THE CHARACTERISTICS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL

SAFETY IN GROUP COUNSELING

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

University of North Texas in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Kevin A. Fall, B.A., M.Ed.

Denton, Texas

May, 1997

THE CHARACTERISTICS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL

SAFETY IN GROUP COUNSELING

DISSERTATION

Presented to the Graduate Council of the

University of North Texas in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

By

Kevin A. Fall, B.A., M.Ed.

Denton, Texas

May, 1997

Fall, Kevin Anthony, <u>The characteristics of psychological safety in group</u>

<u>counseling</u>. Doctor of Philosophy (Counseling and Student Services), May, 1997, 110

pp., 8 tables, references, 98 titles.

Psychological safety is a concept mentioned throughout the literature as a

necessary component in the process of change in group counseling. Despite its frequent

mention, no study has examined the characteristics of psychological safety. The purpose

of this study was to lay the groundwork for a definition of the concept of psychological

safety using self reports of group leaders and group members on a constructed Likert

format psychological safety questionnaire of three attributional categories: self, other

members, and leader.

The study utilized group members (n = 44) and group leaders (n = 4) participating

in laboratory groups as a part of a counseling related masters curriculum. The

questionnaires were filled out on the first, eighth (middle), and fourteenth (last) sessions.

Hierarchies for characteristics and attribution were constructed by using a summing

procedure of the Likert responses.

Results on the attribution of psychological safety by group members showed a

consistent pattern over the three time measures. Group members reported leaders as the

most attributed to facilitating psychological safety, other members as second, and self as

least attributed to facilitate psychological safety. Group leaders showed no apparent

agreement between groups, but each group leader attributed psychological safety

consistently over time within one's own group.

Results on the characteristics of psychological safety yielded a comprehensive list of characteristics, arranged in hierarchical format, as reported by both group members and leaders. Results indicated that psychological safety has some core concepts in each of the attributional categories. For group members, the characteristics of "warmth and support" and "active listening" were stable across every attributional category and time measure. For group leaders, "self disclosing feelings", "warmth and support", and "responding in an emotional, feeling manner" were reported in every time measure and attributional category.

Characteristics that had a negative effect on psychological safety and recommendations for future research were also discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The genesis of group treatment can be placed at 1906 with the work of J.H Pratt (Ettin, 1988). Since that time, group counseling as a popular treatment modality has been extensively practiced and researched. Ettin reported that three main areas of focus can be found in group literature: theoretical variables such as curative factors, basic logistics of practice, and technical considerations.

Bloch and Crouch (1985) concurred with Ettin's grouping and delineated three important, linear sections of the group process in the literature. At the top of the hierarchy are the therapeutic techniques and the curative factors. Both facilitate and indicate that change is currently happening or has taken place. At the bottom of the hierarchy, the conditions for change are necessary components that must be in place for the curative factors to occur and for the techniques to be effective. Of these three, the research on curative factors and therapeutic techniques have been the most exhaustive and the conditions of change have largely been ignored.

The literature is filled with reports and commentary on various techniques used in group counseling. The shallowest of the levels of the hierarchy, techniques can be drawn from many different theoretical sources. Many authors devote whole chapters or entire textbooks to the description of techniques. However, the research on the efficacy of the many techniques is scarce and little work has been done on the interaction among

techniques, the curative factors, and the conditions for change.

In the extensive research on curative or therapeutic factors, Yalom (1970), drawing on earlier research, constructed eleven therapeutic factors that formed the basis for future research. Early therapeutic factor research was qualitative, based on member self-reports, and demonstrated the interactional nature of the factors. As a list of therapeutic factors was formed from qualitative methods, empirical studies could be carried out based on the foundational work. The area of therapeutic factors has been exhaustively and thoroughly researched, but questions as to what conditions must occur for the factors to be effective still remain.

One concept that surfaced often in the literature as a necessary condition for change was psychological safety. Maslow (1954) was the first to concretely place safety in a system as a foundational need for growth. In Maslow's hierarchy of needs, safety rested above physical needs in order of priority, where each need must be approached and satisfied before mastery of the next need was possible. Maslow believed that safety needs centered around feelings of security, stability, and trust, and were largely psychological in nature. Members must feel psychologically safe in a group before they can feel a state of belonging in the group. In groups, physical needs are usually satisfied outside of group, therefore, the need for psychological safety is the first need that must be satisfied in order for growth to occur within the group. Maslow was the first main proponent of psychological safety, but he never studied factors related to the need.

Rogers (1970) also supported the role of psychological safety as a condition for change. Rogers mentioned psychological safety often in his writings and considered the

climate of safety to be paramount for change. Rogers, within a phenomenological perspective, placed responsibility on the members, the leader, and the individual to foster and create a climate of safety. Although Rogers addressed the importance of psychological safety, he never published any research on its components or nature.

Drawing on the theories of Maslow and Rogers, many theorists developed models of group process that included the climate of safety as a condition necessary for change (Dinkmeyer & Muro, 1979; Gibb, 1964; Gibb & Gibb, 1968; Korda & Pancrazio, 1989; Ohlsen, 1970; Rugel, 1987; Schutz, 1958). An examination of the research on characteristics of the curative factors supports a need for the establishment of psychological safety before the curative factors can facilitate growth within a group (Bloch & Crouch, 1985; Bloch & Reibstein, 1980; Butler & Fuhriman, 1983; Marcovitz & Smith, 1983; MacDevitt, 1987; Yalom, 1970). This concept strengthens the theoretical linear relationship between psychological safety and the therapeutic factors in the group process.

Psychological safety can be seen via its impact on and relationship to well researched group dynamics, such as trust and the developmental stages. Literature on trust considered psychological safety to be important to the change process by being a part of the bigger concept of psychological safety (Hansen, Warner & Smith, 1980; Posthuma, 1996; Rotter, 1971; Trotzer, 1989; Worchel, 1979). Discussions on the stages of group development, based primarily on clinical observation, cited psychological safety as being important at different levels during the stage process and being created at different times

by the roles of individuals, other members, and the leader (Corey & Corey, 1992; MacKenzie, 1983; Trotzer, 1989; Tuckman, 1965).

Although the importance of psychological safety is noted, a thorough definition of its characteristics remains absent. Despite a firm theoretical base, has the literature been blind to psychological safety? What is psychological safety? What do members and leaders see as contributing to psychological safety? What can leaders do to facilitate psychological safety? Questions such as these make a foundational study important in identifying the conditions that contribute to psychological safety.

Statement of the Problem

Within group counseling, the research areas of curative factors and techniques have been extensively researched while foundational aspects of the conditions for change have been ignored and neglected. Psychological safety is a dynamic construct that is mentioned repeatedly in the literature as a vital and necessary component to the change process, and yet to date, no research has examined the characteristics of psychological safety as defined by the individual and the leader. Another critical aspect is defining the role of the leader, the individual member, and the other members in contributing to psychological safety within the group counseling process.

Related Literature

A survey of the related literature involved the review of psychological safety, other concepts related to psychological safety, and group counseling. The review is organized

into the following areas: issues related to psychological safety, theoretical foundations of psychological safety, the relationship between psychological safety and trust, research and anecdotal evidence of the role of psychological safety, and stages of group development and psychological safety.

Issues Related to Psychological Safety

Bloch and Crouch (1985) separated group dynamics into three areas: conditions for change, therapeutic factors, and therapeutic techniques. Therapeutic techniques are the activities facilitated by the counselor that elicit the development of the therapeutic factors and promote change. Therapeutic factors are described as "any element that contributes to the improvement in a patient's condition, and are a function of the actions of the group therapist, the other group members and the patient himself" (Bloch & Crouch, 1985). Conditions for change are basic to all forms of therapy and must be met before change can take place. Conditions for change, a foundational aspect of growth, incorporate any dynamic that provides a groundwork for the other two levels of therapeutic factors and techniques.

