954) had 52 subjects rate themselves as they are and as they would like to be with respect to 25 personality traits on two similar seven-point rating scales. The adjectives were used as stimulus words in a word-association test, and employed as an index of conflict. The indicators used as indices of conflict were: (a) long reaction time, (b) long reproduction time, (c) defective reproduction, (d) repetition of stimulus word, (e) responding with more than one word, and (f) overt emotional behavior. Zimmer tested the hypothesis that the presence of conflict over a personality trait is associated with a discrepancy between the concept of self and concept of ideal self. The results failed to support the criterion that discrepancies between the concept of self and the concept of ideal self are directly indicative of conflict.

Jourard and Remy (1955) correlated Maslow's Test of Security-Insecurity with self-appraisal, and percept of parents' appraisal. They found that the self-appraisals covary with the individual's perception or belief concerning the parents' appraisal of him. Furthermore, negative self-appraisals were correlated with insecurity.

Hood (1960) performed an anxiety symptoms study using Q-Methodology. He examined the concept of "anxiety" as it is used by teachers and other professional workers describing anxious or mal-

CONTINUED

1 OF 3

adjusted high school students. The plan of the study called for selection of 100 behavior description items from a collection of statements made by teachers during interviews in which they were requested to describe specific behaviors of children whom they had labelled anxious. Sorts made by 38 persons; teachers, social workers, psychologists, and psychiatrists showed common agreement among all four groups especially in the broad areas of Emotional Control, Self-Orientations and Social Approval. However, in the area of "anxiety" as such, there was marked inconsistency by sorters.

Acceptance of Self and Others

Omwake (1954) found a marked relationship between the way an individual sees himself and the way he sees others. Those who accept themselves accept others and perceive others as accepting themselves; those who reject themselves hold a correspondingly low opinion of others, and perceive others as being self-rejecting.

Susceptibility to Change of the Self-Percept

In a study regarding the organization of self-percepts through their susceptibility to change, Leonard (1958) found that test - retest self-percepts show stability over a short period of time. A 120 item test was devised to investigate the stability of four levels of self-percepts over a short period of time. The experimental group consisted of 20 out-patients in a psychiatric clinic. The control group consisted of 35 students in a psychology course. The self-percepts included items related to: (1) the body (2) the

family (3) extra familial concerns (4) societal images. The results indicated that self-percepts do not change easily, but the experimental group changed more significantly than the control group.

Summary

A number of researchers have found that the juvenile delinquent tends to be self-rejecting and to hold a distorted picture of himself and those about him. Insulation against delinquency is related to the acquisition of a socially acceptable self-concept.

Self-concept seems to be related to psychological and social maladjustment, as well as school achievement. Furthermore, self-acceptance seems to be positively related to acceptance of others.

CHAPTER III

METHOD, INSTRUMENTS, AND HYPOTHESES

Method

Subjects consisted of adolescent adjudicated delinquent girls, committed to the Girls' Welfare Home in Albuquerque, New Mexico, for a variety of offenses, ranging from truancy to check forgery. The number (N) was 60. Subjects consisted of almost the entire population of the institution.

The sixty subjects were given the pretest consisting of the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort. The Asocial Index on the Jesness was calculated. Equal numbers of high-scorers, mid-scorers, and low-scorers were assigned to each of the three groups so that the Jesness mean Asocial Index was 24.2 for each group. The scores on the Chicago Q Sort were not used for the purposes of assigning subjects to groups.

Each group had twenty members at the start of the experimental period. The assumption was made that one or two may drop out from each group due to AWOLs, releases and paroles. However, these were not replaced as new members may have constituted an interference with on-going group processes. The anticipated attrition did occur. At the end of the experimental period, the N of Group I (Self-Disclosure) was 19; the N of Group II (Pseudo-Self-Disclosure) was 16; the N of Group III (Control) remained at 20.

Group I had the pretest, guided group interaction along the lines of self-disclosure, and the posttest. Group II had the pretest, guided group interaction along the lines of pseudo-self-disclosure, and the posttest. Group III had the pretest and posttest. Group III is a control group which received no special treatment, but experienced only the ordinary routine of the "milieu therapy" which is characteristic of the Girls' Welfare Home.

There were ten sessions with Groups I and II approximately one hour in length. Ten sessions was chosen somewhat arbitrarily, but one consideration affecting this decision was the fact that the length of stay at this institution is not very long (average of eight months, with many staying shorter periods) and a prolongation of this study could have resulted in a turnover variable which is not consistent with the notion of a closed group. Groups I and II met once a week with staff counselors acting as group leaders.

Since each group had twenty members, these were divided into sub-groups of ten each. There were to be two self-disclosure sub-groups and two pseudo-self-disclosure sub-groups.

The Girls' Welfare Home employs nine qualified counselors. Of these nine, four counselors have collateral duties, i.e., Clinical Director, Education Director, Residence Director, and Aftercare Worker. All counselors indicated their willingness to participate in the study. The Clinical Director chose four counselors without collateral duties and assigned them to the four groups. No effort was made to match counselor and group since there was no

criterion for matching. While it is recognized that counselors vary in their approaches to counseling, for the purposes of this investigation, the counselor's approach was to be as uniform as possible with the experimental groups.

It was found after the first session or two, that groups of ten were too large (See Appendix). The decision was made by the investigator to further subdivide the groups. There were, henceforth, four self-disclosure sub-groups, and three pseudo-self-disclosure sub-groups. Almost all of the staff counselors participated in the investigation (See Appendix).

Group I was informed that the purpose of the group meetings was honest self-disclosure. For the purposes of promoting self-disclosure, the leader made the following statement: "I wonder how many of us know the real life stories of other people. We probably talk to one another about lots of things in our lives, some good things, and some bad things, but it's just bits and pieces. I wonder if we can really trust one another enough to tell the real stories of our lives in these meetings. We can start with our earliest memories and tell our story up to the present time.

"Since these group meetings are like group counseling in some ways, we all need to agree that anything we say in these sessions will stay in this room. We won't talk about it outside of this room. Can we all agree to that?

"You won't be punished or locked for anything you say here. Nothing will go in your record, or to a probation officer or a judge. Just relax on that point."

Should blocking occur, others could continue their narrative. It was foreseeable that two or three life stories would be running concurrently.

Group II was informed that the purpose of the group meetings was to assess their originality and inventiveness in story telling, and in this connection, subjects were to make up an autobiography and tell it as if it were true. For the purposes of promoting pseudo-self-disclosure, the leader made the following statement: "The purpose of these meetings is to give you a chance to tell stories--not just stories that you've read somewhere, but a story you make up--a make-believe or pretend story of your life. You are to make up a story of your life and tell it as if it were your true life story. The story should not be wild and fantastic--things that all of us know couldn't have happened--like a trip to the moon, for instance, but make the story sound true. Let's see how original you can make your story and let's see if you can also make it sound like it could have happened. However, remember, it is not to be the real story of your life."

Tape recordings or written reports were made of the group sessions. The written reports described the content of material disclosed, the extent of participation, and interaction among members of the group (See Appendix for counselor's reports of self-disclosure and pseudo-self-disclosure sessions). Staff counselors listened to tape recordings, read the counselor's reports, and/or observed the sessions through a one-way mirror in the observation room. Staff

counselors acted as judges and analyzed the sessions in terms of whether or not self-disclosure was occurring on the basis of the known social history of the subjects, by filling in a Counselor's Rating Scale form for clients in the study who were also on their case loads.

The pseudo-self-disclosure sessions were evaluated along the same lines. It was expected that some real happenings would be woven into the narrative. If a counselor felt that the story being told was essentially true, this was noted. To be sure, it is reasonable to expect that known social histories cannot include everything of importance in the subject's life. Therefore, counselors involved in analyzing the sessions were asked to judge the material by checking the appropriate category on the scale to assess the probability of significant events having occurred. A model of the Counselor's Rating Scale follows:

Counselor's Rating Scale

Counselor's Name _____ Client's Name _____

In your opinion, how self-disclosive are the statements made by your client?

Fabrication Not likely Some doubt Quite likely Self-disclosing
Not Participating

A count was made of the numbers of check-marks in the different categories (See Chapter IV).

In addition, school reports and daily cottage logs (running commentary on incidents in the cottages, infractions of rules, instances of disobedience, lock reports) were studied for the purposes of counting the number of infractions of stated rules of the subjects participating in the study. A comparison of the means of the infractions was made of the three groups participating in the study (See Chapter IV). The most common punishable infractions at school and cottage include:

1. Swearing and abusive language
2. Temper outbursts
3. Destroying school or cottage property
4. AWOL or attempted AWOL
5. Smoking in forbidden areas--bedrooms, kitchen, library
6. Refusal to do chores
7. Assaults on other girls or personnel
8. Homosexual advances to other girls
9. Defiance of cottage parent or teacher

Posttests consisted of the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort and were administered to all groups.

The Jesness Inventory

The Jesness Inventory (1966) provides scores on eleven personality characteristics, and consists of 155 statements which are answered true or false. The Asocial Index, the final scale, is based on a regression equation which combines attitude syndromes and personality traits into an index most predictive of acting-

out potential. A brief definition of each scale follows:

1. Social Maladjustment Scale (SM)--63 items. Social Maladjustment refers here to a set of attitudes associated with inadequate or disturbed socialization, as defined by the extent to which an individual shares the attitudes of persons who demonstrate inability to meet environmental demands in socially approved ways.

Social Maladjustment is a broad syndrome including a variety of personality types. There are recurrent themes when delinquents are grouped together. A conspicuous theme is that the delinquent tends toward a negative self-concept, feeling misunderstood, unhappy and worried. He shows a marked distrust of authority, blames others for his problems, and yet often maintains an unrealistic and over-generous evaluation of his own parents. He is bothered by feelings of hostility, which he has trouble controlling. He is sensitive to criticism and lacks ego strength. There is often an uneven development of conscience, and the delinquent views as acceptable much behavior which is generally regarded as antisocial.

Raw scores on SM tend to decrease with age, as do scores on several other scales in the Inventory. For non-delinquents the mean T - score is 50; for 15 year old delinquents the mean T - score on Social Maladjustment is 62 (7).

2. Value Orientation Scale (VO)--39 items. Value Orientation refers to a tendency to share attitudes and opinions characteristic of persons in the lower socioeconomic classes.

The items selected for the VO scale included the main themes of lower-class culture--the trouble, luck, and thrill motifs, and the gang orientation, toughness ethic, and desire for early or premature adulthood.

There is a change with age with older adolescents tending to answer fewer items in the scored direction. Higher scores on VO are related to a tendency toward non-conforming, rule-violating behavior, lack of responsibility, and alienation in the relations between youngsters and adults (9-10).

3. Immaturity Scale (Imm)--45 items. Immaturity reflects the tendency to display attitudes and perceptions of self and others which are usual for persons of a younger age than the subject.

The assumption in developing the scale was that "maturity" could be defined on the basis of attitudes which characterize older as contrasted with younger groups. A high scorer shares attitudes more common among persons of a younger age. The item content suggests that "immature" subjects are naive in evaluating their own and others' motivations. They repress or suppress problems, lack insight, and express anxiety through somatic symptoms.

In general, the trend is for fewer "true" responses with higher age. On Item 50, 80% of young groups and 20% of older groups will mark the following item "true":

"When things go wrong, there isn't much you can do about it."

Delinquents show a consistent tendency to score higher than non-delinquents at every age level. There is a trend for both non-

delinquent and delinquent girls to be more "mature" than boys of the same age, with the female delinquents being only slightly less mature than the female non-delinquents (10-11).

4. Autism Scale (Au)--28 items. Autism measures a tendency, in thinking and perceiving, to distort reality according to one's personal desires and needs.

The high-scoring individual sees himself as self-sufficient, smart, good-looking, and tough, while at the same time he expresses concern about "hearing things," feels there is something wrong with his mind, day dreams, is fearful, prefers solitude, and expresses somatic complaints. The picture is that of an inappropriate facade of self-adequacy covering an insecure person.

Delinquents have significantly higher average raw scores at all ages than non-delinquents, and change with age is quite marked (12).

5. Alienation Scale (Al)--26 items. Alienation refers to the presence of distrust and estrangement in a person's attitudes toward others, especially toward those representing authority.

The person scoring high on this scale appears to be critical of others, he views those in authority as unfair, domineering, and not to be trusted. The mean scores show a linear relationship with age, with raw scores being lower for older subjects. Differences between mean scores of delinquents and non-delinquents at every age show the delinquents to be more rebellious and distrustful of authority, with the differences between the delinquent and non-

delinquent females actually more impressive than those between the two male samples.

While the mean scores for delinquent girls are much the same as those of delinquent boys, the non-delinquent females achieve substantially lower scores than do the non-delinquent males (13).

6. Manifest Aggression Scale (MA)--31 items. Manifest Aggression reflects an awareness of unpleasant feelings, especially of anger and frustration, a tendency to react readily with emotion, and perceived discomfort concerning the presence and control of these feelings.

The individual who scores high is aware of, and uncomfortable with his feelings of anger and hostility. However, a high score is not necessarily associated with angry outbursts of temper--some individuals who are highly concerned with controlling their feelings may display conforming, over controlled behavior. Manifest Aggression, as used here, means simply the perception of unpleasant feelings of anger and discomfort concerning control.

This scale shows a tendency to peak during adolescence. Mean scores increase from age 8 through 10, level off, and slowly decrease with maturity.

The MA score showed the highest relationship of any scale with aggressive, assaultive behavior. There was also significant relationship between scores on the scale and a background history of difficulty with peers (13-14).

7. Withdrawal Scale (Wd)--24 items. Withdrawal involves a perceived lack of satisfaction with self and others and a tendency toward isolation from others.

The individual who scores high perceives himself as depressed, dissatisfied with himself, sad, misunderstood, and lonesome. He sees others as poorly controlled, and is displeased by their aggressive behavior, and feels fighting is bad. There is a relationship with retarded-depressed behavior as rated on a behavior checklist. Means for the male and female samples show significant differences between delinquent and non-delinquent groups, and the scores show a slight linear relationship with age. Females make somewhat higher scores than males which points to a dislike for aggressive, open combat (14).

8. Social Anxiety Scale (SA)--24 items. Social Anxiety refers to perceived emotional discomfort associated with interpersonal relationships.

Those scoring high characteristically feel and acknowledge nervous tension and self-consciousness, seeing themselves as sensitive to criticism and unduly shy.

Scores on Social Anxiety remain fairly constant with age except for a trend to higher scores in early adolescence. On this scale, scores tend to peak around age 11, decreasing slowly with maturity.