Working from the top of the hierarchy, the effectiveness of therapeutic techniques depends on the power of the therapeutic factors which, in turn, derives its function from conditions of change. Colijn, Hoencamp, Snijders, Van Der Spek, & Duivenvoorden (1991) suggested that most of the research looked at the therapeutic level, specifically, the therapeutic factors of Yalom (1970).

In 1970, drawing from seminal research in the area of therapeutic factors in groups (Berzon, Pious, & Farson, 1963; Corsini & Rosenberg, 1955; Dickoff, & Lakin, 1963),

Yalom conducted a study of twenty long term group therapy patients who were considered successful by their therapists. Each patient had participated in a group for an average of sixteen months. Every subject completed a sixty-item, seven-pile Q-sort, which Yalom synthesized into his twelve therapeutic factors. Yalom defined his twelve curative, or therapeutic factors as: catharsis, interpersonal learning, universality, altruism, imitative behavior, imparting of information (guidance), development of socializing techniques, instillation of hope, group cohesiveness, the corrective recapitulation of the primary family group, and existential factors..

Yalom (1970) viewed the therapeutic factors as components of the ever-changing process of group. The factors are not arranged in hierarchical manner and are not necessarily contingent on one another. For group leaders, the factors provide "a central organizing principle by which to approach the most vexing and controversial problems of psychotherapy" (Yalom, 1985, p.3). The factors illuminate the change process as viewed through the complex interplay of forces within any given group.

Since Yalom's 1970 work, the area of therapeutic factors has been exhaustively researched (Bloch & Crouch, 1985; Bloch & Reibstein, 1980; Bloch, Reibstein, Crouch, Holroyd, & Themen, 1979; Butler & Fuhriman, 1980; Butler & Fuhriman, 1983; Flowers, 1987; Kapur, Miller & Mitchell, 1988; Kivlighan & Goldfine, 1991; Kivlighan & Mullison, 1988; Marcovitz & Smith, 1983; MacDevitt, 1987; Roark & Sharah, 1989; Stone, Lewis & Beck, 1994; Tschuschke & Dies, 1994; Whalen & Mushet, 1986). However, much of the research has been criticized for not being cumulative and has

mainly derived results from client reports from a Q-sort method utilizing a forced choice of Yalom's factors.

Bloch et al. (1979) sought to study therapeutic factors using a method developed by Berzon et al. (1963). Bloch et al. reasoned that the Q-sort, as used by Yalom, limited the subject's responses. Bloch et al. used the "most important event" questionnaire, which was completed by thirty-three patients with either neurological or characterological disorders and who were considered appropriate for long-term group therapy. Each subject was asked, "Of the events which occurred in the last three meetings, which one do you feel was the most important for you personally? Who was involved? Why was it so important for you?" (p.258). Forms were completed by each member every three sessions, and responses were then factored into predetermined classifications or factors. Bloch et al. also had the group leaders do the same questionnaire, which elicited a global view of the group process, both leader and members. Bloch et al. proposed ten therapeutic factors: catharsis, learning from interpersonal actions, universality, altruism, vicarious learning, guidance, instillation of hope, acceptance, self understanding, and self disclosure. These factors were very similar to those identified by Yalom, but Bloch et al.'s research method yielded a manual of characteristics, or conditions, corresponding to each proposed therapeutic factor. Utilizing the manual, a leader could now see what therapeutic factors were operating in the group.

Using Bloch et al.'s (1979) and Yalom's (1985) list of therapeutic factors, leaders can easily define each factor. "Catharsis," a measure of emotional release that brings relief, can be seen in a group when a member expresses feelings that previously had been

difficult to release. Yalom (1985) termed catharsis as a corrective emotional experience and believed the release must contain an intellectual and emotional component.

"Interpersonal learning" is the act of relating to others in the group in a constructive, adaptive manner. The learning is characterized by achieving a degree of closeness with others and trying out new ways of behaving in the group. According to Bloch et al. (1979), one must also be open to criticism. Yalom (1985) cited research of members' views of the therapeutic factors that placed interpersonal learning as the most important of the factors (Freedman & Hurley, 1979; Lieberman, Yalom, & Miles, 1973; Leszcz, Yalom, & Norden, 1985; Mowrer, 1980; Yalom, Tinklenberg, & Gilula, 1985; Weiner, 1974). Yalom (1985) included viewing the group as a social microcosm as an essential element of the interpersonal learning factor. Once a member can see that actions in the group reflect behaviors outside the group, the group can then be used as an agent for change.

"Universality" is the realization that one is not alone in personal struggles and problems. Through universality each person becomes a part of the group, which breaks down the feeling of isolation and fear (Dinkmeyer & Muro, 1979). As the members become willing to risk embarrassing experiences about themselves, a bond is formed among those who have shared similar experiences. Universality, according to Yalom (1985), like many of the therapeutic factors, cannot operate on its own. Universality feeds other factors, like cohesiveness and interpersonal learning, and is likewise fed by factors such as cohesiveness, catharsis, and instillation of hope.

"Altruism," according to Bloch et al. (1979), occurs when the members believe they can better themselves by helping others in the group. Altruism represents a movement from being only concerned with one's individual stake in the group to an awareness of the other members and their struggles. "Vicarious learning", or "imitative behavior," flowed next to altruism as a means for individuals to simply learn by watching the work of others. "Guidance" is the other side of altruism: a willingness to allow others, specifically the leader, give information in order to change a personal view or behavior.

"Self-understanding" (Bloch et al., 1979), or "development of socializing techniques" (Yalom, 1985), operates when members are able to gain insight into personal issues and are willing to change and continue to self-explore. This factor seems to increase with time spent in the group and is interconnected with other factors. "Instillation of hope" refers to feeling optimistic about personal change and the group's role in change. According to Yalom (1985) the hope factor is created by both the members and the leader and assumes a positive atmosphere in the group.

"Group cohesion" (Yalom, 1985) or "acceptance" (Bloch, et al., 1979) is the most complicated and vague of the therapeutic factors. A number of studies have tried to operationalize cohesion with little and conflicting success (Braaten, 1990; Budman, Demby, Feldstein, Redondo, Scherz, Bennett, Koppenaal, Daley, Hunter, & Ellis, 1987; Budman, Soldz, Demby, Feldstein, Springer, & Davis, 1989; Kirshner, Dies, & Brown, 1978; ; Littlepage, Cowart, & Kerr, 1989; Peteroy, 1983; Roark & Sharah, 1989; Stokes, 1983; Wright & Duncan, 1986). Bednar and Kaul (1978) cited four criticisms of cohesion research: the ambiguity of the construct, inadequate information on

cohesiveness operations, lack of agreement between construct and operation, and the difficulty comparing results because of the multitude of operations used. Mudrack (1989) blamed much of the confusion regarding a definition of cohesion on a misinterpretation made by Back (1951). Mudrack advised the group community to bury the term "cohesiveness" and work on the forces that make up cohesion, as was intended by original researchers (Festinger, Schachter, & Back, 1950). Kirshner, Dies, and Brown (1978) stated, "the consequences of group cohesion have been relatively well established, but its determinants remain less clear" (p.1171), and the clarification of the mechanisms behind factors such as self-disclosure and cohesiveness are of "theoretical and practical importance" (p.1176).

"Corrective recapitulation of the primary family group" was detailed by Yalom (1985) as the factor that operates as the members relate to the group as their family of origin. Members interact with both leader and other members and attempt to rectify unfinished business embedded in their methods of interacting with others. Because the methods of interaction were learned and practiced in the family, the member, through the group, can learn and practice new ways of relating.

"Existential factors" represent many issues in one factor cluster. Yalom (1985) stated that these factors comprised the issues that every member faces, which include "responsibility, basic isolation, contingency, the recognition of our own mortality and the ensuing consequences of our life, and the capriciousness of existence" (p.92). As members come to terms with these issues, both within themselves and within the life of the group, change and growth are fostered.

"Self-disclosure" (Bloch, et al., 1979) involves the revealing of personal

information to the group which the member perceives as embarrassing. According to

Egan (1973), self-disclosure can be described in terms of quality. "History" refers to the

self-disclosure that keeps the member hidden and safe within the self and therefore, risks

little. "Story" self-disclosure is more open and honest and assumes the client feels safe to

take a risk.

Knowledge of the therapeutic factors and the historical pathways of its research

can aid in cultivating future research on the base of Bloch and Crouch's (1985) hierarchy:

the conditions for change. As stated previously, a condition for change is any element

that is necessary for therapy to occur. Unfortunately, no research has been found that has

examined factors associated with universal conditions of change outside of Rogers'

(1970) three necessary and sufficient conditions for change which include genuineness,

accurate empathy, and unconditional positive regard. Much of the writing on

psychological safety has been anecdotal in nature and has focused on physical settings,

initial interviews, and confidentiality issues. Although little research has been done, some

theories have been proposed to support the importance of psychological safety as a

condition of change.

Theoretical Foundations of Psychological Safety

Murphy (1968) reported that until the late nineteenth century, psychology was the

study of individual minds. Back (1979) contended that the popularity of group therapy

was due to humankind's growing need for intimacy and socialization in a modern society.

However, as people enter groups, a fear arises, characterized by a mistrust of others due

to an unsafe and insecure feeling in a new environment. Maslow (1954, 1968, & 1971) proposed the first theory that examined the need for psychological safety. Maslow constructed a five basic needs hierarchy, which included (in order of priority): physical needs, safety, love and belonging, esteem, and self-actualization. According to Trotzer (1989), the hierarchical conceptualization reflects the developmental process of group counseling, where each member must satisfy each need to move up the chain towards personal growth.

Physical needs, the lowest on the hierarchy, must be met at all times in the group in order for the group to progress. Maslow (1968) defined the physical needs as hunger, thirst, shelter; enough to survive. Fortunately, the physical needs are met by material means outside the group counseling session in most situations. Therefore, most members will be dealing initially with the next need on the hierarchy: the safety need.

Maslow (1968) described the need for safety as a person's need to feel secure in unknown situations. It is the force behind withdrawal from the unfamiliar and the anxiety that arises when members feel in danger. Maslow (1968) believed that the need for safety was comprised of physical and psychological aspects that can be broken down into five specific categories of safety: physical safety, material safety, inner safety, feeling safe around others, and feeling safe to others.

The first two components, physical and material safety, can be attained by each member of the group before coming to counseling. However, as Trotzer (1989) pointed out, the need for physical safety does bleed into the need for inner safety. This aspect of physical safety is dealt with by providing a secure location for the groups, for example a

room with a door. If a member still feels unsafe, Maslow would contend that the individual is struggling with one of the next three safety needs.

The three other components of safety comprise the area of psychological safety. Maslow (1971) referred to these components as more person-oriented. A key aspect of psychological safety is trust. Although not able to fulfill the need on its own, trust in one's self, trust in others, and feeling trusted by others are important aspects of psychological safety. Nicholas (1984) agreed with Maslow and added a security element to the safety need which must be met if growth was expected in individuals within the group.

According to Maslow (1971), the safety need, unlike the physical needs, includes the necessity of other people. In group, the need for psychological safety provides the first barrier to group development. Each member must feel safe with themselves and others in order for this need to be satisfied and further work accomplished. Although psychological safety is considered by Maslow to be necessary for change, Ewen (1988) concluded Maslow's work on psychological safety had generated little research.

Like Maslow, Rogers (1967 & 1970), another humanistic theorist, developed a method of group treatment aligned with his existent individual client-centered therapy. Rogers (1970) postulated eight hypotheses of necessary components to group counseling. Congruent with Maslow, Rogers placed the need for safety as the first essential component. Rogers felt the need for safety must be met before members would express their true selves and fully experience the power of the group. The need for safety is a psychological need, felt by the individual and expressed in the climate of the group.

Rogers (1970) emphasized the importance of psychological safety by linking each of the other seven conditions to safety in a contingent organization. For example, psychological intimacy is described as a product of a safe psychological climate, and the condition of mutual trust forms when members feel accepted and risk is reduced. Risk taking and psychological openness begin as a virtue of members feeling safe with one another. If psychological safety continues, feedback develops, members become more sharing and imaginative, and they begin to transfer learning to areas outside of group. Like Maslow, Rogers viewed psychological safety as the gatekeeper to personal growth in the group. As Hansen, Warner, and Smith (1980) stated, "In Rogers' estimation, the group climate is one of the most necessary therapeutic requirements" (p.166).

Inherent in client-centered theory is the belief that change occurs through the leader/therapist providing and the client perceiving the core therapeutic conditions: empathy, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness (Rogers, 1965). The therapeutic climate is designed to foster the feeling of safety in the individual members. However, also at the core of the theory is the importance placed on the phenomenological frame of the client. "Rogers addresses the notion of psychological safety from both the group leader's and participants' roles" (Hansen, Warner, & Smith, 1980, p. 166). Therefore, psychological safety must be viewed as created by both the members and the leader, with the final judgment of what is psychologically safe being left to each member.

Although Rogers subjected his theory to considerable research, most of the research has been in the area of the three core conditions for change as provided by the therapist. According to Hansen, Warner, and Smith (1980), much of the research has looked at only

a few factors, such as the nature and type of leadership, while other important factors have been ignored or not identified. No research was found to address the member variables which might produce psychological safety, and, in fact, psychological safety was addressed only in terms of the how the core conditions contributed to the climate of safety (Seeman, 1984; Watson, 1984).

Reviewing the therapeutic factors and the theoretical basis for psychological safety, a few statements of relationship can be made. First, according to Maslow's hierarchy, all of the factors listed by Yalom (1970) and Bloch et al. (1979) are higher order needs. Many factors, such as self-understanding, altruism, and learning from interpersonal actions, are dependent on many lower level conditions such as physical needs and safety needs and, to some extent, love and belonging needs. All of the factors, because they are higher order needs, assume each member feels a certain degree of safety to fulfill the safety need in order to progress to the next higher need in the hierarchy. For example, Bloch et al. (1979) stated that for self-disclosure to occur the member must "reveal information about... his feared, embarrassing, or worrisome problems" (p. 262), or for catharsis, members must be "willing to express painful feelings, anger, sorrow or grief, which have previously been difficult or impossible to release" (p.262). A more explicit example of a therapeutic factor's reliance on safety comes from Yalom (1985) speaking about the conditions for catharsis. "Two conditions are required: the members must experience the group as sufficiently safe and supportive so that they may permit these differences to emerge, and there must be sufficient feedback and honesty of expression to permit effective reality testing" (p.26). Third, since the therapeutic factors, as postulated by

Yalom (1970), are not hierarchical in nature but are interconnected within the group process, any factor that acts as a precondition for the therapeutic factors to occur would, according to Bloch and Crouch (1985), be considered a condition for change.

Research by Mahler and Nadler (1986) also addressed factors and conditions for change. Mahrer and Nadler attempted to provide a preliminary list of moments in therapy that demonstrated "good therapeutic process, movement, progress or change" (p. 10). These moments, termed "good moments," were cultivated from client reports of group process found across the literature. Comparing results with past studies on good moments (Gomes-Schwartz, 1978; Luborsky, 1967; Murray, 1954; Orlinsky & Howard, 1978; Strupp, Chasson & Ewing, 1973), Mahrer and Nadler constructed a list of good moments in therapy.