There are no important differences between the means of delinquents and non-delinquents. However, there are distinct sex differences. Both delinquent and non-delinquent females tend to be

more socially sensitive and self-conscious than males. Subjects with high scores on SA tend to be alone during the commission of delinquencies and tend to have problems with peers (14-15).

9. Repression Scale (Rep)--15 items. Repression reflects the exclusion from conscious awareness of feelings and emotions which the individual normally would be expected to experience, or his failure to label these emotions.

The similarity of content in the items of this scale point to a factor of "hypernormality." The high-scoring subject does not admit to, or is not aware of, feelings of anger, dislike, or rebellion, and is generally uncritical of himself and others. It is assumed that the defensive behavior leading to a high score on Repression is that of unconscious exclusion rather than conscious suppression or deception. From ages 8 through 10, scores tend to decrease rapidly, then level off and remain fairly constant for all groups beyond age 12. In general, both male and female delinquents demonstrate more use of Repression than do non-delinquent groups (15).

10. Denial Scale (Den)--20 items. Denial indicates a reluctance to acknowledge unpleasant events or aspects of reality often encountered in daily living.

About half of the items concern the individual's perception of his family, the high scorers seeing their parents as without fault and admitting to no conflict with them; another group of items suggests denial of personal inadequacies or unhappiness; and a final group indicates unwillingness to criticize others. A very low score,

therefore, suggests the presence of family conflict and a willingness to admit to these and other problems. Those high on Denial suppress critical judgment and avoid unpleasant thoughts about interpersonal relationships.

A moderate rise of scores with higher age is apparent in the data, Denial being the only scale showing this kind of change with age. It is also the only scale which shows higher mean scores among non-delinquents. Thus, a moderately elevated score may be indicative of good emotional adjustment and optimism. A very low score could be associated with low ego strength and dependency feelings. A significant relationship was shown between Denial and conforming social behavior and responsibility. High scores were also related to high social status as rated by peers (15-16).

11. Asocial Index. Asocialization refers to a generalized disposition to resolve problems of social and personal adjustment in ways ordinarily regarded as showing a disregard for social customs or rules.

The Asocial Index is derived from the computation of the relative distance between the SM score and scores on the other scales. It takes into account the amount of information for differentiation provided by the ten Inventory scales, and combines the information, making use of the inter-correlations.

The Inventory score which is most closely related to, and most predictive of, delinquent behavior is Asocialization. A distance of approximately two standard deviations separates the

mean scores of the delinquent and non-delinquent groups of both sexes on the Index (16-17).

Validation data for the Jesness Inventory come from two sources: (1) correlations with the California Personality Inventory based on 324 male and female delinquent subjects, ages 10 - 20, and (2) relationships with behavior and test data in a sample of 210 delinquents, ages 10 - 14 (7).

The normative samples consisted of 970 delinquent and 1075 non-delinquent males and 450 delinquent and 811 non-delinquent females.

The majority of delinquent subjects in the normative group came from the two reception centers serving the California Youth Authority. The non-delinquent sample was obtained in ten public schools in Northern California. Most of the schools were situated in urban "lower-class" socioeconomic areas (18-19).

The coefficients of correlation for odd-even reliability run in the .60's, .70's and .80's. The coefficients for test-retest stability are given by Jesness as: .40 (Al), .55 (Rep), .60 (Imm), .66 (Au), .68 (Den), .70 (SA), .70 (Wd), .76 (MA), .79 (SM), and .79 (VO) (2Q). The correlations for odd-even reliability and test-retest stability seem quite adequate for a personality measure.

The SAQS Chicago Q Sort

The SAQS Chicago Q Sort (Corsini, 1956) consists of 50 personal adjectives imprinted on cards, which are laid out by subjects for perceptions of self or others. Cards are laid out in ten piles or columns, five words in each column-pile. Words to the

left describe the individual least--to the right, most. For the purposes of this study, the pretest and posttest consisted of a self-sort (What are you like?) and an ideal-self sort (What would you like to be like?). Differences between the self-sort and ideal self-sort were computed and a correlation was made using a table provided in the manual.

Reliability and validation data seem to be somewhat sparse on this measure. The manual mentions one test-retest on the self-sorts. The SAQS was given to two college groups for "self" a week apart. The 27 women had an average test-retest correlation of .81, and the 31 men had a reliability correlation of .79. The measure was used in two investigations in marital happiness by Corsini. One investigation concerned self-concept and marital happiness. Happy couples had an average correlation of .58 for self, and unhappy couples had an average correlation of .20 for self. In another investigation, Corsini found that when either the husband or the wife's sort was compared with a sort by the mate of the prediction type, i.e., agreement between how the wife saw herself and how the husband saw her, the correlations typically averaged .60.

The Q Sorts evaluated the congruence between the self and ideal self on the basis of the correlations of these two sorts. High correlations were assumed to be indicative of self acceptance and low correlations of lack of self acceptance. The differences in the means of the correlations were examined from pretest to posttest to ascertain the amount and direction of change, for the experimental and control groups.

Null Hypotheses to be Tested

- I. There will be no significant differences between those subjects who participated in guided group self-disclosive activities, and those subjects who participated in guided group pseudo-self-disclosive activities as measured by the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort.
- II. There will be no significant differences between those subjects who participated in guided group self-disclosive activities, and those subjects who participated in the pretest, (control group) as measured by the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort.
- III. There will be no significant differences between those subjects who participated in guided group pseudo-self-disclosive activities and those subjects who participated in the pretest, (control group) as measured by the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort.
- IV. There will be no differences between pretest and posttest scores on the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort for all subjects participating in the study.

Design and Analysis

A Pretest-Posttest Control Group Design, described by Campbell and Stanley (1966) will be used. The design may be diagrammed as follows:

Group I	Pretest	Self-Disclosure	Posttest
Group II	Pretest	Pseudo-Self-Disclosure	Posttest
Group III	Pretest	Control	Posttest

Two treatment variables are proposed. These are self-disclosure and pseudo-self-disclosure. The three groups will be given the pretest and posttest consisting of the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort using correlation scores on self versus ideal self. The data will be analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance design. Differences will be looked for on the scales of the Jesness Inventory and on the correlation scores on self versus ideal self.

CHAPTER IV
THE FINDINGS

Introduction

Forty-eight separate analyses of variance were performed and three significant F values were found at the .05 level of probability. By chance alone, an investigator would achieve $(48 \times .05) 2.40$ significant results. Since the three significant F values obtained approach the number that chance alone would have predicted, there is grave doubt that the results show anything but chance results. However, these results will be discussed to show where the "significance" occurred, for the reader's information.

Analysis of the Data

One way analyses of variance were computed to ascertain if there were pretest, posttest differences in means for Group I (Self-Disclosure), Group II (Pseudo-Self-Disclosure), and Group III (Control) on the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort.

There were no significant differences in means on the scales of the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort between pretest and posttest for the Self-Disclosure Group and the Pseudo-Self-Disclosure Group (see Table 1). There was one significant difference on the Manifest Aggression scale of the Jesness Inventory beyond the .05 level of probability, in a positive direction (i.e., a tendency to be less angry) between pretest and posttest for the Control Group (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 1

F Values Derived From Analyses of Variance (one way) of Pretest Posttest Means Differences on All Scales of the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort

Jesness Scale	Self-Disclosure (N=19)	Pseudo-Self Disclosure (N=16)	Control (N=20)	All Subjects (N=55)
	F Value	F Value	F Value	F Value
SM	1.09	.24	1.76	2.55
VO	2.36	.01	3.68	3.40
Imm	.84	.39	.03	.72
Au	.13	.28	.08	.47
AI	.16	.23	.35	.68
MA	1.49	.01	5.32*	3.24
Wd	2.49	.10	3.94	4.68*
SA	.02	.04	.25	.23
Rep	.04	.38	.66	.94
Den	1.79	.31	2.34	3.97*
Asoc.	.76	.98	.00	1.68
Chicago Q Sort	4.00	.56	2.91	2.41

*Significant beyond .05 level

Table 2

Analysis of Variance (one way) for Means of Control Group
on the Manifest Aggression Scale of the Jesness Inventory

SOURCE	df	ss	ms	F
Treatment	1	105.6	105.6	5.32*
Within	38	754.4	19.9	
Total	39	860.0		

Treatment is pretest versus posttest. Pretest mean is 18.15;
posttest mean is 14.9. N = 40.

*Significant beyond .05 level

One-way analyses of variance were computed to ascertain if there were pretest, posttest differences in means for All Subjects; Group I, Group II, and Group III, (N=55). Significant differences were found in means on two scales of the Jesness Inventory. These were the Withdrawal Scale, and the Denial Scale, both of which were significant beyond the .05 level of probability, in a positive direction (i.e., a tendency to be less withdrawn and more conforming) between the pretest and posttest (see Tables 1, 3, and 4)).

Summary of the Results

The results as a whole indicate change in a positive direction on all scales and for all groups on the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort (see Tables 5 and 6). However, the data do not achieve statistical significance except on the following scales, and the investigator has already indicated that these results could possibly represent chance results.

The Control Group, which was involved in only the pretest and posttest, showed a significant decrease in the scores on the Manifest Aggression Scale identifying a tendency to be less angry, and less uncomfortable with feelings of anger and aggression. The Manifest Aggression Scale mean score changed from 18.15 to 14.90.

All subjects involved in the study showed positive change from pretest to posttest on the Withdrawal Scale, indicating a tendency to be less withdrawn, and on the Denial Scale, which indicates more conforming social behavior and responsibility. The Withdrawal Scale mean score changed from 15.00 to 13.93. The Denial Scale mean score changed from 8.84 to 10.16. (This is the only scale of the Jesness Inventory in which an upward shift of scores indicates better adjustment.)

Table 3

Analysis of Variance (one way) for Means of All Subjects
on the Withdrawal Scale of the Jesness Inventory

SOURCE	df	ss	ms	F
Treatment	1	31.65	31.65	4.68*
Within	108	729.70	6.76	
Total	109	761.35		

Treatment is pretest versus posttest. Pretest mean is 15.00; posttest mean is 13.93. N=110.

*Significant beyond .05 level

Table 4

Analysis of Variance (one way) for Means of All Subjects
on the Denial Scale of the Jesness Inventory

SOURCE	df	ss	ms	F
Treatment	1	48.54	48.54	3.97*
Within	108	1317.00	12.19	
Total	109	1365.54		

Treatment is pretest versus posttest. Pretest mean is 8.84; posttest mean is 10.16. N=110.

*Significant beyond .05 level

Table 5

A Comparison of the Means of the Pretest and Posttest
on the Jesness Inventory

SELF-DISCLOSURE GROUP N=19					Differences
Scale	Pretest Means	(S.D.)	Posttest Means	(S.D.)	in Means
SM	27.84	5.06	26.16	4.88	1.68
VO	19.11	5.27	16.58	4.56	2.53
Imm	14.16	4.90	12.89	3.44	1.27
Au	10.00	2.05	9.68	3.27	.32
Al	9.00	5.53	8.42	4.21	.58
MA	17.58	4.57	15.84	4.17	1.74
Wd	16.00	2.79	14.53	2.97	1.47
SA	16.11	3.70	15.89	4.48	.22
Rep	4.42	2.46	4.26	2.42	.16
Den	8.11	3.18	9.58	3.60	1.47
Asoc.	23.89	5.25	22.79	5.44	1.10

PSEUDO-SELF-DISCLOSURE GROUP N=16					Differences
Scale	Pretest Means	(S.D.)	Posttest Means	(S.D.)	in Means
SM	29.50	7.33	28.19	7.83	1.31
VO	17.88	7.77	17.63	8.74	.25
Imm	14.13	5.07	13.06	4.48	1.07
Au	11.06	4.06	10.25	4.61	.81
Al	8.94	6.10	7.94	5.67	1.00
MA	17.00	5.93	17.19	6.83	.19
Wd	14.17	2.51	13.88	2.94	.31
SA	16.44	3.83	16.19	3.71	.25
Rep	4.75	2.57	4.25	1.98	.50
Den	9.38	3.05	10.13	4.41	.75
Asoc.	24.63	5.21	24.31	4.39	.31

CONTROL GROUP N=20					Differences
Scale	Pretest Means	(S.D.)	Posttest Means	(S.D.)	in Means
SM	28.40	4.50	26.00	6.71	2.40
VO	19.90	4.32	16.40	6.92	3.50
Imm	13.15	3.63	13.35	3.73	.20
Au	9.50	2.14	9.20	4.32	.30
Al	8.10	3.80	7.35	4.26	.75
MA	18.15	3.84	14.90	4.99	3.25*
Wd	14.70	2.11	13.40	2.04	1.30
SA	15.60	2.84	15.05	4.05	.55
Rep	6.35	3.66	4.40	2.46	1.95
Den	9.10	2.69	10.75	3.99	1.65
Asoc.	24.20	4.38	24.10	5.35	.10

*Significant beyond .05 level

Table 5-continued

ALL SUBJECTS N=55

Scale	Pretest Means	(S.D.)	Posttest Means	(S.D.)	Differences in Means
SM	28.53	5.57	26.69	6.46	1.84
VO	19.04	5.77	16.82	6.80	2.22
Imm	13.78	4.48	13.11	3.80	.67
Au	10.13	2.83	9.67	4.03	.46
Al	8.65	5.08	7.89	4.63	.76
MA	17.62	4.71	15.89	5.34	1.73
Wd	15.00	2.55	13.93	2.65	1.07*
SA	16.02	3.51	15.67	4.06	.35
Rep	5.22	3.58	4.31	2.28	.91
Den	8.84	2.97	10.16	3.95	1.32*
Asoc.	24.22	4.86	23.71	5.20	.51

*Significant beyond .05 level

Table 6

Fisher's z Coefficients (converted from Pearson's r's) for Pretest Means and Posttest Means on the SAQS Chicago Q Sort

	Pretest Means	Standard Error	Posttest Means	Standard Error	Difference
SELF-DISCLOSURE GROUP N=18	.22	(±.49)	.25	(±.49)	.03
PSEUDO-SELF-DISCLOSURE GROUP N=15	.43	(±.50)	.41	(±.50)	.02
CONTROL GROUP N=19	.41	(±.49)	.49	(±.49)	.08
ALL SUBJECTS N=52	.35	(±.14)	.38	(±.14)	.03

Standard Errors were derived by computing a 95 per cent confidence interval for Fisher's z coefficients.

Relationship of the Results to the Hypotheses

Four null hypotheses were stated in Chapter III of the present investigation. These are:

Hypothesis I.

There will be no significant differences between those subjects who participated in guided group self-disclosive activities, and those subjects who participated in guided group pseudo-self-disclosive activities as measured by the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort.

No significant differences were found; therefore Hypothesis I is accepted.

Hypothesis II.

There will be no significant differences between those subjects who participated in guided group self-disclosive activities, and those subjects who participated in the pretest, (control group) as measured by the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort.

Hypothesis II is rejected inasmuch as the Control Group showed a significant difference in lower Manifest Aggression Scale mean scores.

Hypothesis III.

There will be no significant differences between those subjects who participated in guided group pseudo-self-disclosive activities and those who participated in the pretest, (control group) as measured by the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort.

Hypothesis III is rejected inasmuch as the Control Group showed a significant difference in lower Manifest Aggression Scale mean scores.

Hypothesis IV.

There will be no significant differences between pretest and posttest scores on the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort for all subjects-participating in the study.

Hypothesis IV is rejected inasmuch as there were significant differences between pretest and posttest on the Withdrawal Scale mean scores and Denial Scale mean scores for all subjects participating in the study.

Staff Counselor Evaluations

Counselors were asked to answer the following question: In your opinion, how self-disclosive are the statements made by your client? Categories to be checked were: Fabrication, Not likely, Some doubt, Quite likely, Self-disclosing, and Not participating.

Table 7

Counselor's Rating Scale

Counselor's Name _____ Client's Name _____

In your opinion, how self-disclosive are the statements made by your client?

	Not likely	Some doubt	Quite likely	Self-disclosing	Not participating
Fabrication	11	4	18	37	34

The counselors checked the above categories with the frequencies noted above. In the opinions of the counselors, subjects were either self-disclosing (37 checkmarks), or it was quite likely they were self-

disclosing (18 checkmarks), or they were not participating (34 checkmarks). There were relatively few fabrications. Pseudo-self-disclosure was very difficult to promote and was more or less readily abandoned after the first two or three sessions (see Appendix). The pseudo-self-disclosure sessions became discussion sessions on a variety of topics, with self-disclosure not encouraged, but tending to appear (see Appendix).

In summary, the counselors checked the category for "self-disclosure" with the greatest frequency (37), followed by "not participating" with the second greatest frequency (34), followed by "quite likely" with the third greatest frequency (18). Fourth was "fabrication" (11), fifth was "some doubt" (4), and not checked at all was "not likely."

It was concluded that subjects could talk about real things or not at all. About two-thirds of the participants took active parts in the discussions in both groups. Some subjects were able to engage in ten sessions of group activities without saying more than "Hello," or "I don't like the group," or "This is boring." (For detailed reports of the group sessions, see Appendix).

Daily Cottage Logs and Lock Reports

While the study covered a period of twelve weeks, an actual count of infractions of rules over a sixteen week period was made. The sixteen week period started two weeks before the study and ended two weeks after the study. Needless to say, there is quite a lot of variability in the assessment of infractions on the part of the

various group workers, but it was decided that the group workers would not be informed that a count was being made, so that there would be no tendency to report in other than the usual way for the group workers.

The count of behavior infractions showed no marked differences among groups (see Table 8). The Self-Disclosure group had the lowest mean number of infractions, 6.2; the Control group had a mean of 6.4; the Pseudo-Self-Disclosure group's mean was 6.7.

The greatest number of infractions, or most typical acting-out behavior, was "defiance of cottage parent or teacher," with a count of 196 out of a total of 351. The Control group had 75 offenses, averaging four offenses per resident over the sixteen week period. The Pseudo-Self-Disclosure group had 66 offenses, averaging four offenses per resident over the sixteen week period. The Self-Disclosure group had 55 offenses, averaging three offenses per resident over the sixteen week period.

Perhaps the most important outcome of this portion of the investigation was the actual frequencies of various behaviors. Actual reports of "swearing and abusive language" numbered 40 for all subjects; "refusal to do chores," (32 offenses for all subjects); "temper outbursts," (23 offenses for all subjects); "homosexual advances to other girls," (23 offenses for all subjects). There were low frequencies of "AWOL and attempted AWOL," (16 for all subjects); "destroying property," (8 for all subjects); "assaults on other girls or staff," (7 for all subjects); and the lowest number of infractions concerned "smoking in forbidden areas," (6 for all subjects).

Table 8

Daily Cottage Logs and Lock Reports. Total Numbers of
 Infractions by Groups for Sixteen Week Period

	Self-Disclosure Group (N=19)	Pseudo-Self- Disclosure Group (N=16)	Control Group (N=20)	Total
Defiance of cottage parent or teacher	55	66	75	196
Swearing and abusive language	14	8	18	40
Refusal to do chores	12	10	10	32
Temper outbursts	11	5	7	23
Homosexual advances to other girls	7	10	6	23
AWOL or attempted AWOL	9	3	4	16
Destroying school or cottage property	4	3	1	8
Assaults on other girls or personnel	3	1	3	7
Smoking in forbidden areas--bedrooms, library, kitchen	2	1	3	6
Total	117	107	127	351
Mean Number of Infractions	6.2	6.7	6.4	

CHAPTER V
INTERPRETATION OF THE FINDINGS

Discussion

In Chapter II, the investigator discussed the research findings regarding self-disclosure. One study (Jourard, 1961a) described a relationship between high self-disclosure to mother and high grades in nursing college. Another study related high self-disclosure to parents and underachievement in college (Powell, 1963). In the first case, the conclusions were drawn that relating well to mother developed the skills of relating well to female authority figures, and establishing good interpersonal relationships with patients. In the second study, the conclusions were drawn that underachievers who disclose to their parents may be exhibiting a lack of emancipation from familial ties, whereas achievers had established the pattern of disclosing to their peers. It is difficult for this researcher to accept self-disclosure as having positive value if it operates for success for one group, and failure for another group.

While theorists may relate self-disclosure to mental health, the investigator was unable to uncover any objective evidence to support this theory. Indeed, the investigator feels that there may be a great deal of common sense in maintaining the privacy of the private areas of one's life. It is interesting to recall that a general pattern emerged in this respect, regardless of the race, culture, sex, or socioeconomic class of the respondents. There are areas of the self that are public and are disclosed more or less

freely. Psychologists who espouse self-disclosure do not generally concern themselves with these areas. However, the private areas of the self regarding money, body, and personality, are not readily disclosed. Respondents indicated that these areas were disclosed only to spouses, parents, and confidants. The investigator suggests that this collective consensus may be quite functional in nature-- the individual insists on his right to privacy, anonymity, and the right not to be known, unless he chooses.

Perhaps the investigator was naive in assuming that self-disclosure could be easily promoted. In looking over Jourard's Self-Disclosure Questionnaire, it would seem that Self-Disclosure indices were built on the premise that one is willing to talk about both the public self, and the private self. Perhaps there is a mystique in this process that was overlooked. But, if the notion of self-disclosure is viable, it should also be feasible. That is, anybody reading the literature regarding self-disclosure should understand the process and the intent, and be able to establish certain expectancies for outcomes.

Perhaps an important factor in this study of self-disclosure was that the investigator used simple encouragement to promote self-disclosure. In "attack therapy" as practiced in Synanon, therapists are trained to confront rudely and crudely. Ridicule and hostile verbal confrontation "hold up a mirror" to the individual's actions, attitudes, and life-style. It is freely stated that the purpose of the synanons is to release the "emotional garbage" that activates disfunctional behavior.

Another factor which may have militated against proof of the value of self-disclosure in this study was the group setting. Perhaps one can expect more progress in an individual setting where the client needs to learn to trust only one person. In the group, the clients need to establish bases for trusting several people. This factor may have been the most important variable in that about one-third of the participants in the study did not self-disclose to any significant degree. They functioned as listeners. The counselors felt that some of the girls were not ready to trust the others in the group inasmuch as they did not participate.

Length of treatment may have played an extremely important role. In Synanon, a drug addict needs to remain in the program for two years. Whole new repertoires of responses need to be built in to replace existing disfunctional behaviors. The length of stay at the Girls' Welfare Home is approximately eight months. This study was conducted over a twelve week period of time--roughly about one-third of the average length of stay. More significance can be attached to a study which covers the average length of stay. However, the turnover variable would create problems if an investigator wished to have a sizeable sample. In this connection, it is entirely possible that changes took place that may not manifest themselves for a time. A followup within three or four months of the sample population might yield interesting results. However, the investigator would be most cautious in ascribing changes to a study which terminated several months previously.

Conclusions

Perhaps the most valid interpretation of the findings that the investigator can make regarding the effects of self-disclosure is that the value of self-disclosure was not borne out in this study. However, the study, as conceived and carried out, contained a number of unforeseen limitations.

Perhaps the most important limitation concerned the willingness to disclose. Curiosity prompted the investigator to look for differences on the Asocial Index between those who participated in self-disclosure and pseudo-self-disclosure, and those who acted as listeners. Of 35 subjects in the two groups, 25 talked about themselves, and 10 did not. Roughly one-third of the participants did not participate. Further computations revealed some interesting differences. Of the Self-Disclosure group, 13 participated and 6 did not. The mean change from pretest to posttest was -1.65 for the participants; for the non-participants, the change was $+0.33$. Of the Pseudo-Self-Disclosure group, 12 participated and 4 did not. The mean change for participants from pretest to posttest was -0.75 ; for the non-participants, the change was $+1.00$. To sum up, those subjects who talked about themselves had the following lower mean Asocial Index differences: 1.65 for Self-Disclosure, and 0.75 for Pseudo-Self-Disclosure. The subjects who did not talk about themselves had the following higher mean Asocial Index differences: 0.33 for Self-Disclosure, and 1.00 for Pseudo-Self-Disclosure. The reader will recall that a lower Asocial Index indicates less tendency to engage

in delinquent behavior, while higher Asocial Index scores indicate a greater tendency to engage in delinquent behavior.

Two-thirds of the members of the Self-Disclosure Groups were judged to be truly self-disclosing. The other one-third functioned as listeners. After the first two or three sessions, the discussions became quite serious, and often focused on many private areas of behavior. A great deal of interesting material regarding the behavior patterns and value systems of the residents of the Girls' Welfare Home emerged (see Appendix). However, self-disclosure, as such, did not, after ten group sessions, result in significant changes in a positive direction on the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort. Nor were there marked changes in behavior within the confines of the cottages and school, as based on Daily Cottage Logs and Lock Reports.

Pseudo-self-disclosure was difficult to promote. As in the case of self-disclosure, roughly two-thirds of the subjects participated, and the others functioned as listeners. The subjects made more or less valiant efforts to fulfill the wishes of the counselors (see Appendix), but the stories that were told in the early sessions were mainly personifications. That is, the girls told stories using animals as protagonists—but the stories could have applied to the girls themselves. Pseudo-autobiographies, when they were given, contained many self-referents. Later sessions rarely achieved deep personal levels. There was quite a lot of complaining about various authority figures, and group discussion on a variety of subjects. Pseudo-self-disclosure, however varied the content became, did not, after ten sessions, result in significant changes in a positive

direction on the Jesness Inventory and the Chicago Q Sort. Nor were there marked behavior changes as based on Daily Cottage Logs and Lock Reports.

Recommendations for Further Research

One observation that this researcher made previously concerned the number of non-participants in group activities. Perhaps groups can be better identified which can profit from self-disclosive "counseling" techniques. The Jesness Inventory is capable of differentiating among delinquent types, so that Low-Maturity, Middle-Maturity, and High-Maturity youngsters are identified. An investigation using self-disclosive techniques, with the three levels of maturity might throw some light on which youngsters are most apt to profit from this technique. Unfortunately the methods by which the different maturity levels are identified are still in the process of being refined, and the techniques for establishing maturity levels have not yet been published.

Delinquent youngsters may not react well in traditional psychotherapeutic settings. Goldstein, Heller and Sechrest (1966) suggest that psychotherapy as it has traditionally been practiced has expended a disproportionate amount of time and effort on responses to be eliminated eventually. The heavy emphasis on negative feelings may merely heighten the availability of these responses so that they become probable in conditions where they are inappropriate. A concentration on positive feelings and responses, and exclusion of negative feelings may increase the effectiveness of therapy (237). With delinquents,

particularly, who take such negative, fatalistic views of life, it almost seems as if any emphasis on the past, and on bad experiences simply accentuates all the bad things that have happened. In traditional psychotherapy, the patient is led to view his hostility in all its aspects and becomes quite accomplished at recognizing and labeling hostile and negative feelings. Could it be that the therapist has produced a person so well practiced in the expression of hostility that it has become a highly available response (Goldstein: 238)?

Another possibility to consider in the search for researchable hypotheses is that self-disclosure may be more effective with older or younger clients. Adolescent subjects talk quite easily, but there is a pseudo-sophistication which masks feelings. The reader is directed to the Appendix, where counselors indicated again and again, that significant, emotional material was disclosed without a show of feeling.

This technique might prove to be more effective with boys--again, one might be alert to the differences in ages, and look for differential success rates for younger and older boys.

Promoting self-disclosure and then role-playing more appropriate responses for the purposes of building in repertoires of functional behavior may yield more significant changes in a positive direction.

Perhaps this study could be replicated outside of an institutional setting. This might be a more effective technique with adolescents with behavior problems than with adolescent girls with delinquency problems.

In conclusion, more research with self-disclosure needs to be done before theorists can claim that there is a positive value in self-disclosure. This study failed to show value in self-disclosure, but the conditions of short length of treatment and non-participating subjects may have placed severe limitations on the investigation.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allison, Sarah G. "Parent and Peer-Group Friend Attitudes as they Relate to the Self-Concept of the Juvenile Delinquent," Dissertation Abstracts, 17:1957, pp. 3086-3087.
- Baymur, Ferika B., and C. H. Patterson. "A Comparison of Three Methods of Assisting Underachieving High School Students," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 2:1960, pp. 83-90.
- Bills, R. E. "Nondirective Play Therapy with Retarded Readers," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14:1950, pp. 140-149.
- Blodgett, Harriet Eleanor. "An Experimental Approach to the Measurement of Self-Evaluation Among Adolescent Girls," Dissertation Abstracts, 13:1953, pp. 871-872.
- Brunner-Orne, Martha, and Martin Orne. "Alcoholics," in Slavson, S. R. (Ed.), The Fields of Group Psychotherapy, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966.
- Campbell, Donald T., and Julian C. Stanley. Experimental and Quasi-Experimental Designs for Research, Rand McNally, Chicago, 1966.
- Caplan, Stanley W. "The Effect of Group Counseling on Junior High School Boys' Concepts of Themselves in School," Journal of Counseling Psychology, 4:1957, pp. 124-128.
- Chase, Philip H. "Self-Concepts in Adjusted and Maladjusted Hospital Patients," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 21:1957, pp. 495-497.
- Chenven, H. "Effects of Group Therapy Upon Language Recovery in Predominately Expressive Aphasia Patients," Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation, New York University, 1953.
- Chickering, Arthur Wright. "Self-Concept, Ideal Self-Concept, and Achievement," Dissertation Abstracts, 19:1958, p. 164.
- Clements, Barton E. "Transitional Adolescents, Anxiety, and Group Counseling," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 45:1966, pp. 67-71.
- Corrie, Christopher C. "Aspiration, Self-Acceptance and Acceptance of Others in Normal and Neuropsychiatric Groups," Dissertation Abstracts, 18:1958, p. 1855.