Examining the good moments, a key characteristic of every good moment listed was the movement of a member from one state of being to another. In other words, for each good moment, the client changed in some manner. Mahrer and Nadler agreed with other studies in attributing client change to a willingness in the client to make the movement and take a risk, but Mahler and Nadler also included the feeling of security as an aspect of the change process. However, no indication was given regarding what conditions existed to create the willingness to change.

Mahrer and Nadler concurred with the shortcomings of the study by offering several research pathways. One pathway discussed was identifying which good moments were indications of progress that led to change and which ones were indications that change had occurred. This suggestion paralleled Bloch and Crouch's (1985) delineation between

conditions of change (indications of progress and impending change) and curative factors

(change has occurred). Another research option seen as necessary by Mahrer and Nadler

was to examine the operations that preceded the good moments. For example, focusing

on the condition that led to the willingness to change in the client, or that facilitated the

client's introspection or responding to the group in a warm manner, could aid the leader

in facilitating the good-moments in group counseling.

The Relationship Between Trust and Psychological Safety

In the theoretical basis for psychological safety, Trotzer (1989) stated that trust was a

fundamental aspect of Maslow's safety need. The review of the literature supported

Trotzer's link and deserves some further clarification of the relationship between trust

and psychological safety. Worchel (1979) delineated the importance of trust stating,

"Directly or indirectly, trust plays a vital role in everyday living" (p. 174). Erikson (1968)

observed the important developmental stage of trust versus mistrust as the first obstacle

newborns must overcome. Erikson (1963) succinctly illustrated the relationship between

safety and trust by describing that an infant develops a sense of security, or safety, over

time as the infant trusts its caregivers to provide care. In groups, members may develop

safety in the same way, using trust as a part of the safety process.

Trust and mistrust play an important role in group processes. According to Worchel

(1979), trust is necessary to resolve group conflict in a meaningful and satisfactory way.

Since trust and mistrust are cited as being important to the process, theorists and

practitioners have attempted to define the terms. Worchel (1979) contended that

individuals interested in group dynamics define trust "as a derivative of the personal

characteristics of the participants" (p.176). Pruitt (1965) viewed trust and mistrust in terms of a global evaluation of members and self as "good" or "bad."

As a construct of group, trust is also defined as a belief, expectancy, or feeling. For example, Rotter (1971) defined trust as a generalized expectancy that the word or actions of another could be relied upon. Both forms of the definitions of trust are congruent with Trotzer's (1989) view of trust as a component of psychological safety. Trust, as a derivative or an expectancy, cannot account in and of itself for a climate of psychological safety, but instead is a hypothesized vital aspect of the climate of safety.

Although little research has been done on the role of trust in group psychotherapy, many textbooks include trust as a component of the process. Some texts emphasize specific techniques to aid the members or the leader to establish trust. Corey and Corey (1992) focused on the roles of both the member and the leader in creating trust, stressing the attitudes and actions of the leader. Although Corey and Corey point out the importance of the leader, they also remind leaders that the members have responsibility to work. Along these lines, Corey and Corey (1992) illustrated the link of trust to safety: "... if they [members] are unwilling to share enough of themselves, or... are unwilling to take risks, trust will be slow to happen" (p.129). If psychological safety has not been cultivated within the client, either by the client or the leader, trust will be hindered.

Many texts emphasize techniques that can be used by leaders to create trust. Jacobs, Harvill, and Masson (1988) recommended exercises such as trust falls and lifts to promote trust. Johnson and Johnson (1987) and Corey, Corey, Callanan, and Russell

(1992) also cited many techniques used to instill hope in the group process and build trust. However, as Gladding (1992) pointed out, there is no one technique or procedure that can guarantee the formation of trust. In fact, most of the techniques listed are used to elicit the formation of some specific therapeutic factors, such as instillation of hope, catharsis, universality, and not specifically trust. As stated earlier, a climate of psychological safety must theoretically exist before members can engage in the prescribed behaviors or exercises.

Some books do not consider trust to be a vital component. Posthuma (1996) stated that "trust is only an issue in terms of confidentiality" (p.97). She contended that a leader has a responsibility to be honest and respectful and informative about confidentiality. The link to safety lies within the intention of the information. Through informing the members and, thus, being trustworthy, according to Posthuma (1996), the member will feel more secure within the group. Even in a case where trust alone is not considered vital, it provides for a portion of the overall climate of psychological safety. Hansen, Warner, and Smith (1980) summed up the relationship between psychological safety and trust by stating, "The greater the degree to which an atmosphere of psychological safety pervades the group, the greater the trust that group members will experience" (p.118).

Research and Anecdotal Evidence of the Role of Psychological Safety

Although no research has been completed that deals directly with the characteristics of psychological safety, some studies and writings have addressed issues that implicitly or explicitly discuss its role. This section reviews the available material, empirical or anecdotal, focusing on psychological safety.

Dinkmeyer and Muro (1979) stated that a climate of concern was a primary goal for group. A climate of concern "actively encourages support of self-disclosure and the expression of feelings and emotions" (p.108). The climate is the foundation of the therapeutic factors, which is built from the beginning of the group. As the climate of safety develops, growth can begin. Members can risk sharing their weaknesses, become more congruent, and begin to give feedback to other members. "The climate of support makes the group psychologically safe" (Dinkmeyer & Muro, 1979, p.108).

Many theorists have postulated models that describe the process of group members moving from a fear position toward a sense of safety and belonging. Gibb (1964) formulated a model based on extensive T-group research incorporating four concerns applicable to individuals in any group. Gibb's four modal concerns, acceptance, data, goal, and control, are hierarchical in that each factor in this order facilitates subsequent development of the other concerns. Growth in each concern is therefore dependent on successful growth in the preceding concern.

At the base of Gibb's hierarchy, the acceptance concern is defined as "the formation of trust and acceptance of self and others and a reduction of fear of self and others" (p. 280). Individuals come into every group with a fear and distrust of themselves, other members, and the leader. To overcome this concern and grow within the group, each member must address this fear and strive for a sense of safety. Rooted in safety is the ability to trust others and oneself. A climate of support is a method of detecting whether a group has met the challenge of the acceptance concern, and Gibb insisted that overcoming fear and distrust was the first necessary step to change in groups. Gibb (1964) also stressed that

for change to occur, a person must be willing to create the trust and sense of security for oneself. However, Gibb (1964) gave no indication of client reports of what helped them fulfill the conditions of the acceptance concern and contributed to the climate of safety that led to later group growth. Instead, the research mainly focused on ways the leader could facilitate the climate and fulfillment of the concerns.

Gibb and Gibb (1968) created the TORI process that described the movement of members away from fear, closed behavior, and dependence and toward trust, openness, and interdependence. Gibb and Gibb believed the process of movement was intrinsic to all people and occurred independent of the leader, which added the significance of the role of the individual to the findings of Gibb (1964).

Schutz (1958) developed the three-dimensional FIRO model of group interpersonal behavior. Schutz believed that every individual has three interpersonal needs: inclusion, control, and affection. At the beginning of every group, each individual will struggle to fulfill the needs in the order of inclusion, control, and affection. The first need, inclusion, finds every member at the beginning of group in an unknown, unsafe atmosphere. Each member will behave in order to be included and, therefore, feel more secure in the group. Once this need is fulfilled, the members feels safe enough to move on and meet the control and affection needs. Schutz was clear to point out that the cycle may recur, in times of stress for example, when a member feels excluded.

Ohlsen (1970) also placed security high on the therapeutic conditions hierarchy. He defined security as "the client feeling reasonably safe in the group, and therefore, being more willing to express genuine feelings" (p.70). Cartwright and Zander (1960) mirrored

this view of security by reporting that members may leave the group if they feel too dominated or experience other unpleasant characteristics early in the group. Ohlsen (1973) maintained that the feeling of safety guarded against attrition, stating, "Although [the member] realizes that at times the experience will be painful, [the member] is willing to tolerate the pain within this safe environment to reap the potential benefits" (p.162). Therefore, the feeling of safety is needed to keep the members in the group and, later, for genuine expression and growth to occur.

Dinkmeyer and Muro (1979) stressed the importance of the climate of psychological safety. They stated that each new group must deal with a set of negative forces. All of the negativity is centered around fears: fear of expression and personal exploration, fear of the unknown, fear of being hurt, fear of others, fear of rejection and alienation. Through the development of a climate of security, the members begin to feel safe in the group. "The security enables the person to move from a description of past feelings to the expression of genuine feelings... which bring immediate feelings into the open and free the spontaneous capacity to deal with pain and suffering" (Dinkmeyer & Muro, p.117, 1979). Through the feeling of safety, individuals become part of the group, the therapeutic factors begin to emerge, and change begins.

Dinkmeyer and Muro (1979) encouraged the leader to work in such a way "to create psychological safety" (p.118). They encouraged the leader to have members recognize the safety of the group and to listen empathically, stating that basic acceptance is necessary for the development of courage. However, none of the suggestions are

supported by research findings, and as Gibb and Gibb (1968) noted, the development of the feeling of safety may be independent of the leader.

Krumboltz and Potter (1973) also focused on the role of the leader in enhancing the climate of the group. The research emphasized behavioral techniques where words and actions that were indicative of trust were increased in frequency and ones that seemed detrimental to a supportive climate were decreased. Unfortunately, for any individual or group, the specific factors must first be observed, and therefore already exist within the group, for replication of the positive factors to occur. Focusing primarily on the leader does not address the means to globally facilitate a climate of psychological safety. Also, focusing on trust alone does not seem to capture the entire scope of a psychologically safe climate.

Many authors support structuring the group experience as a combination of self, others, and leader factors (Gendlin, 1964; Lakin, 1985). "To understand group process one must know that the individual is not an entity, not only a thing inside a box or inside the skin, but the individual in an experiential interplay with the environment" (Gendlin, 1964). In terms of psychological safety, each member must self-create and other-experience the feeling in order for it to be real for that individual.

Gendlin and Beebe (1972) stated that the process required closeness with other members and leader support for people to be feel accepted. The climate of safety is set through a number of groundrules such as confidentiality, everyone belongs, and a primary emphasis on contact. However, because the perception of safety may lie with the phenomenological frame of the member, groundrules may not provide for psychological

safety in every member, or at least not in the same way. Shaffer and Galinsky (1989) supported the notion of the role of the group in the creation of the condition of psychological safety by stating, "It is the group's readiness to adjust its level of psychological safety to the combined needs and anxieties of its members that gives it its uniquely curative powers" (p.76).

Korda and Pancrazio (1989) examined the relationship of the climate of safety to preventing negative outcomes in group counseling. They listed providing a safe atmosphere as one of the key ingredients leaders could provide to facilitate a positive group experience. Despite the fact that the authors contended that both members and leaders contribute to negative outcomes, they gave all of the responsibility to providing a safe climate to the leader. Focusing on self-disclosure, Korda and Pancrazio contended that the leader must deflect inappropriate member disclosure and self-monitor for inappropriate leader self-disclosure. Unfortunately, no research or guidelines were cited to inform on what characteristics of self-disclosure, by member or leader, contributed to the safe climate. Furthermore, research on self-disclosure (Friedlander, Thibodeau, Nichols, Tucker, & Snyder, 1985; Morran, 1982; Stokes, Fuehrer, & Childs, 1983) is contradicting and non-informative. For example Morran (1982) gave the self-disclosure guideline to leaders to "use it judiciously by revealing only things they believe will be directly helpful to members" (p.222).

Rugel (1987) utilized the Tavistock groups, a form of laboratory leaderless groups, to demonstrate the need for group acceptance. Rugel described two steps groups go through to achieve cohesion, which emphasized the important role of the climate of safety in the

process of change. Rugel stated " during step one members make initial forays into the group and find their contributions are acceptable and that the group environment is relatively safe. Experiencing this allows them to move to step two, which involves riskier self disclosures" (p.114). However, Rugel never described evidence of what initiated the climate of safety, or what constituted the climate of safety that seemed invaluable to the change process.

Stages of Group Development and Psychological Safety

Tuckman (1965) published the first overview of the group process as a social system, formulated into stages, citing over fifty articles concerning various types of group modalities. Tuckman discovered that, although terminology varied across many theorists' proposed stages of groups, they all were fairly similar. Out of this synthesis, Tuckman postulated the four stages of group development: Forming, Storming, Norming and Performing. In 1977, Tuckman and Jensen added Adjourning as the fifth and final stage. Since Tuckman's work, many theorists have created their own stages of development, but most reflect Tuckman's work, and like Tuckman's stages, are based on observation, not empirical evidence.

A recent and widely read account of group stages (Corey & Corey, 1992) was used in this review to illustrate the possible relationship between stages of development and psychological safety. Corey and Corey followed Tuckman's philosophy and created a four stage model which included the stages: Initial, Transition, Working, and Termination.

The Initial stage of group development is characterized by increased anxiety and insecurity. Members, afraid to take interpersonal risks, are generally silent and observant.

Corey and Corey stated that members are "deciding whom they can trust, how much they are willing to disclose, and how safe the group is" (p.141). The members focus on the leader to structure the session and keep themselves hidden from the others. Hansen, Warner, and Smith (1980) characterized this stage as, "members revealing their 'safer' or more public sides" and "only revealing what is safe to describe" (p.487). Psychological safety can be expected to be low in this stage, as members look to the leader, rather than to themselves or others, to provide the climate of safety.

During the Transition stage, anxiety and hostility increase. Members struggle between wanting to stay within themselves, where they feel safe, and wanting to risk bonding with others in the group. In the Initial stage, if they perceived their environment as psychologically safe, members may begin to test the waters of the group in the Transition stage in order to build trust and increase the feeling of safety. "Members will test the leader and other members to determine how safe the environment is" (Corey & Corey, 1992, p.184).

The Working stage is characterized by the development of cohesion. Psychological safety is felt by self, from others, and from the leader. Members feel safe to risk trying new behaviors, to confront other members and the leader, and to experience the group in the here-and-now. The therapeutic factors of universality, hope, and catharsis also begin to help unite the group. Corey and Corey believed that the bonding was facilitated by the comfort and security the members feel and experience early in the group. In the Working stage, psychological safety may be experienced more from others and self, and less from the leader who takes a less active role as the group propels itself.

The last stage, Termination, appears similar to the Initial stage in that, as groups come together or separate, anxiety and fear increases. According to Corey and Corey, "leaving the group may be as threatening as entering it" (p. 228). The authors emphasized the leader's role in facilitating the discussion of the insecurity and fear of leaving. As the members prepare for separation, psychological safety may be experienced primarily from self or leader, since the members are individually detaching from the others in the group.

As stated previously, other practitioners have developed similar models of group development. Some, such as Trotzer's (1989), contained a specific stage for safety, called the Security stage. For Trotzer, security defined the members' feeling of safety and comfort within the group. Once a member felt safe, they could proceed on to the next stage of development. This method is similar to Maslow's need hierarchy, in that the safety phase must be dealt with in order for further growth to develop. The need for safety in Trotzer's model is congruent with that of Corey and Corey as well as other stage models of development. The review suggests that a climate of safety is crucial to the process and development of group. Unfortunately, most of the work is not empirical but is observation based, and none address the components of psychological safety.