- Corsini, Raymond. SAQS Chicago Q Sort, Psychometric Affiliates, Box 1625, Chicago, Illinois, Copyright, 1956.
- Dreyfus, Edward A. "Openness: An Examination and Formulation," Journal of Existentialism, 7:1967, pp. 309-317.
- Fiedler, F. "The Concept of the Ideal Therapeutic Relationship," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14:1950, pp. 239-245.
- Fine, Benjamine. 1,000,000 Delinquents, World Book Company, New York, 1955.
- Fitzgerald, Maureen P. "Relationship Between Expressed Self-Esteem, Assumed Similarity, and Self-Disclosure," Dissertation Abstracts, 22:1962, p. 4402.
- _____. "Self-Disclosure and Expressed Self-Esteem, Social Distance and Areas of the Self Revealed," Journal of Psychology, 56:1963, pp. 405-412.
- Gersten, C. "An Experimental Evaluation of Group Therapy with Juvenile Delinquents," International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 1:1951, pp. 311-318.
- Gilman, Merritt, and Elizabeth Gorlich. Group Counseling with Delinquent Youth, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare Social and Rehabilitation Service, Washington, D.C., 1968.
- Glasser, William. "Reality Therapy: A Realistic Approach to the Young Offender," Speech presented to the British Columbia Correctional Association at their meeting in Vancouver on November 3, 1962.
- _____. Reality Therapy, Harper and Row, New York, 1965.
- Glueck, Sheldon, and Eleanor Glueck. Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1950.
- Goldstein, Arnold P., Kenneth Heller, and Lee Sechrest. Psychotherapy and the Psychology of Behavior Change, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966.
- Goodman, Gerald. "Emotional Disclosure of Therapists and Clients Over the Course of Psychotherapy," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Chicago, 1962.
- Hersko, Marvin. "Group Psychotherapy with Delinquent Adolescent Girls," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 32:1962, pp. 169-175.

- Hoghghi, Masud S. "Educational Failure and Delinquency," Approved Schools Gazette, 60:1966, pp. 354-359.
- Hood, Paul Douglass. "Q-Methodology: A Technique for Measuring Frames of Reference," Dissertation Abstracts, 20:1960, pp. 2935-2937.
- Jesness, Carl F. The Jesness Inventory Manual, Consulting Psychologists Press, 577 College Avenue, Palo Alto, California, Copyright, 1966.
- Jourard, Sidney M. "Age Trends in Self-Disclosure," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 7:1961d, pp. 191-197.
- _____, and M. J. Landsman. "Cognition, Cathexis, and the 'Dyadic-Effect' in Men's Self-Disclosing Behavior," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly Journal, 6:1960, pp. 178-186.
- _____, and Lasakow. "Some Factors in Self-Disclosure," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 56:1958, pp. 91-98.
- _____, and Richard M. Remy. "Perceived Parental Attitudes, the Self, and Security," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 19:1955, pp. 364-366.
- _____, and Patricia Richman. "Factors in the Self-Disclosure Inputs of College Students," Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 9:1963, pp. 141-148.
- _____. "A Study of Self-Disclosure," Scientific American, 198:1958, pp. 77-82.
- _____. "Healthy Personality and Self-Disclosure," Mental Hygiene, 43:1959a, pp. 499-507.
- _____. "Religious Denomination and Self-Disclosure," Psychological Reports, 8:1961b, p. 446.
- _____. "Self-Disclosure and Other-Cathexis," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 59:1959b, pp. 428-431.
- _____. "Self-Disclosure Patterns in British and American College Females," Journal of Social Psychology, 54:1961c, pp. 315-320.
- _____. "Self-Disclosure Scores and Grades in Nursing College," Journal of Applied Psychology, 45:1961a, pp. 244-247.
- _____. The Transparent Self, D. Van Nostrand Co., Princeton, New Jersey, 1964.
- Klestler, J. "Some Myths of Psychotherapy Research and Search for Paradigms," Psychological Bulletins, 65:1966, pp. 110-136.

- Konopka, Gisela. The Adolescent Girl in Conflict, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1966.
- Kotkov, Benjamin. "Research," in Slavson, S. R. (Ed.), The Fields of Group Psychotherapy, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966.
- Leonard, Julia Bader. "A Study of the Organization of Self-Percepts Through Their Susceptibility to Change," Dissertation Abstracts, 18:1958, pp. 1492-1493.
- Lively, Edwin L., Simon Dinitz, and Walter C. Reckless. "Self-Concept as a Predictor of Delinquency," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 32:1962, pp. 159-168.
- Lunden, Walter A. Statistics on Delinquents and Delinquency, Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, Springfield, Illinois, 1964.
- McBride, John J. "A Study of Relationships Between the Self-Concepts of Seventh Grade Disadvantaged Children and Certain Counseling and Motivation Techniques," Dissertation Abstracts, 27:1967, pp. 4135-4136.
- Maslow, A. H. "Existential Psychology--What's In It For Us?" in May, Rollo (Ed.), Existential Psychology, Random House, New York, 1967.
- Matza, David. Delinquency and Drift, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1964.
- May, Rollo. "The Emergence of Existential Psychology," in May, Rollo (Ed.), Existential Psychology, Random House, New York, 1967.
- Mehlman, B. "Group Play Therapy with Mentally Retarded Children," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 48:1953, pp. 53-60.
- Melikian, Levon H. "Self-Disclosure Among University Students in The Middle East," Journal of Social Psychology, 57:1962, pp. 257-263.
- Moustakas, Clark E. Loneliness, Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1961.
- Mowrer, O. Hobart. The New Group Therapy, D. Van Nostrand Co., Princeton, New Jersey, 1964.
- Mullaney, Anthony J. "Relationships Among Self-Disclosive Behavior, Personality, and Family Interaction," Dissertation Abstracts, 24:1964, p. 4290.

- Omwake, Katherine T. "The Relation Between Acceptance of Self and Acceptance of Others Shown by Three Personality Inventories," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18:1954, pp. 443-446.
- Parsons, Talcott. The Social System, Free Press, Glencoe, 1951.
- Pederson, Darhl M., and Vincent J. Breglio. "The Correlation of Two Self-Disclosure Inventories with Actual Self-Disclosure," Journal of Psychology, 68:1968, pp. 291-298.
- Peres, H. "An Investigation of Nondirective Group Therapy," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 11:1947, pp. 159-172.
- Pierson, G.R., R.B. Cattell, and J. Pierce. "A Demonstration by the HSPQ of the Personality Changes Produced by Institutionalization of Delinquents," Journal of Social Psychology, 70:1966, pp. 229-239.
- Plog, Stanley C. "The Disclosure of Self in the United States and Germany," Journal of Social Psychology, 65:1965, pp. 193-203.
- Powell, W. James, and Sidney M. Jourard. "Some Objective Evidence of Immaturity in Underachieving College Students," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 10:1963, pp. 276-282.
- Raymaker, Henry, Jr. "Relationships Between the Self-Concept, Self-Ideal Concept, and Maladjustment," Dissertation Abstracts, 17:1957, pp. 409-410.
- Reckless, Walter C., Simon Dinitz, and Barbara Kay. "The Self Component in Potential Delinquency and Potential Non-Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 22:1957b, pp. 577-570.
- _____, _____, and Ellen Murray. "Self-Concept as an Insulator Against Delinquency," American Sociological Review, 21:1956, pp. 744-746.
- _____. "The 'Good' Boy in a High Delinquency Area," Journal of Criminology, 48:1957a, pp. 18-25.
- Rogers, Carl R. Client-Centered Therapy, Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, 1965.
- _____. "Two Divergent Trends," in May, Rollo, (Ed.) Existential Psychology, Random House, New York, 1967.
- Robb, J. Wesley. "Self-Discovery and the Role of the Counselor," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 45:1967, pp. 1008-1011.

- Robinson, Sandra. "A Comparison of Expressed Acceptance of Self and of Others on the Blacky Pictures of Two Adolescent Groups," Dissertation Abstracts, 28:1967, p. 1311.
- Sartre, Jean-Paul. Existential Psychoanalysis, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1953.
- Schulman, Irving. "Delinquents," in Slavson, S. R. (Ed.), The Fields of Group Psychotherapy, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966.
- Sheldon, W. D., and T. Landsman. "An Investigation of Nondirective Group Psychotherapy with Students in Academic Difficulty," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 14:1950, pp. 210-215.
- Shoham, Shlomo. Crime and Social Deviation, Henry Regnery Co., Chicago, 1966.
- Tait, C. Downing, Jr., and Emory P. Hodges, Jr. Delinquents, Their Families, and the Community, Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, Springfield, Illinois, 1962.
- Thorpe, James J. "Addicts," in Slavson, S. R., (Ed.), The Fields of Group Psychotherapy, John Wiley and Sons, New York, 1966.
- Weigel, Richard D., and Charles F. Warnath. "The Effects of Group Therapy on Reported Self-Disclosure," International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 18:1968, pp. 31-41.
- Yablonsky, Lewis. Synanon: The Tunnel Back, Penguin Books, Baltimore, 1967.
- Zimmer, Herbert. "Self-Acceptance and Its Relation to Conflict," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 18:1954, pp. 447-449.

APPENDIX
REPORTS OF GROUP SESSIONS

Self-Disclosure Groups

GROUP LEADER: Counselor A

PARTICIPANTS: Dolores, Betty, Laura, Sarah, May, Jane, Iris, Pat,
Tessie, Edith

Session I

The session opened with lots of resistance.

Laura: What do they want to hear from us?

Iris: Our case histories.

Jane: Our private lives.

The resistance continued with quite a lot of giggling, jokes, and everyone talking at once. Iris acted as a leader. She called the girls to order, said the counselor was serious about this, and the group ought to respond.

Sarah related her early life in Germany, and her early teen years.

She was running around, no one was taking care of her--she ran away from home--and she was shuffled among aunts and grandmother.

Edith said she ran away from home when she was five and when she returned home her father hit her with an extension cord.

May told of running away from home. Her father looked for her. He said, "he was going to hit me." When I got home "he didn't hit me because Mom said she would kill him."

Iris came in at 1:00 A.M. one night. Her step-father jumped all over her. Her brother ordered the step-father to leave Iris alone or he'd kill him. Iris ran to get her Mom and more fighting ensued between her mother and step-father.

Iris: I got a straight razor and told him if he didn't leave my Mom alone I'd kill him.

Edith related an early memory of a flood. May told about a fire in her home when she was six years old. It was Christmas Day. Everything got burned up in the house--"all the Christmas things and everything."

Iris stated she saw a neighbor's house burn down.

The subject changed to step-parents.

Betty: When I was six, I was introduced to my step-father—I climbed a tree and wouldn't come down.

Iris: If my father was living I wouldn't be living in this damn rat hole. I'd be living in style.

Five girls did not participate. Laura kept her head down on the table throughout most of the session. Edith and Betty talked briefly. Tessie and Dolores did not take part, but they listened to the others.

Session II

The session began with a great deal of noise, giggling, and horseplay.

Co: I'm interested in your experience with hippies.

Laura responded to this question at great length. She talked about hippies, marijuana, acid, etc.

CONTINUED

2 OF 3

Iris told about a girl in the Detention Home who "scared the heck out of us" with her flashbacks.

Jane: I felt like I was walking on air. Who needs spray paint and glue when there's all this acid and grass floating around?

Jane: I was sniffing ether.

Laura: Oh! Wow!!

Laura continued with her monologue to a rapt audience of four or five girls at her end of the table. She explained how to "have a good trip. You have to have a guide to help you along. I went on a bum trip the first time because I was scared."

In the meantime, a sub-group was formed consisting of Edith who narrated the story of Goldilocks and the Three Bears to Dolores and one or two other girls who seemed to be divided in their loyalty to Laura and dope, and Edith and the Three Bears.

Laura: Gay colors - that's the main thing that affects you. Wow!

I saw the devil. Marian saw the devil, too. In my flashback, the devil kept coming closer and closer to me.

Co: I can't hear everybody.

May: You all cooperate.

Jane: I felt like I was a genius, man.

Laura: You feel like you're real strong.

Laura continued even though the Three Bears were running strong competition. She related the testing of a person on a trip. The non-tripster gets a gun and loads it with real bullets in a variation of Russian roulette. If the gun clicks and the tripper moves, it is known he is not on a real trip.

Jane described the game of "chicken." Two girls put their arms together and a burning cigarette is dropped between the two arms. The first one to pull her arm away is "chicken."

Sarah told of stealing money from offertory plates in church when she was a child. She also stole money from her mother's purse.

After this second more or less uproarious meeting, it was decided to split the groups in two. Henceforth, Counselor A's group consisted of Edith, Jane, Laura, May and Sarah.

Session III

The group meeting began with an exuberant greeting of Jane who had run and been picked up the same evening and was currently serving ten days in the Quarantine unit.

Jane told about the run in great detail. Actually Jane's runs abort. The first time she ran, she couldn't get over the fence--a feat which other residents accomplish with ease. Jane is obese, with short, stumpy legs and was quite embarrassed about her ignominious performance. This time, Jane ran with another girl from an off-grounds activity. She was attending a play at the University of New Mexico and she approached a strange girl for help saying "We are running from the Girls' Welfare Home. Can you help us?" The stranger helped them to the apartment of some friends. Just by coincidence, a staff member of the Girls' Welfare Home was visiting in the same apartment. She notified the Home and Jane and Phyllis (her co-runner) were picked up within the hour.

Jane: The funny thing is when you're out there--we couldn't think of any place to go. We were shaking like leaves. We were scared. My mind wouldn't function right. I couldn't remember any phone numbers.

In the course of telling and retelling the story of the run, Jane used the expression "got busted" at least five times.

Co: How do you feel when girls run?

May: Wish them all the luck.