MacKenzie (1983) examined the relationship between climate and stages of group by measuring the general climate across stages of group development. He developed the Group Climate Questionnaire (GCQ) and a twelve question short form (GCQ-S) due to time difficulties of the original long form. Normed by 75 members of twelve therapy groups, the members were asked to fill out the GCQ-S at the end of every sessions for 35

sessions. MacKenzie then factor analyzed the reports and came up with three scales: Engaged, Avoiding, and Conflicting.

MacKenzie compared results to the first three stages of a social system stage model such as Tuckman's (1965) and discovered the scales predicted the stages fairly well. For example, in the first five sessions, comparable to the first stage of development, each of the three scales were represented, but in a bipolar arrangement of "caring" and "support" at one end, and "distrust" and "distancing" at the other. Mackenzie (1983) concluded that "resolution must be found to basic social anxiety before constructive change can occur" (p.167). The findings suggest that a climate of safety must be established before change can occur. However, the GCQ-S can only measure the three broad scales and, therefore, does not measure psychological safety directly. Given the absence of an acceptable measure, a measurement scale cannot be constructed until the characteristics of psychological safety are known.

The dilemma of how to provide for psychological safety within a group was expressed by Kottler (1994) when he cited the leader statement, "This group is a safe place" as a slightly unethical behavior. The reason the statement is unethical is precisely because the leader cannot guarantee the group will be safe without knowledge of what individuals believe they must do for themselves, what others must do for them, and what the leader can do in order to establish a climate conducive to psychological safety. A dilemma exists in the research in that, although many sources agree the climate of psychologically safety is important to the foundation of change in group counseling, no

one has examined the individual, group, and leader factors that contribute to the safe climate.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study will be to lay the groundwork for a definition for the concept of psychological safety. The definition will be a listing of factors, derived from self-reports of members and the group leader, considered to have contributed to the psychological safety of the group and the individual. The classification into the characteristics of psychological safety attributed to the individual, the other members, and the leader, will aid future group leaders in determining what aspects of psychological safety the leader can facilitate, what aspects other members must provide, and the aspects that individuals need to cultivate for themselves. The qualitative foundation of psychological safety will hopefully provide a basis for future empirical research on the concept.

CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter provides the methods and procedures utilized in fulfilling the purpose of this study. The following methods and procedures explored the characteristics of psychological safety in the categories of characteristics attributed to the leader, to the self, and to other members. The methods and procedures were designed also to compare the characteristics of psychological safety as reported by group members to those reported by group leaders.

Research Questions

This exploratory study sought to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the characteristics of psychological safety as reported by group members and group leaders?

2. Will the characteristics of psychological safety change over time?

3. Is the facilitation of psychological safety primarily attributed to the leader, one's self, or to other members of the group?

4. Does the attribution of the facilitation of psychological safety to leader, self, or other members change over time?

Definition of Terms

Psychological safety is the main concept of this study, but is also the most evasive to define. Psychological safety is a concept or dynamic cited by many sources as a critical aspect of the group counseling process (Dinkmeyer & Muro, 1979; Hansen, Warner, & Smith, 1980; Maslow, 1963; Rogers, 1970; Trotzer, 1989). Unfortunately, no clear

definition has been provided by past research. The purpose of this study was to delineate the characteristics of psychological safety in order to provide a clear definition of the term. For this study, psychological safety was defined through ratings generated on a psychological safety questionnaire based on characteristics of psychological safety attributed to the leader, self, and other group members.

Group counseling is a term that has different meanings depending on the population chosen to study. For this study, group counseling was defined as:

A dynamic, inter- and intra-personal process whose content is generated out of the feelings and behavior of the individual group members. The group is comprised of persons functioning within the normal ranges of adjustment who are seeking increased awareness of self and others (Berg & Johnson, 1971, p.x).

This definition best fit the university population chosen for this study and can also be applied to other counseling groups being conducted with the general public.

Subjects

The researcher recruited 44 group members (9 male, 35 female) and 5 group leaders (2 male, 3 female) as subjects in this study. Subjects were recruited from four master's level group counseling courses offered through the Counselor Education and Family Sciences programs at two northern Texas universities. Group members were enrolled in a group counseling course, participated as a member in a laboratory group, and possessed at least a bachelor's degree. Group leaders eligible for this study had previous group experience and were selected and approved to lead the groups by the professor of the group course.

The only criterion for inclusion in the study was the participation in the laboratory/ groups. All members and leaders of the laboratory groups had an opportunity to participate in this study, and no subject was excluded from the study due to age, gender, ethnicity, or physical ability. Every subject signed an informed consent form (Appendix A) . Prior to proceeding with the project, the author obtained Human Subjects Approval from the university Institutional Review Board.

Instruments

The researcher constructed a Psychological Safety Questionnaire which was used as an exploratory tool to investigate the characteristics of psychological safety (see Appendix B). The questions were based on information found in the review of related literature and included questions related to the three possible sources of psychological safety in group counseling: a) group leader; b) self; c) other group members. The questionnaire section pertaining to psychological safety was constructed in a five level Likert format, ranging from 1-5 with the categories of Decreased Greatly (1) to Increased Greatly (5). The scale also contained a (0) value answer labeled Behavior Not Experienced. The stem question read, "How did (the other members'/ the group leader's/ your own) behaviors (listed below) affect your feeling of psychological safety within the group".

The questionnaire contained three categories of possible interactive arrangements for the attribution of psychological safety in a group: leader, self, and other group members. The leader's questionnaire had slightly different categories, but maintained all the interactive arrangements: leader, individual member, and total group (group as a

whole). Despite the difference in categories, the questions pertaining to the characteristics of psychological safety were identical. The categories were congruent and were paired as: a) leader category (same in both), to what extent is psychological safety attributed to the role of the leader; b) self/ individual member, focuses on the attribution of psychological safety to the power of each individual; c) other members/total group, emphasis on the attribution of psychological safety to the power of the total group, not coming from the individual and not the leader.

The basis for using the questionnaire methodology was found in foundational research on accurate empathy, genuineness, and non-possessive warmth (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). When exploring a possible important construct that is not defined, historical research has relied on basic qualitative measures to lay the groundwork for future exploration. This study, much like initial research on accurate empathy, genuineness, and non-possessive warmth, utilized a questionnaire cultivated from the related literature for the defining process.

Reliability and validity of the questionnaire was not a consideration in this exploratory study. The questionnaire was used as a probing instrument, designed to achieve the purpose of delineating some characteristics of psychological safety. As the group members and group leaders answered the questions, baseline evidence was gained in order to more clearly define psychological safety. Face validity was secure, as the elements included in the instrument were culled from the literature and represent possible characteristics of the term, psychological safety, which was being examined.

Procedure for Defining Psychological Safety

During the first class meeting of the semester, the researcher visited each group

counseling class participating in the laboratory group format. The researcher explained

the nature and purpose of the study as "research to be used in a doctoral dissertation. The

purpose of the study will be to generate exploratory research in order to more clearly

define the concept of psychological safety in group counseling." The researcher handed

out the informed consent form and asked the students to sign and return the form before

the start of the first group if they were willing to participate in the study. The students

were also verbally informed that they were under no obligation to participate and that the

decision to not participate in no way affected their status in the class or program.

The researcher met with each group leader and explained the nature and the purpose

of the study in the same manner as given to the group members. Group leaders were

given an informed consent form and were asked to sign and return it to the researcher

before the start of the first group if they were willing to participate in the study. Group

leaders were also verbally informed that they were under no obligation to participate and

that their decision would in no way affect their status in the class or in the program.

Completed questionnaires were only used if at least half of the members from the

group consent to participate in the study. If the leader did not give consent to participate,

the group members' questionnaires were still used in comparison with questionnaires

completed by members of the other participating counseling groups. Out of 46 possible

group members, 44 gave consent to partcipate. Out of six possible group leaders, five

leaders participated.

Group members and group leaders were asked to fill out the Psychological Safety Questionnaire after the first, eighth, and fourteenth (last) group sessions. At the end of each designated group, the group leaders passed a large envelope around the group, and participants placed the finished questionnaires inside. The group leaders sealed the envelope and returned it to the researcher. The questionnaires contained no identifying marks in order to protect confidentiality of the respondents. The leader's questionnaire was designated by an "L" and was placed in the same envelope as the corresponding group. The group's envelope was given a numeric code that designated the group and the session of the measurement. For example, a group given the group code "A" with the envelope containing the measure taken at the eighth session was marked "A-8". Measures were therefore sorted by group, time of measure, group members, and group leaders.

The researcher compiled the responses once all three, first, middle, and last session measures were collected, according to several different levels. Each questionnaire was sectioned by psychological safety characteristics attributed to leader, self, and other group members. To aid the subjects in differentiating between the leader, self, and other questionnaires, each form was printed on different colored paper with the leader, self, or other specifier highlighted and printed in bold font in the stem of the question. To guard against ordering effects, the order of the questionnaires in the packets were shuffled. One third of each group had the questionnaires in the order of a) self; b) others; c) leader. Another third of each group were given the order of a) others; b) leader; c) self. The other third was ordered a) leader; b) self; c) others.

The question responses were summed for each question. Sums for each item were calculated by assigning a value to each possible Likert choice in the following manner: Decreased greatly (-2); Decreased slightly (-1); Wasn't affected (0); Increased slightly (+1); Increased greatly (+2); Behavior not experienced (0). The choices of "Wasn't affected" and "Behavior not experienced" were both assigned a "0" value due to the similar effect each choice had on psychological safety. Each sum was then divided by the number of members answering the question to yield a raw score of psychological safety ranging from -2.0 to +2.0.

The hierarchy of characteristics for the leader attribution was formed by taking all of the group members' responses for every group in the leader category/first session measure, summing the responses for each item, and arranging the characteristics from highest response to lowest response. The higher the total sum, the more that characteristic contributed to psychological safety. The same process was then applied to leader category/middle session measure and leader category/last session measure. The three resulting hierarchies of characteristics resulted in a list of ten psychological safety characteristics attributed to the group leader at the three group time measures.

The researcher took all of the group members' responses for every group in the self/first session measure, summed the responses, and arranged the characteristics from highest response to lowest response. The same process was applied to self category/middle group session measure and self category/last group session measure. The resulting hierarchy of characteristics portrayed the ten characteristics of psychological safety most attributed to the self at the three group time measures.

The researcher took all of the group members' responses from every group in the other members/first group session measure, summed each question's responses, and arranged the questions from highest response to lowest response. The same process was applied to other members category/middle group session measure and other members category/last session measure. The resulting hierarchy of characteristics portrayed the ten characteristics of psychological safety most attributed to other members at the three group time measures.

Attribution of psychological safety was calculated using a similar summing process. Each item was summed within each group using the -2 to +2 values of the various Likert choices and then divided by the number of members in that group to yield a raw score. Every item raw score on each questionnaire was then summed and divided by the number of questions on the questionnaire (29) to yield a total score of psychological safety attributed to the stem of the questionnaire (leader, self, or others). Attribution hierarchies were constructed for each group for each time measure and were determined by the assumption that the higher total sum corresponded to the higher report of psychological safety.

The characteristics of psychological safety reported by the group leaders were calculated for each attribution questionnaire by summing every group leader's answers, using the same -2 to +2 Likert values, for each item and dividing by the number of reporting group leaders. The highest ten reported sums were then listed as a hierarchy of psychological safety characteristics for the given attributional designation of leader, group as a whole, or individual members, for each time measure.

Attribution of the facilitation of psychological safety as reported by the group leaders was calculated for each individual group for each of the three time measure. Each group's attribution hierarchy was constructed by taking each of the group leader's three questionnaires and summing the values of every item, using the -2 to +2 range, for each questionnaire and dividing the total by the number of questions (29). The attribution stem with the highest calculated value was assumed the primary facilitator of psychological safety as reported by the group leader, for that group, at that particular time. The second highest value was seen as the second chosen contributor to psychological safety, and the third highest value was given the last spot in the facilitation hierarchy of psychological safety.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the results of the exploration of the characteristics of psychological safety as well as discussion of the findings. The purpose of this study was to lay the foundation for a definition for the concept of psychological safety. This research employed a qualitative examination of psychological safety to explore both possible characteristics and attributional entities of psychological safety within a group counseling atmosphere.

Results

This section of the chapter discusses the results of the summing of the data taken from the Psychological Safety Questionnaires. This section is partitioned into a portion explaining the results of attribution and a portion on the results of characteristics.

Attribution

To answer the research question concerning whether the facilitation of psychological safety is primarily attributed to self, leader, or other members and whether this attribution changes over time, the researcher utilized the summing procedure outlined in the Procedures chapter. Table 1 exhibits the attributional pattern for each group over the three time measurements. The results of the first session measurement of group member's reports indicated an identical attributional pattern in all groups of, in descending order; leader, others and self.

39

Table 1

Group Members' Hierarchy of the Attribution of Psychological Safety

Session 1	Score	Session 8	Score	Session 14	Score
GROUP A		GROUP A		GROUP A	
1. Leader	0.92	1.Leader	0.79	1. Leader	0.68
2. Other Members	0.76	2. Other Members	0.71	2. Other Members	0.51
3. Self	0.47	3. Self	0.69	3. Self	0.45
GROUP B		GROUP B		GROUP B	
1. Leader	0.57	1. Leader	0.79	1. Leader	0.75
2. Other Members	0.52	2. Other Members	0.66	2. Other Members	0.72
3. Self	0.42	3. Self	0.58	3. Self	0.56
GROUP C		GROUP C		GROUP C	
1. Leader	0.81	1. Leader	0.81	1. Leader	0.65
2. Other Members	0.74	2. Other Members	0.76	2. Other Members	0.57
3. Self	0.64	3. Self	0.58	3. Self	0.45
GROUP D		GROUP D		GROUP D	
1. Leader	0.86	1. Leader	0.6	1. Self	0.5
2. Other Members	0.73	2. Self	0.49	2. Leader	0.49
3. Self	0.69	3. Other Members	0.45	3. Other Members	0.48
GROUP E		GROUP E		GROUP E	
1. Leader	0.46	1. Other Members	0.74	1. Leader	1.17
2. Other Members	0.41	2. Self	0.64	2. Other Members	1.17
3. Self	0.39	3. Leader	0.54	3. Self	1.09
GROUP F		GROUP F		GROUP F	
1. Leader	0.92	1. Self	0.62	1. Leader	0.78
2. Other Members	0.72	2. Other members	0.51	2. Other Members	0.71
3. Self	0.64	3. Leader	0.41	3. Self	0.68

At the eighth session measure, the leader remained the primary choice by group

members for the facilitation of psychological safety, except in two groups where the

leader was third in the hierarchy. The other member designation held the second position overall, except in group D-8 third, and in E-8, first. Attribution of the facilitation of psychological safety to self remained at the third place in the hierarchy overall, yet, similar to the other member designation, moved up in the hierarchy in a few of the groups.