Session IV

Edith talked at length during this session. She told about her misbehavior over the Thanksgiving visit and her feelings of remorse. Apparently she stayed at home for Thanksgiving Day--then found more congenial lodgement elsewhere, returning to her home only to pack her suitcase to return to the Girls' Welfare Home.

The subject of witches came up.

Edith: She's a normal lady, but she's a witch. She had a fight with Eddie and he told her off. She (the witch) told Eddie "Tonight one of your friends is going to kill you," and later someone stabbed Eddie.

The talk turned to birthday parties.

Edith: I never had a birthday party in all my years except one. All my brothers and sisters had them.

Jane: On my fifteenth birthday, I dropped my first acid.

Sarah: On my tenth birthday I was in Germany. I got all kinds of presents I didn't like--a scarf, socks, candy, pierced ear-

rings--and my ears aren't even pierced. I got money--\$2.00, \$5.00 and \$10.00.

Jane: I got a Thumbelina on my 13th birthday from my dad.

Everyone laughed.

Session V

This session involved three major topics. The first was tattooing: how to put them on and how the doctor gets them off. The second topic was Marian's marriage. (Marian, a resident, was on leave over Christmas. She got married in Juarez.) The girls revealed the same confusion about Mexican weddings that is shared by the general population. Laura stated the couple needed to remain in Juarez 90 days or the marriage isn't legal. Paroles and releases were discussed again in connection with Marian's marriage.

Session VI

May participated in discussion of group workers, cottage living problems, etc., but never by relating anything concerning herself. Edith also related incidents concerning others, primarily. Sarah did not participate. Laura and Jane took part in most of the discussion. The group seemed to start on self-disclosive material, then retreated to "safe" topics. Some members are not ready to trust, and this seems to inhibit the others.

Session VII

The group session began with a discussion of "lock-happy" housemothers.

Laura: I've been sitting at the table all by myself.

Co: How come?

Laura: I spit in a girl's face. The stupid idiot made me laugh.

I had a mouth full of water and splat!

Everyone laughed.

Edith continues to talk to someone in the group in a low voice.

Jane: I'm not going to be here no 12 months.

Sarah: I've been here 12 months already. They had to straighten me up.

The topic of funerals came up. May talked about her grandfather's recent death and funeral. Edith told of the girls trying to comfort May in the cottage, and "they all came out crying." Sarah stated that in Germany if someone dies, all the teeth are pulled out, the blood is taken out and embalming fluid put in. Her father told her so.

Co: How old were you when your father told you this?

Sarah: Nine. It was a weird feeling seeing someone in a coffin.

Session VIII

The funeral theme was explored further. Laura related the death of her foster mother, seeing her in her coffin, etc. There was resistance at this point. Jane talked in "pig English," a made-up

language that she chatters very glibly and few can understand, although the other girls "want to learn it."

Laura continued talking about the foster mother's death. She couldn't accept it but "it didn't bother me."

Laura: My father won't ever remarry.

Edith: You won't let him.

Edith related stealing Betty's Christmas presents in the cottage, confessing it, and asking to be locked as punishment. Jane told incidents of her father bringing women home. They would go into the bedroom and when the bed squeaked, Jane left the house and went for long walks.

Jane has taken over control of the group. She tells others to shut up, and uses "pig English" to divert. She states she may be acting this way because a home visit is approaching. She told of how she "blew it" when she was supposed to visit last time. She said her father "didn't use to drink," but now he has a drink before breakfast.

Sarah: My father has a drink before breakfast, too.

Session IX

The session began with a tirade against a housemother who makes the girls do their details over if they fail to pass inspection. Jane launched a tirade against Eleanor (a resident) because she is too well treated when in Quarantine. Jane branched out in a tirade against her step-mother who "acts like she cannot trust me" and the drinking that her father and step-mother do. Jane angrily explored

other placement possibilities--here or the Group Home--"I can't fit into that family--no way." Sarah's home visit was equally disappointing. Her father was drunk and verbally abusive to her. Laura related that her home visit was good--her father has changed and "he was so sweet." Everyone treated her as if she were fragile and delicate and might crack. (There had been some question in Laura's father's mind about her sanity. Psychiatrist's report informed him that Laura was neurotic, and depressed, but not psychotic. Her prognosis was good. Laura later reported that her father's comment to her was "Neurotic is worse than psychotic. That's the worst thing you can be." He is an educated man!)

Session X

Laura related that the boy she was going with is getting married. She quickly became "engaged" to another boy via the telephone. Someone asked "What if he gets married?" Laura rattled off a long list of boys she could become engaged to if the current boy gets dis-engaged. Jane told of approaching Bess (a resident, mentally retarded) as a joke asking her to "go with her." She chopped at other people and controlled the group. May talked of her new nephew. She spoke with warmth and affection about her family.

GROUP LEADER: Counselor B

PARTICIPANTS: Iris, Tessie, Dolores, Pat, Betty

(Sessions I and II were led by Counselor A. Sessions III, IV, V, and VI were taped, but due to defective tapes, no record is available.)

Session VII

The counselor and Iris conversed about the Seven Step Foundation, a rehabilitation program for ex-convicts.

Blocking and silence.

Co: No one has anything they feel like they really want to discuss?

Iris: Some of us have something we really want to discuss, but we won't discuss it.

Co: You feel like you want to talk with just your counselor?

Iris: I won't even tell my counselor.

Iris then launched into long and involved complaints about the staff. Her criticisms were directed against teachers and housemothers sitting around gossiping--"they're supposed to set a good example but they don't practice what they preach."

Iris: I'm afraid to tell anyone my problems. They turn it against you and stab you in the back.

Betty: I hope you won't get mad if I say this but I don't think the counselors are as good as they used to be like Miss _____ and Miss _____.

Iris: They spend more time off grounds than with the girls. Lots of them have girls they see just about every day.

Betty: They're not doing what they're trained for.

Co: Do you think they are spending time with girls in ways other than counseling?

Someone muttered: It's a waste of money.

Iris: If they get paid for work, they should work instead of nagging all the time. Lots of them are lock-happy.

Co: Counselors?

Iris: No, housemothers.

Then ensued a general discussion of locked and unlocked doors at night; locked and unlocked cottages and Iris concluded by asking that girls be allowed to attend the counselor's and housemother's meeting.

Sessions VIII, IX, and X

This was a 2½ hour session in order to complete the three sessions required to finish. We used the device of "filling chairs" with relatives or friends. This is a good device for projective self-revelation. The girls were resistant to participating at first. After discussing parole plans for each girl, Dolores, Betty and Iris became relaxed and were not resistant. Pat and Tessie never voluntarily took part, except for Pat, who at the very end volunteered a few remarks. Iris monopolized the session, and was quite self-revealing, discussing her most intimate problems. Betty talked about her baby's baptism and plans to live with a woman and care for her baby. She was not resistant, but since Iris was on so strong, and

Betty was not particularly pushed to talk, Betty was passive. Dolores took some part in most discussions and didn't seem too reluctant to reveal her feelings. Again, however, Iris's domination kept Dolores from having much chance.

During this session, the group discussed homosexuality. (Will girls who are "gay" here stay gay? The consensus was "No.") Also discussed were releases, paroles, smoking, birth control pills, and the morality of stepping out on your boy friend if he's overseas.

GROUP LEADER: Counselor C

PARTICIPANTS: Carol, Loretta, Harriet, Marie, Susan, Martha, Louise,
Charlotte, Lynn, Pam

Session I

Some of the girls were slightly nervous and apprehensive as to what was expected of them. Initially I read the standardized beginning and then left it up to the girls.

On the whole, the girls did not deviate from the topic at hand, i.e., events in their past lives. However, the anecdotes mentioned were very superficial, mainly funny or embarrassing happenings. There was no discussing of any emotional traumas they had experienced, no depth to the events.

The girls participated quite differently, as is to be expected. Lynn dominated the group for the majority of the hour with quite hilarious experiences which the group seemed to enjoy. Whenever a lull in the conversation occurred, Lynn immediately began again with another incident. Lynn's audience was the entire group and specifically Carol. Carol did not contribute anything other than encouraging Lynn. Marie was silent the entire time, laughing almost to herself at Lynn's hilarity. Carol was quiet most of the time but opened up toward the end, contributing several experiences in her life. Loretta seemed tremendously excited over anything that was said, giggling and laughing even when a question was directly asked of her. She did not volunteer any information. Martha also did not

contribute and did not seem particularly amused by anything; she listened, but rather passively. Pam withdrew completely; she had her head on the table a good deal of the time, appeared listless and sleepy. Susan was an active participant, like Lynn, contributing whenever a pause occurred. Louise was quiet for the most part but when questioned directly, volunteered two incidents.

My impression of this first group session was that the girls appeared to enjoy themselves due to the lighthearted topics discussed. Pam was the only one who did not function even as a participating group listener.

Session II

The group did not function together during the second session. Some participated and others had no interest. The content of their conversation was maintained at a fairly non-emotional level. Gradually, a few began talking about past pets and they turned briefly to experiences with brothers and sisters. Later, the subject of dead people was introduced but Harriet shut this off by stating that dead people should be left in peace.

Following is an individual listing of each girl's participation. Marie did not participate voluntarily in the group, nor did she appear to be attentive when someone was speaking. Charlotte involved herself in writing notes, and on a ruler. Carol participated quite actively, volunteering incidents and listening attentively. Lynn was surprisingly passive, resting her head on the table for the

duration of the session. She claimed to have been hit by a snowball on the head and did not feel well. Pam was also completely passive, falling asleep on the table. Margie contributed three or four comments; Loretta dominated this session but talked directly to this counselor rather than involving other girls in the group. At times, she was quite enthralled with her own silliness and wit. Susan again participated, interjecting her own incidents whenever a pause ensued. Harriet became highly resistant toward the end, demanding to know the time, when they could leave and if she had to return again.

Session III

At this third session, it was explained to the girls for several reasons why the group had been split.

Those remaining in the group were Carol, Loretta, Marie, Lynn, and Pam.

After some initial resistance, Pam began and when the girls felt she was beginning to dominate, they all were quite eager to share their own experiences, even to the point of one almost interrupting another to begin her story.

Pam related past actions of her mother that she strongly rejected and continued in this vein for some time. An occasional comment or question came forth from the members. An interesting note to mention here is that the girls made light of situations that were quite serious almost so that their levity would cover their true feelings of sympathy or compassion. Marie concurred, "My mother is

the same way," but felt slightly embarrassed when she realized the focus of the group was upon her and then weakly finished her story. Lynn then spoke of advice her mother had tried to give her, but tried in her usual manner to make the members amused.

Loretta participated only to the extent that she listened and questioned speakers or added a comment. Carol then related an incident when she was quite young and became confused because there were so many men visiting her mother, each claiming to be her father. However, she told it in such a manner as to leave her feelings out and make it into an amusing anecdote.

Session IV

The girls settled right down to relating incidents, mainly pertaining to their parents. Marie recounted her many step-fathers and how they had treated her and her brothers and her reaction to them. Lynn then gave an account of how her mother had treated her as she was growing up and the arguments she created between her parents. Next Loretta told about her mother and difficulties encountered with her father and step-father.

Probably the beginning forty-five minutes of the session were devoted to the three monologues of each girl and the last segment was devoted to discussing why the girls felt their parents were partially to blame for their being here. Again, as during the last session, the girls made light of serious situations, although not nearly to the extent as the previous time.

Session V

Carol and Lynn dominated this session. Lynn suggested at the beginning that the members try to recall incidents in their past lives that made them angry. Lynn began by telling that she was a very poor sport and could not stand to lose, to win just second place. This led to discussing cheating to win. Then Carol interjected that she became angry at her parents when she was younger and talked quietly and with feeling. The others seemed to sense this feeling, also, and let Carol continue without interruptions. Lynn talked about her father also but in the sense that he let her do anything she wanted. Then the conversation shifted to her mother and her dislike of her actions was quite obvious.

Loretta only spoke to interject a few comments and it was quite likely she was self-disclosing. I felt Lynn and Carol were self-disclosing.

Session VI

The general tone of this session was rather silly and giddy. This was due, mainly, to Loretta and Marie who thought everything was funny. The first topic broached was respect between boys and girls and how a girl acted to gain respect. Carol related a few incidents, in all likelihood self-disclosing. Loretta brought sex into the conversation and also dope. One fairly serious comment Loretta did make, and it was one of her few serious ones, was that parents should be brought to reformatories instead of kids.

Charlotte tried to maintain a somewhat serious attitude but finally gave up and admitted she was bored.

The topics dealt with tonight had good potential for some discussion and thought, but the group always skimmed over the top of whatever subject was introduced.

Session VII

Carol began this session by relating what had taken place in the last session because Lynn had been in lock. Sex and respect were mentioned. Lynn felt that a boy had respect for a girl when he asked if she would do something immoral but she refused no matter whether he continued to date her or not. Lynn then switched topics and felt that girls started talking too soon about leaving and ended up returning a second time for an even longer period of time. She then contradicted an earlier statement she had made in a counseling session. She felt that it was wrong of teenagers to blame their parents for their mistakes. Instead of blaming them, she felt that she should have coped with them. For the rest of the session, the girls discussed homosexuality and their feelings. They related several incidents that had taken place in the cottage and I felt they were telling what actually happened. They did not want their parents or other people to know that they called themselves homosexuals because society would call them crazy. They did not want to flaunt their activities in public and felt other homosexuals should not want to, either.

I felt both the girls were self-disclosing concerning the incidents they related as well as their attitudes and opinions.

Session VIII

Remembering the group marathon session held at Perkinson, Lynn suggested that each one of the group members evaluate the others giving both good and bad aspects. Lynn began by stating that she felt Loretta was smiling and friendly most of the time but was too generous with her cigarettes and people used her on account of this generosity. Lynn felt that Marie was snobby upon first entering which was now interpreted as being feminine. She felt Marie liked to have friends for herself and made attempts to take girls away from others. Lynn saw herself as being able to make friends easily but not caring about her own appearance and unable to give others an honest opinion of how they dressed.

Marie volunteered next. She felt Lynn was quite friendly and saw no bad points. Marie felt that she herself had fought and drunk for kicks before she came here, but was by no means a whore. She felt Loretta was a nice person but did do some things wrong. She felt I tried to be what a counselor should be, helping people, and didn't feel she knew me well enough to evaluate any further.

I spoke next. I commented that Loretta was always smiling and friendly but I was looking for a more serious side of her and hadn't found one yet. I had felt Marie was rather shy and scared when she first came but then warmed up to the girls. I also reflected

that it was good that Marie had a seemingly sincere interest in taking care of her younger brothers and trying to keep them all together. Lynn, I felt, had developed insight into solving her own problems and understanding those of others. However, she had to realize that she could not go on attempting to shirk her share of the work.

Loretta concluded by saying that Lynn was a fun person to be with, but should try to be more honest in her opinions concerning others' dress. She felt Marie thought she was too good when she first came in but after you got to know her she was nice. She had no opinion concerning myself because she felt she did not know me well enough. About herself, she felt she liked to have friends and agreed with Lynn's opinion that she was too generous.

The session went quite well, although it appeared that each was giving guarded opinions as to avoid hurting anyone's feelings.

Session IX

This session was rather tearful, due to the fact that Carol was upset because her counselor had quit. Carol mentioned that she had left before and this was her second time here. I asked how she felt before leaving her counselor and friends. She explained that it was different then because she had left and this time she was being left. The rest of the session, the girls tried to comfort Carol. I tried, but unsuccessfully, to suggest that the girls might express their feelings about when they had ever had to leave close

friends or relatives. I stopped the session early and had Carol see the Clinical Director.

Session X

The girls talked about jobs they have held before coming here. Loretta said she was lazy and had never had a job. Marie worked at two jobs as a waitress and mentioned a couple of times when she had spilled food on customers. Lynn then related why she didn't like working at the nursery and had quit. Then she began entertaining with stories of when she had full time babysitting jobs in the summer. She was quite funny. Charlotte stated that she had been a waitress. The only thing she mentioned concerning her jobs was that she was clumsy and constantly spilling things. Her friends would come in and watch her work and make her nervous. Carol recounted incidences when she and Teresa had run together to Gallup. There was little, if any, feeling expressed, mainly experiences. I felt the girls were all self-disclosing.

GROUP LEADER: Counselor D

PARTICIPANTS: Martha, Charlotte, Harriet, Louise, Susan

(Sessions I and II were led by Counselor A. Sessions III, IV, V, and VI were led by Counselor D. Sessions VII, VIII, IX and X were led by Counselor E.)

Session III

Harriet recounted some childhood experiences--dirt clod fights with neighborhood gangs. This was followed by a general discussion of drinking, and getting drunk.

Susan: I drank because kids called me "chicken."

Co: Is "chicken" a word that turns you on?

Susan: Not necessarily, but if you don't drink, you act like you're better than they are.

Martha: That's all there is to do in Las Vegas is drink.

Susan: In Carlsbad, that's all there is to do.

Harriet: There's lots of things to do besides drink.

Harriet then described games she played as a child, and disclosed quite a lot of information regarding her parents and siblings and particularly parental discipline.

The discussion became general as the girls told of different ways they "conned" money out of their parents--sneaking into shows--stealing for themselves and their friends. One girl told about sneaking into a drive-in movie by allowing herself to be locked into the trunk of the car.

Session IV

Harriet talked about her ambivalent feelings toward her father and her reluctance to discuss her feelings with him. Harriet stated she has had dreams about her father. She sees him coming at her with a knife. "He hates us all. He hates our guts. But I still want to see him anyway."

Martha talked about her difficulties in getting along with her father, and the problems teenagers have in West Las Vegas in finding enough to do.

Susan was quite subdued. She had intended to get married over the Christmas vacation, and the marriage plans fell through. She did not go into this disappointment at any length. She merely announced it.

Session V

Charlotte talked about her experience in preventing a man from raping her. Martha talked about conflicts with her grandfather who resides in their home. Susan talked about her positive experience in a foster home and her baby's successful placement in foster care. Harriet talked about her ambivalent feelings toward her counselor, and experiences she has had in which she was frightened by strangers.

Session VI

Harriet talked about her reactions to name calling, her desire to finish school and sex education. Charlotte participated in

discussion of sex education. Susan talked about her desire to be pregnant and the rejection she experienced from her friends in Carlsbad when she became pregnant. Martha and Louise participated only briefly.

GROUP LEADER: Counselor E

PARTICIPANTS: Martha, Charlotte, Harriet, Louise, Susan

Session VII

The group began by expressing some feelings about their original counselor being gone. They then began questioning the new leader.

Had I ever been in a group? Was it a "self-disclosure" group? Did people really talk about "deep" (i.e., secret) selves? Did I?

Harriet asked if I really told about myself. She asked this several times. I replied affirmatively each time.

The first self-disclosure material appeared after this initial exchange. It concerned loss of temper. Harriet revealed she is ready to blow. Someone in the cottage who's also in two classes is trying to "get her to quarantine." She says she won't give in. Susan said she's going through some turmoil and she can't bear being "baited." Charlotte commented that the same thing used to happen to her. Martha said it's hard to live in "this place" because of mad girls and all the gossip to "get people in trouble."

All five girls participated in this discussion. All agreed that girls are "bad" for each other and fight over little things and some made fights and liked them, like Vera and Mary. Harriet,

Charlotte and Martha agreed on this but Susan and Louise kept silent on names.

Louise led off from cottage conflicts to area of trust. She stated that her family, especially her father, acted like the kids in the cottage. She said he accepted gossip by anyone rather than "truth" by her, and that trust was something she didn't have any more. This spoke personally to Susan's experience and she then talked of her mother who never trusted her and who could not be trusted herself.

Much self-disclosure came from Louise, Susan and Harriet in the next 20 minutes. Martha listened, had lots of facial expression, but didn't verbalize. She attended visibly, however, yawned and wiggled when Louise and Susan revealed their past behavior of "whoring" around. The counselor assessed the yawns as being a cover for more feelings of curiosity and/or interest. Charlotte chose to show she could remain aloof.

Significant disclosures here: Louise was by far the most self-disclosive and presented what she termed "new" material. She thought of herself as a "whore" because she slept with any boy who asked. She had been picked up many times. She took boys to her home to her own bed for kicks, in the hope of embarrassing her father, but he never really found out. Louise felt safe with "Dave" but he left when she got pregnant. She aborted her baby. She says she's accused of punishing herself by counselor, cottage mom, etc., but says they don't know why. She says she reminds herself of her sins

because no one else punishes her for taking a human life and for being cheap. She began "whoring" around because she wanted to be popular and have friends. It only made her the object of boys' disgust, and the girls talked behind her back. She had no friends anywhere until Girls' Welfare Home where she and Laura became friends. She says she is trying to be two people and both are at war inside her. She feels okay here, but on the outs she feels she'll fall into old ways. She talked about difficulty of change and being accepted by high school kids when she goes home. Said it's too hard to prove to others she's changed.

Harriet popped in here as a "helping" person. She said she'd changed since September because she'd made up her mind and that she didn't need to prove change to anyone but herself and that other people would catch on sooner or later that she was a different person now.

Susan revealed almost the same material as Louise. She cried once about trying to make people like her in school at home (in Carlsbad) but that they never did, so she tried to "buy" friendship with her "body."

Harriet: You meant to make your Mom's ideas of you come true.

Susan: Yes, I guess so but it's more than that. I wanted other kids to really like me and let me be with them.

Susan also expressed a real fear of going back to "whoring" around. She said she felt safe if a boy stayed with her. It isn't the sex (said she doesn't enjoy it that much), but that someone was close to her and helped take care of her.

Martha inserted, "Yeah! They left you their memory" (hostility here, I think but she didn't go on).

Susan: "See what I mean, Harriet? Even when you think you've changed, people won't let you forget. I can't hide a baby and this thing in my stomach."

Harriet: "Even if you're pregnant, you can change but you have to prove it by saying 'no,' I guess. After all, the past is over-- Don't let it bug you that they throw the past in your face."

Susan revealed that what Harriet said was right. She talked at some length about how she enjoyed throwing the past in her mother's face even ten years after her mother had done something wrong.

Harriet talked generally about her own change. It had been hard, and even now some girls and grownups try to get her to do something that will prove she hasn't changed. She said turning the other cheek works but some people think you don't have guts if you don't fight back. Her major role was a "helping" one throughout the session. The girls talked directly to her after the first ten minutes.

Toward the end of the session, after time was called, Harriet said she thought that Louise and Susan could change and that maybe the whole group could help.

Harriet, Susan and Louise told the group they'd revealed things they "couldn't" tell counselors before.

Susan and Louise said they withhold personal information because if counselor knew how bad they were, they'd never be released

from here. Louise cited how she's always told her counselor she was blackmailed so she'd had to go to bed with a boy. Said she's told counselor she's only been to bed with two boys in her whole life.

Susan said she wouldn't tell how much she's prone to go to bed with boys and do all "wild" things they ask her to. Also she won't tell real hopeless feeling about getting along with mother to counselor.

Harriet said "Ah S___! every girl comes in with lies. Counselor don't look for how awful you've been but how much you grow up while you're here."

Session VIII

The session began with Louise and Susan telling how they felt after the last session and their first real truthfulness in self-exposure since being at the Girls' Welfare Home. They expressed apprehension because they were fearful that their group counselor would think less of them. They were also afraid that their counselors would find out, since they weren't clear about who had access to group session information. They had no fear about other girls finding out. All four girls asked me to repeat again the purpose of the study. I did so. I assured them that the investigator was the only one with access to major points of the counseling. Louise was obviously relieved. Susan said she'd like to "level" with Mrs. R. if an appointment could be arranged. She was assured it could be arranged.

All joined in a general discussion about the importance of trust and confidentiality. Harriet asked if girls felt anything besides "being afraid" word would get to their counselors. Louise and Susan both said they felt major relief not to have to pretend. Susan said you could believe your own lies. Louise said she had always talked herself into believing her lies were the truth.

Harriet said that the last session was the best she'd ever felt about counseling. Louise concurred. Louise said she wished she could be freer with her counselor and that it was her own fault she couldn't. Said she thought maybe now she could tell the truth completely to Mrs. V. but still wasn't sure.

Louise presented a problem to the group. Should she live with Mrs. G. whom she loves and feels understands her, or with her father who says he loves her but hurts her and makes her feel "no good?" Harriet again shines as the "counselor." She asked Louise if she loved her father or felt she owed him herself. Louise replied she owed him because he paid her room, board, etc., for 15 years. Harriet asked if she went back to her father would she go to "old ways?" Louise said she'd end up back here. Harriet said she hated parents who made children feel they owed life to them. She began a discourse here about her own father and all the kids' lack of respect to him because he was such a mean selfish old "S___." About 20 minutes here from all except Charlotte on fathers.

Self-disclosures:

Harriet says she feels no need to ever love her father or live with him. She does love her mother but feels generally independent of

the family, although she would want to see her mother as often as possible.

Susan says she'll never tell her father she's in Girls' Welfare Home because he prophesized she would end up here if she went back to Carlsbad. She says she really loves her father and would like to be close to him--that he treated her badly because she did the same to him and never gave him a chance to be a real father. She said it was probably 50-50 deal of meanness on both sides.

Louise said (to Harriet) she didn't really love her father at all but had to say so because he was her father. She said she could hate him except she didn't feel it was right. Also, he did provide for her and never really kicked her out and he could have.

Susan said children learn from what parents do, not from what they tell kids to do. General heated and involved talk here about parental hypocrisy.

All vowed they loved adults here (at Girls' Welfare Home) who acted like they talked.

At the end of the session, Louise asked if Laura could be in the group. Harriet said Laura needed it. Susan said Laura was one troubled kid who was lying about everything and needed to tell the truth. Louise said Laura needs to tell her true feelings about the lady she plans to live with in Alamogordo and some of their experiences. She said she'd told Laura about pretending and how good it felt not to have to lie anymore. Counselor said Laura couldn't come into the group but maybe could get into a group when these sessions end.

Session IX

The session began with Martha asking what had been said in the last session while she was in quarantine. Louise and Susan filled her in on the high spots. Susan pointed out how she felt about this particular group. She felt the girls in it weren't really close friends but that she'd never be able to really dislike anyone in the group. They had shared too many things together. Louise agreed; she said she'd been to lots of psychologists and psychiatrists but that this was her first experience of really telling about herself to people her own age.

Martha said she'd talk in the group today. She didn't feel that Susan and Louise were like the other Anglos she knows.

Charlotte told Martha that she doesn't like to talk about herself to anyone. It took her a "long time" to be able to talk to Mrs. W. in private and that there are some things she won't tell anyone, not even her favorite counselor, Mrs. W.

Louise took her on here; told her that the longer you hide things from people who want to help you, the worse you feel and the less you can make sense of your life. Charlotte let it drop there.

Enter our fireball Harriet, who had been tied up in a meeting with her counselor. Harriet comes in angry and what she called an "arguing" mood.

Louise is first to speak after Harriet gets settled. Louise reveals that when she leaves Girls' Welfare Home she plans to help high school kids whom she knows have done the same things she has but

haven't been caught. Harriet asks her how (disdainfully). Louise says she doesn't exactly know but can tell them about life in the Welfare Home and how it is in prison. Louise said she'd encourage them to get community counseling and even go to church. All hell broke loose here. Martha told Louise that no one would listen to her since she was a juvenile delinquent herself. Harriet took her on about "church" piousness.

Herein began a 15 minute heated "set to" about God, Jesus, religion, and faith.

Significant points of exchange:

All five girls felt the church had failed them and their families.

The three Spanish girls felt "Catholic" but accept teachings only on their own terms and don't believe in a lot of the doctrine.

All but Louise expressed resentment of parents who pushed them to church but were full of hypocrisy in their own actions.

Harriet said her father used "church" for example to the kids but he himself got drunk and gambled every Saturday and Sunday and rarely attended himself.

Martha and Charlotte both heatedly revealed that in Spanish homes the poorest people used the rosary, creche and statuary to ward off evil spirits, not for purposes of worship to God or Jesus.

Harriet tried to bait Susan and Louise into the "is there or isn't there a God" debate. Louise said for her there is a God but that you can't argue about it because it concerns faith of the person, not whether you can see or feel him.

Martha says she doesn't think there is a God at all because if there was he wouldn't let a home like hers be possible and her Grandmother (a devout Catholic) would be happy, not sad. She also felt God would not have taken her mother away.

Harriet goes back to Louise having her "stupid Anglo friends" go to church so they'll stop their "life of crime." She said that you can change your life without believing in God because her brother did it. Harriet said she was positive her brother wouldn't go back to the State Pen because he'd made up his mind, not because God had told him to be "good." She said she felt the same about herself. She reflected here on her family situation. She told the group that her mother could keep the kids good and pretty happy until they got to be teen-agers but then they all go "bad" and end up in trouble with the police. She was almost sure all her younger siblings would be in Springer or Girls' Welfare Home before they were adults. Susan and Louise asked her why. Harriet said because her father made too many fights with them and that the "Anglos" in Clovis put Spanish kids down and that Spanish kids were put in institutions more than Anglo kids.

This opened the second major phase of group interaction, that of prejudice. All five girls interacted heatedly in the following significant exchanges (even "quiet" Charlotte).

Susan led off with Harriet on the fact that prejudice works both ways. She cited that "chukes" in Carlsbad wouldn't let Anglo kids near "their territory." She said that school fights were fre-

quently between Spanish gangs rather than between Anglo and Spanish. Harriet flatly denied this.

Charlotte said Anglo kids always got their parents to take their side and that her probation officer and judge were Anglo and that they always think Anglo kids should have lots of chances but that Spanish kids are bad to begin with. Said Anglo kids do worse things in Roswell than Spanish kids ever thought of doing. She said she didn't trust Anglo kids at all, or Anglo adults.

Harriet jumped around a lot in this phase of the session and almost every exchange was delivered by thumping the receiver on the chest. Harriet went to Louise, said that Anglo kids put the finger on each other so that they would all be punished if one got into trouble but that Spanish kids knew how to keep their mouths shut and protect each other. Louise denied this hotly, said there were three girls she could report for taking and carrying drugs but she kept her mouth shut. Harriet responded with "Big deal, esa." Harriet said even at Girls' Welfare Home where prejudice wasn't too bad, the house-mothers always know that Anglo kids can be made to tell all and put the finger on other kids in the cottage. Anglos are goody-goodies who want adults to think they're really nice and good. Martha agreed here. She said she could never have a good friendship with an Anglo girl or boy. Revealed that Cecilia is the only Mexican she could tell things to, "Cecilia really understands me" says she. Charlotte rises here (obviously a touchy spot). Charlotte says, "Until she wants to hurt you, esa, then to hell with you." Harriet says, "Goddamn, I hate this love junk."

Susan summarizes prejudice issue for girls. She feels that people who feel mean inside act mean on the outside. That she has always felt guilty about Anglos "putting down" the Mexican kids like it is in her family and in most of Carlsbad. She feels that we should have people in Girls' Welfare Home who are Spanish, not only as group workers but as counselors and teachers. That every girl in the group learned their prejudice from their families and that she felt Harriet, Charlotte, and Martha were more prejudiced toward Anglos than she and Louise were toward Spanish.

Martha said "Maybe, but Anglos don't even try to know about us. They could care less about how we feel and how we live, but you throw your way in our faces all the time."

Probably to break the unresolved friction, Louise led off into what started the third and final phase of the session; that of illusions, imagination, mysticism, and visions, which turned out to be a major factor in these girls' perceptions of themselves and their families.

Louise opened with the fact that she'd been thinking since Wednesday's session about telling our group another secret. She said she felt enough trust to do so. The room got quiet and all gave attention to Louise. Louise self-disclosed about her illusion that she feels got her here. She confessed it came about through a year of glue sniffing. She saw her father (in her illusion) come at her with a knife while their family was at a drive-in. She became hysterical and passed out, but said she knew, illusion or no, that

was his real intent. She said she'd had other similar experiences and that they were more real than reality. Self-disclosed that the last time she was taken to D Home she spent the night in a church and she saw a figure in white--a woman--who called to her. The D Home counselors didn't know what to do about the recurring vision of the white lady--had her talk about it with the D Home minister but Louise felt no one believed the realness of her vision. She said that she knew all adults thought she was crazy. At this point, Martha said, "I believe you, Louise, you aren't crazy. I've seen the lady in white, too." Charlotte, too, answered similarly. The lady in white is the "Lady of Tears" and she appears to people who are troubled deeply. Harriet said she knew people who had seen the lady in white but that the vision hadn't come to her because she "didn't believe."

All five girls talked of the supernatural in their lives.

Charlotte saw the Lady in White plus one other vision at night. Martha disclosed that her mother's spirit sat on the bed, then went into the kitchen and took out pots and pans. It awakened the entire household. The spirit disappeared but the kitchen mess was seen by all members of the family. Her mother's spirit re-visited her and told her to promise not to be a "bad girl." At Girls' Welfare Home she has been awakened twice by grandmother's voice in the room at night. Fear always accompanies these spiritual visits.

Harriet was visited at Meyer by an old whiskered man who sat in her chair in her room. She was so scared she couldn't call the night

lady. Finally she said a Rosary (under her pillow) and crossed herself and the man went away. She says her sister and mother have had visions also but Harriet's are not religious in nature. They are always men who mean to "hurt" her. Harriet trembled visibly while telling of this.

Louise differentiates among illusions (when on dope or glue); conjuring up, through the use of concentration and imagination, a real image (she says she can do this at will), and the white lady vision which is scariest of all because she can't "reason this one" out.

Susan provided the last self-disclosure on this topic this session. Susan said she'd never believed in this stuff but at Christmas her mother and Charlotte (her mother's best friend) held a seance and used her as the trance figure. Out of this came information about a friend of her mother's who had been killed in a fall from a horse the previous October and no one knew about it. They called this woman's husband in Phoenix and it proved to be true. Susan also has been visited by her ex-boyfriend killed in a car wreck and hears night voices which awaken her sometimes.

The girls hated to end the session. They want to discuss more of the same next session.

Session X

The group began with talk of Pat, of the still-birth, and of the ensuing "storm" that took place as the aftermath.

Susan revealed that the other girls, especially Marie, blamed her for the mishap and told her they hoped her own baby would be born dead. Susan felt it was another case of the girls visibly showing their dislike for her. She said she didn't have one friend here at the Girls' Welfare Home and never has had.

Harriet told Susan she let kids pick on her because she walked away from them. Harriet advised Susan to stand up to them.

The next topic concerned holding back angry feelings. All four girls said it was "hard to do." Susan said it was unnatural but that getting out of here depended on it. There was some talk here about what happens to each when anger is held back. All revealed it made little things seem great big and that you learned not to care about anyone or anything. Susan commented that if you hold back bad feelings it makes you hold back good ones.

The subject switched to illegitimate births; how it affects the child; being called a "bastard"; society blames the child; people are cruel to them, says Susan and Louise.

Martha and Harriet disagreed. "Not in Spanish families," they said. Harriet has an illegitimate nephew whom everyone adores. Martha has a niece. They gave several incidents where the child is never hurt and is made to feel always welcome. Harriet says her nephew is even treated especially well. Susan says her boy is always hurt by family and neighbors. Harriet, "Why are you having another bastard then?" Susan, "I want this baby, to me it isn't a bastard." Harriet, "But other people make it hard on him, you said." Susan,

"I know it, I'll have to move away from people like that."

Susan said Spanish people are more generous and loving than Anglo people. She recalled a Spanish boy she went with; he stopped seeing her because of family disapproval.

Martha said her sister married an Anglo boy, but the family doesn't really accept him, even now.

Harriet said Spanish people, men especially, love kids. She said her father never did ask her sister who her baby was "from" when she became pregnant on a run from Girls' Welfare Home. Susan said she was envious because her family thought this was the most important thing and hounded her with it, especially her father. Martha said no one ever made a point of this "who's the father business" in her family either. She said children were considered a gift of life from God.

Louise was pretty silent throughout this session.

Harriet asked why Louise never mentioned her mother. Louise said she didn't even like to think of her mother; it made her so miserable. No one pushed her. Lovely acceptance of private feelings by the group. More talk of fathers and brothers in prison. This was stated as a fact of life by Susan and Harriet. No overt value judgments were made by anyone in the group. The counselor asked the girls how they felt about group counseling experience. Consensus was: They like a mixture of individual and group counseling, but think groups are pretty important because it tells you how other people see your problems and it is helpful to help each other. All commented about

having to trust a counselor, more in group than in individual sessions. (I never did get their perceptions clarified on this, but it had to do with not having counselor talk about group sessions outside of group.)

The girls said they got a "C" for the first six sessions but gave themselves an "A" for the last four sessions because: (a) they said "important" things, (b) they all participated, (c) they felt they helped each other and that it was "good" help, and (d) they all kept strict confidentiality.

Pseudo-Self-Disclosure Groups

GROUP LEADER: Counselor F

PARTICIPANTS: Margaret, Anna, Phyllis, Nora, Sophie, Dora, Lola,
Mary, Darlene, Gwen

Session I

After the statement was read to the group, there was a period of silence. The participants seemed to be mulling over what was expected of them.

Dora: I don't know how to make up a story. You mean write it out?

Co: Tell us.

Sophie: I'm too dumb.

Co: You feel you're too dumb to make up a story?

Sophie: I went out with Elvis Presley.

Laughter

Dora: It can't be a true story.

Co: You're supposed to make it sound like it's true.

Phyllis: I was born in Rhode Island, moved to Roswell, New Mexico, and went to school there.

Mary: You're telling a real story.

Phyllis: Yeah, but part of it's fake.

Anna: Did you live in Roswell?

Phyllis continued her narrative--she said she quit school, got mixed up with the wrong people, took acid, went to California, came back, went to wild parties, was picked up by the cops, and "here I am."

Phyllis's sister Darlene said the story is not true.

Anna: I never saw you in Roswell.

Dora: I got a mother and father and they had six kids. I was a triplet and came out second best. We had a beautiful two-story house on a hill and all around it there was a beautiful green pasture, and across the street, a park. On the side of the hill across the park they had puppies. It was all happy. After Texas we moved to California and we went through these forests with pine trees. My dad said we're going up to heaven.

Dora stopped here and seemed to be finished.

Co: You have me in suspense. You said your father said we're going up to heaven. Did you go to heaven?

Dora: We went to hell.

Laughter

Darlene told a story of a grasshopper. "I'm a grasshopper, hatched in a small town in Georgia (much giggling). I married a cricket and we had a baby elephant."

Dora: Can a grasshopper make a noise like a cricket?

Darlene: I lived happily ever after.

Sophie: I'll tell my story. I was born in a small town. From there my parents took me to Roswell.

Someone said, "That's your true story."

Sophie: No, it isn't. I went to school. Every day I ended up in the office. I got paddled every day. I was expelled from school and never went back. To me school was a place where

somebody wasn't going to learn anything--going to be dumb all the time. My parents sent me to California on the bus. I got off somewhere and was lost for two months. I would sit at the bus station and I cried. Finally I was picked up by my parents and sent to Roswell. I got in trouble and was sent to Albuquerque.

Mary: Is that true?

Sophie: No.

Lola told a story of running around and getting into trouble. Her mother worked nights. She went on a blind date. "This guy was driving a blue Camaro. Daddy was in the hospital. I didn't have to tell nobody nothing." The date took Lola to a motel. They went to the bar. She told her escort "I'm too young to drink," but he ordered beer and they served him. I looked at his driver's license. He was 32 years old. "I got jumpy. I went to the bathroom--tried to get out the window--started to climb out, but felt someone pulling on my legs. I looked down and it was him and he was pulling on my legs just like I'm pulling on yours."

Laughter

Mary: Was that true?

Lola: No.

Someone explained the expression "pulling your leg."

Nora: I was born in Phoenix and my mom and dad were born there, too. When I was 14 years old, on my birthday, I said, "Let's go to Gallup" and they said okay. I was in the bus station and this

man came up and said "You want a drink?" I said "What's a drink? You mean water?" He said, "No, alcohol."

Nora blocked at this point--even though encouraged to go on, she said "No, I don't want to. Forget it."

Dora: Would I be in trouble if I refused to be in the group?

Mary: Do we have to be in this?

Counselor replied she'd talk to the girls later.

Dora asked the counselor to tell a story.

Co: I was born in Europe--in France. The first language I spoke was French. When I was five my parents came to this country. I was very shy. I went to school and talked with the teacher in sign language. I had to stay in the first grade two years so I could learn English. My father was a chef--he cooked in hotels. When I was nine he was killed in an accident. My mother went to work as a pastry chef. She married again, and I went back to France and lived with my aunt. I went to school, graduated, got married, and had four children. Then World War II came along.

Gwen: How old are you?

Co: My husband was in a German prison camp. I had to leave France.

I never heard from my husband and children. I keep waiting for the postman to bring me news of my family every day.

Gwen: Have they ever been found?

Co: I'm not going to tell you if that's true or not.

The session closed with the girls guessing at the counselor's age--"46, 39....no, she's forty-something."

It was decided that groups of ten were too large for the self-disclosure groups, so the pseudo-self-disclosure groups were also split up.

Session II

PARTICIPANTS: Margaret, Lola, Anna, Sophie, Mary

The group asked the purpose of "just telling stories." The study was explained again briefly. The counselor said we might just "shoot the breeze" in between stories, if we felt like it. Margaret verbalized a fear of fantasizing. "It means you're insane." This led to a discussion of Edgar Allen Poe and whether or not he was insane. "If someone has such a weird imagination--doesn't that mean he's insane?" We discussed the visit to the State Prison, hippies who "blow their minds," mental retardation, abortion, capital punishment, and mercy killing.

Lola indicated she wanted to tell a made-up story.

Lola: I was born in Hobbs. My mother died when I was born. My father died when I was two. They sent me to live with my aunt and uncle in California. I lived with them until age 6. Then I moved to Florida to live with my sister. Her husband beat me. I went back to my aunt and uncle and lived with them until age 12--then grandmother--then back to aunt and uncle. I started running around, taking dope and marijuana and got mixed up with Hell's Angels. I got hung on Speed. They sent me to the junior pen in California. Since coming here I've

killed Margaret, and now I'm going back to the pen.

Margaret: Why did you make your story miserable?

Lola: Cause I live miserable.

Co: Can we think of someone who had a happy life?

Margaret: No one has a happy life.

Sophie told about a funeral in Roswell and Anna told why she returned to Girls' Welfare Home. "I did the same thing again--drinking and staying out all night."

Session III

(Two new participants were added; a counselor went on vacation and her girls were divided up. The new participants were Doris and Carol.)

Mary: I'm in lock for throwing spaghetti across the table.

Co: You were locked for throwing spaghetti across the table?

Laughter

(No further explanation)

The group discussed burning themselves in the game of "chicken," returning from Christmas vacations, griped about lock. They discussed parole, release, cottage problems, a long movie the group had seen on Sunday, pregnancy, teen-age marriage, and problems encountered on release from Girls' Welfare Home. The group interaction remained on a fairly superficial, discussion level. Participants hopped from topic to topic, and no topics were explored in depth. However, despite the "bull-session" atmosphere, one or two girls related incidents with quite a lot of feeling.

Anna: I saw my father when I was in Roswell. He wanted to talk to me but I told him to go away. When I was small he didn't support me. Now that I'm grown, he wants me. I'll burn his mind. I'll take his money and tell him to go to hell. He's just like an ordinary man to me. He's not my father.

Sophie told a story about taking 45 aspirin when she was in Harwood School. She and a friend did this "to see how many aspirin we can take before we get sick." The friend passed out--Sophie was screaming because the aspirin were painning her stomach. The girls were rushed to the hospital and their stomachs pumped.

Session V

Anna: It's boring.

Margaret talked about the Combined Juvenile Institutions Board and the new Department of Corrections.

Anna: I'm tired of being good.

Co: You're ready to be bad.

Anna: Yeah.

Co: What are you going to do?

Anna: I'm going to run. But, I don't know where to go if I run. The girls then talked about runs, and our recent champion runners-- Teresa with 17 runs and Mary with 14 runs.

Anna: I'm just going to be good two more months; that's all.

Mary related how she cleaned a 12 room house for someone. It took her all day and the woman paid her \$5.00 saying, "That's too much money but I'll give it to you anyway."

Mary: I felt like throwing the money in her face.

Sophie described a beautiful home she cleaned--it was all carpeted, and the teen-aged boy had his bicycle in his bedroom. He also had a TV, tape recorder, and stereo. He had thrown darts into the wall and cracked the plaster. Discussion of "spoiled brats" followed.

Session VI

Anna: Do we have to come to these things? (meaning the sessions)

Lola: Of course. It's like group therapy.

Co: It's not too much like group therapy, but you have to come.

Anna: I get tired of walking up here.

Co: This doesn't seem worthwhile to you.

Anna: When are the girls going to start going home? (Evaded counselor's question).

There followed a discussion of heaven, hell, and purgatory.

Mary: We're in hell right now.

Co: At the Girls' Welfare Home?

Mary: Any place in the world.

Co: Why?

Mary: Because we suffer.

The girls discussed La Tienda. Now that it's being run by grown-ups they don't like it any more. They feel bad about failing the Education Director.

Margaret: If it wasn't for her, I wouldn't be graduating.

Session VII

Lola told about her experiences in Portales. She met Bill Sands and was taken to visit a quadriplegic girl--injured in an accident. She went to a children's home and talked to the children about Girls' Welfare Home. She loved staying up late and loved being trusted.

The group talked about prisons--beating, whipping, broken bones, prison stabbing, all of which had been described by Bill Sands in his lecture. This was followed by a discussion of the Seven Step Foundation. Differences between petty larceny and grand larceny were brought out by a group member.

Sophie: You mean I committed grand larceny? I broke into a house and stole lots of stuff.

Lola: I committed both grand larceny and petty larceny.

Girls who had been on a field trip to a furniture factory described their experiences.

Session VIII

This session was mainly a group discussion centering on Bill Sands' book--his sermon regarding Jesus Christ and the apostles--also a gripe session regarding other girls.

Mainly doing the griping were Mary and Anna, both Meyer girls--both complaining about Laura--her selfishness--how much she eats, etc. Doris and Carol did not participate. Lola was not present. Sophie talked about schools she had attended.

Session IX

Marriage and divorce were discussed. "A man marries you-- then he leaves you." "I'm never going to get married--you always get hurt." etc.

Anna asked how many more sessions there are--she finds them boring. She was relieved to find there is only one more. Doris was absent. Carol was smiling and happy about her forthcoming release, but she just doesn't talk. Lola didn't contribute. Part of the session was devoted to palm reading--heart line, life line, etc.--a sheer waste of time.

Session X

The girls said that since this was the last session--could they please be taken for a ride. They were bored with the group discussions--so we went for a ride. We stopped at a drive-in and had milk shakes, cokes, etc. The conversation was chit-chat mainly. Nothing significant was talked about except perhaps the weather. It was a lovely, sunny day.

CONTINUED

3 OF 3

GROUP LEADER: Counselor G

PARTICIPANTS: Rosalind, Barbara, Evelyn, Carol, Elizabeth, Doris,
Pearl, Vera, Esther, Grace

Session I

The counselor read the statement to the group, then suggested the device of someone starting a short story, stopping, and letting another continue the narrative.

Evelyn: Like I was born in a log cabin or something? What's the purpose of this?

Co: We want to see what happens if we just tell stories—not talk about real problems.

Evelyn: (Hesitantly) I was born on a farm. My father picked tobacco and corn and stuff like that.

Vera: (continuing after Evelyn) I like cows.

Evelyn: It's awful easy to tell a lie when you don't have to, but when you have to, it's hard! (In a surprised voice)

When Carol was asked to continue, she said "I don't know how to tell a story like that."

Counselor was asked to tell a story. She told a story about being the daughter of a whaler. Her father fell overboard and an octopus bit off his leg. He was a shipbuilder after that. The counselor became a doctor, rich and famous.

Evelyn told a story about an elephant who met a boy elephant. They fell in love. They had a baby with big ears. Mother and baby went to Florida and lived in a palm tree. The mother elephant died. The

baby elephant went back to look for its father--couldn't find him,
and cried itself to death.

Silence

Leader asked if the group could continue telling stories.

Evelyn: It's hard.

The group decided to use the sessions to talk about other
things but not personal problems. Elizabeth talked about being a
Hippie in California. She went to the moon and met a monkey.

Co: If I were a hippie, how would I get food?

Evelyn: Steal it.

Laughter

Silence

Counselor asked for someone to continue.

Elizabeth: We went back to earth and got plastic surgery. Changed
from monkeys to people. We bought a house and lived together.
We had a bar upstairs and a pool table downstairs. (This was
told with frequent silences.)

Elizabeth: Someone continue it, man!

Others: "No."

Elizabeth: We had a son and a daughter. Then when they got married,
we were by ourselves. At this point Evelyn attempted to
continue, but she felt uncomfortable.

Evelyn: I'm not going to finish. I can't.

Elizabeth: We'd drink, take dope, go to parties, we'd drag--cops
came after us but they couldn't catch us. We were too fast

for them. We used to smoke grass and all that; trips, went
coo-coo.

Laughter

Evelyn continued the story. She was a monkey who left home because her parents were picking on her. She perched in a tree, but the police found her (the police car hit the tree and she tumbled down). She was taken to her parents. Her mother said, "I wish they hadn't found you. I don't want you back." So I got mad and became a big monkey and packed my suitcase. There was a fight and (Evelyn) the monkey got a gun and was going to shoot herself. A neighbor grabbed the gun and shot Elizabeth. Evelyn erected a grave-stone which said "Here lies a monkey-hater." Later Elizabeth arose from the dead. The groups were divided up after this session.

GROUP LEADER: Counselor H

PARTICIPANTS: Gwen, Phyllis, Nora, Rosalind, Pearl, Evelyn

Session II

Although this was my first session, it was the girls' second. They told me about the first session first. Then Gwen said, and reiterated throughout the session that she can no longer lie. She said she has spent a long time learning to tell the truth and now it's a habit. Thereupon she asked that someone else tell her story for her. (I felt very high resistance, handled very deftly by Gwen.) The girls asked Nora to start and she found it difficult. She soon told a story of an escapade she had written for the journalism (?)

class which the other girls admired. Although it was a fairy tale, I felt a good deal of personal feeling was being expressed in the heroine's disappointment in someone's failure to live up to promises. Phyllis then told a story which she tried very hard to keep unlike her own life. However, the heroine was soon involved in drinking problems and conduct, such as late hours, which would soon involve her in trouble with the law. Nora then told another story for Gwen. While she again tried to make the experiences remote, her voice betrayed considerable emotion. I was then asked to tell a story, which was as far from true as I could make it, and the girls decided must be true. While few facts were disclosed, I felt some feeling was.

Session III

Rosalind and Pearl said nothing except hello until the last five minutes of the session when I asked if they wanted to say something and they declined. Pearl said "no" and Rosalind said "I never say anything."

Evelyn, Darlene and Phyllis, old friends, spent a full hour and ten minutes reminiscing about old times, after saying they knew they were supposed to discuss anything but the past. Their entire discussion was very frank disclosure of what they obviously regard as shared fun episodes. Each episode dealt with drinking parties, boy-friends and angry parents. The girls agreed that their respective mothers blamed friends for the girls' troubles, instead of the individual herself. All further agreed that each was responsible for her own behavior. The girls corroborated each other's stories, adding

forgotten details and obviously relishing the memories. Evelyn kept saying "I've changed now," but she was obtaining a great deal of satisfaction from reliving her past. Rosalind and Pearl, the silent ones, listened intently. Pearl laughed at all stories. Rosalind gave me the feeling that she didn't really find it so humorous but didn't feel free to express her disapproval--her expression was usually one of consternation behind a smile.

Session IV

This session focused more on the present than the last. Pearl's only contribution was "I don't like the group." Rosalind made several neutral statements about Hobbs--size, etc. Evelyn made some very tentative, probing statements to the effect that she knows all about Don's sleeping and waking habits. After each statement she retreated to neutrality and waited to see if she obtained approval or disapproval. Her statements seemed to be received with true neutrality, so she tried again, but never really describing having lived with him. I felt we were all being tested and that Evelyn really wanted to talk seriously. Phyllis and Darlene were not ready to talk so seriously and I tried to follow the moods rather than lead. Pearl made expressive faces. Phyllis and Darlene revealed considerable hostility toward each other, masked by banter that I felt several times was ready to give way. Each expressed negative feelings toward the other's boyfriend. I felt none of the material presented was very significant but that Darlene, Phyllis, and Evelyn would each have been glad to have someone push her into more. It was interesting attack and fall back. Most of the

statements were focused on the present but the undercurrent was of past experiences.

Sessions V, VI, and VII failed to record on the tape.

Session VIII

The girls engaged in a discussion of teen-age marriages.

Evelyn: It ain't a bed of roses.

Phyllis: If there isn't fighting in a marriage, they don't care.

Evelyn: Fighting doesn't mean you love one another.

Darlene: Charlie agrees with me on everything.

Evelyn: I want someone to back-hand me when I get out of line.

They followed with a discussion of quarantine.

Session IX

The girls complained about housemothers and discussed cottage problems mainly. The control of anger, and immaturity were discussed.

Session X

Co: This is our last session.

Evelyn: I want to go on having them. The sessions are getting better all the time.

The girls talked about their experiences in jail, the food, the chores, etc.

Evelyn: Jail is better than home sweet home.

GROUP LEADER: Counselor I

PARTICIPANTS: Vera, Barbara, Elizabeth, Grace, Esther

Session II

The girls adhered to the directions extremely well and did, consequently, not self-disclose. There were very few periods of silence and those that did occur were of extremely short duration. In an attempt to promote pseudo-self-disclosure, I suggested that we engage in a continuous story with each girl contributing. They all favored the idea. I began the story and terminated my speech in the middle of a sentence which the next girl was to continue. Each girl, thus, participated and all did an extremely good job. While all the girls participated, it was Elizabeth and Vera who monopolized the latter part of the session. Toward the end of the session, the girls began injecting each other's names into the story. They did not, however, incorporate self-disclosure--it was primarily a form of wish fulfillment, "living in a palace," etc. While participating, Esther and Barbara were not extremely verbal.

Session III

Vera, Grace and Esther were present. There was very little continuity in this session. The girls were not able to conjure up any imaginative stories so the direction of this session was rather sporadic. There were extended periods of silence. The discussion covered a wide gamut of topics but it was primarily a "complaining" session--complaining about the cottage, the cook, the housemother,

not having more girls in our group, etc. However, very little, if any, self-disclosure occurred. Esther said approximately only 3 or 4 words --because I had directed a question to her; otherwise, she would have remained silent for the entire session.

Verbal discussion is not going to be very effective with this group; therefore, in the future, we will probably engage in some type of activity-oriented program. This should particularly facilitate the group's progress when Esther leaves on a parole and only two girls will remain.

Session IV

Taped this session, but the recorder was not working. Hence there is no record.

Session V

No self-disclosure occurred. We played a game of scrabble and then they taught me how to play Rummy. They seemed to enjoy it.

Session VI

Vera and Grace were present. We talked about a number of insignificant things, like places we had been, games we liked to play, home visits, etc. Most of the hour, however, was devoted to playing Rummy which both girls thoroughly enjoy.

Session VII

Esther was removed from quarantine for the meeting. Naturally the talk initially revolved around Esther's run from Harwood. Vera and Grace did almost all the verbalizing--Esther said very little and seemed to be quite embarrassed about it. Next, we discussed the speech at the U. of A. and the furniture factory tour and the Job Corps assembly.

Session VIII

We didn't play cards today!! The girls wanted to talk, so we did! First we discussed the dance that was held Saturday night with Vera emphasizing the difficulty she had with Iris. Vera contends that Iris is a liar. We also discussed Grace's week-end visit with her mother and the cute boy she met. The male teachers at school were also discussed. They all indicated they liked them. Most of the hour was devoted to a discussion on glue-sniffing led by Vera.

Esther said only a few words but Vera and Grace were quite active. The content was basically self-disclosing in regard to Vera and Grace.

Session IX

In view of our last session devoted to a discussion of glue-sniffing and drugs, I decided to introduce some reading material into our session. The reading material consisted of several pamphlets on various drugs and their effects. Each girl read some of

the information and we discussed each paragraph. All the girls were quite interested and asked quite a number of logical questions. The conversation never digressed to other topics. Esther was the most active participant; she asked more questions and answered more questions than the other two girls.

The only comments made that would be considered self-disclosive were those that occurred at the beginning when they revealed their interest in reading about marijuana because they had used it or because they had thought about using it but never had. We completed only one pamphlet during the session.

Session X

The girls read and subsequently discussed a pamphlet on LSD. They all participated by frequently asking and answering questions.

One digression developed when Vera requested some information on mental retardation. I don't believe that the girls self-disclosed.

VITA

Eugenia Rothenberg was born in Chicago, Illinois in 1923. She attended elementary and secondary schools in Chicago, and the University of Illinois, in Chicago and Urbana, majoring in sociology and psychology. She received the bachelor of arts degree in 1952 with highest honors in sociology. She was elected to Alpha Lambda Delta, Phi Kappa Phi, and Bronze Tablet (Highest Honors). In addition, she received the Women's Group System Award for Scholarship, and the Chi Omega Award, given annually to the most promising woman majoring in sociology.

She completed her master of arts degree, in the teaching of social studies, in 1954. She was employed as an elementary grade classroom teacher for five years, and as a lecturer at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale, Illinois for three years, teaching in the History Department and the College of Education.

In 1966, she enrolled at the University of New Mexico, majoring in Guidance and Counseling. She received the American Association of University Women (Albuquerque Chapter) award to a promising woman student in support of advanced work toward the doctorate in 1967. She held a graduate assistantship in the Guidance and Counseling Department for the 1967-1968 academic year. In June, 1968, she accepted the position of Clinical Director at the Girls' Welfare Home in Albuquerque, New Mexico, and is currently employed in this capacity.

END