The leader was chosen by group members as the main facilitator of psychological safety at the fourteenth session measure by all but one group. The other members factor remained at the second place in the hierarchy, while the self designation was chosen third across all groups except D-14, where self was attributed as the primary facilitator of psychological safety. Overall, the attributional pattern was consistent for all groups across all time measures with the leader reported as being the primary facilitator of psychological safety, the other members as second, and the self as third as reported by group members.

The attributional pattern for the group leader's report was less consistent than the group member's reports between groups. Table 2 illustrates the attributional pattern reported by group leaders in the three different time measures. No overall pattern of attribution could be established, yet it appeared that for all but one group, the attributional pattern remained consistent over the span of the group regardless of the pattern chosen.

Table 2

Group Leader's Hierarchy of the Attribution of Psychological Safety

Session 1	Score	Session 8	Score	Session 14	Score
LEADER A		LEADER A		LEADER A	
1. Individual	0.72	1. Individual	1.1	1. Individual	0.76
2. Whole Group	0.69	2. Leader	0.93	2. Whole Group	0.55
3. Leader	0.59	3. Whole Group	0.76	3. Leader	-0.03
LEADER B		LEADER B		LEADER B	
1. Leader	0.55	1. Leader	0.21	1. Leader	0.21
2. Whole Group	0.24	2. Whole Group	0.17	2. Whole Group	0.17
3. Individual	0.1	3. Individual	-0.21	3. Individual	0
LEADER C		LEADER C		LEADER C	
1a. Whole Group	1.31	1. Whole Group	1.45	1. Whole Group	1
1b. Individual	1.31	2. Individual	1.34	2. Individual	0.76
2. Leader	0.89	3. Leader	0.97	3. Leader	0.69
LEADER D		LEADER D		LEADER D	
1. Individual	1.1	1. Leader	0.76	1. Leader	0.89
2a. Whole Group	1	2. Individual	0.59	2. Whole Group	0.82
2b. Leader	1	3. Whole Group	0.52	3. Individual	0.79
LEADER F		LEADER F		LEADER F	
1. Whole Group	1.1	1. Whole Group	1.31	1. Individual	1.1
2. Individual	1	2. Individual	1.21	2. Whole Group	0.93
3. Leader	0.86	3. Leader	0.86	3. Leader	0.89

Characteristics

To answer the research questions concerning the characteristics of psychological

safety and whether the characteristics would change across time, the researcher examined

specific characteristics attributed to leader, self, and others. The characteristics attributed

to leader, self, and others across time measures were calculated by using the summing

and hierarchical procedure outlined in the Procedures section of Chapter II. Overall, nine

lists of characteristics of psychological safety were created from the responses of the

group members. These are displayed by time measure in Appendix C. These lists answer

the question concerning the characteristics of psychological safety for each attributional

designation within each time measurement.

Examining which characteristics were reported every time measure for each

attributional designation determined which characteristics were stable over time. For the

self designation, the characteristics of "humor," "warmth and support," "active listening,"

"demonstrating an understanding of the issues being discussed," and "responding in an

emotional, feeling manner" were all characteristics of psychological safety which

appeared in every time measure. Table 3 lists the ten highest reported characteristics of

psychological safety attributed to self.

The other members designation reports yielded more stable characteristics

associated with psychological safety when compared to the self category. Table 4 lists the

ten most reported characteristics attributed to the other members of the group. Eight out

of the ten characteristics were reported in each time measure. The stable characteristics

were: "humor," "warmth and support," "self disclosing feelings," "active listening,"

"verbally demonstrating acceptance," "nonverbally demonstrating acceptance," self

disclosing experiences," and "self disclosing personal reactions".

Table 3

Group Members' Ten Highest Reported Characteristics of Psychological Safety

Attributed to Self

Session One	Session Eight	Session Fourteen
1. Used humor.	1. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1. Used humor.
2. Was warm and supportive.	2. Actively listened.	2. Was warm and supportive.
3. Actively listened.	3. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	3. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.
4. Related to members who were most like me emotionally.	4. Was warm and supportive.	4. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.
5. Self disclosed experiences.	5. Used humor.	5. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.
6. Related to members who were most like me intellectually.	6. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	6. Actively listened.
7. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	7. Self disclosed experiences.	7. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.
8. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	8. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	8. Gave feedback.
9. Received feedback from the group.	9. Gave feedback.	9. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.
10. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	10. Self disclosed personal reactions.	10. Modeled ethical awareness.

The leader designation maintained six out of ten characteristics of psychological

safety across all three time measures. Table 5 illustrates the ten highest reported

Table 4

Group Members' Ten Highest Reported Characteristics of Psychological Safety

Attributed to Other Members

Session One	Session Eight	Session Fourteen
1. Used humor.	1. Was warm and supportive.	1. Was warm and supportive.
2. Was warm and supportive.	2. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	2. Used humor.
3. Self disclosed feelings.	3. Self disclosed experiences.	3. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.
4. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	4. Used humor.	4. Nonverbally demonstarted acceptance.
5. Actively listened.	5. Self disclosed feelings.	5. Actively listened.
6. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	6. Actively listened.	6. Self disclosed feelings.
7. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	7. Self disclosed personal reactions.	7. Was free, spontaneous and immediate.
8. Self disclosed experiences.	8. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	8. Self disclosed personal reactions.
9. Gave feedback.	9. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	9. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.
10. Self disclosed personal reactions.	10. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	10. Self disclosed experiences.

characteristics attributed to group leaders. The stable characteristics of psychological

safety included "warmth and support", "demonstrating an understanding of the issues

being discussed", "nonverbally demonstrating acceptance", "active listening", "verbally

demonstrating acceptance", and "responding in an emotional, feeling manner".

Table 5

Group Members' Ten Highest Reported Characteristics of Psychological Safety

Attributed to the Group Leader

Session One	Session Eight	Session Fourteen
1. Was warm and supportive.	1. Was warm and supportive.	1. Was warm and supportive.
2. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	2. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	2. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.
3. Noverbally demonstrated acceptance.	3. Actively listened.	3. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.
4. Actively listened.	4. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	4. Used humor.
5. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	5. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	5. Actively listened.
6. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	6. Gave feedback.	6. Modeled ethical awareness.
7. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	7. Self disclosed experiences.	7. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.
8. Used humor.	8. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	8. Self disclosed feelings.
9. Self disclosed feelings.	9. Modeled ethical awareness.	9. Self disclosed personal reactions.
10. Gave feedback.	10. Was free, spontaneous and immediate.	10.Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.

In each attributional designation, most of the same characteristics of psychological

safety were reported by group members across all three time measures. The overall result

was that the characteristics of the concept of psychological safety seemed to have some

core elements for each attributional designation which did not change over the span of the group.

The same process was conducted on all of the leaders' responses for each question in the categories of leader, group as a whole, and individual member. The calculation procedure outlined in Chapter II was performed on the group leader's responses. The result was nine hierarchies of psychological safety characteristics, three for each time measure, arranged in descending order of the item's reported contribution to psychological safety (Appendix D).

Examining which characteristics were reported every time measure for each attributional category determined which psychological safety characteristics were stable over time. The top ten characteristics attributed to individual members are listed in Table 6. Due to the small sample of group leaders, some items had the same calculated score as designated by the letters next to the corresponding numbers. For the individual member category seven out of the ten characteristics were reported at every time measure. The characteristics of "self disclosing feelings", "warmth and support", "self disclosing personal reactions", "being free, spontaneous, and immediate", "focusing on here and now interactions", "verbally demonstrating acceptance", and "responding in an emotional, feeling manner" were all reported by group leaders as actions individual members contributed to psychological safety across the three time measures.

Table 6

Group Leaders' Ten Highest Reported Characteristics of Psychological Safety Attributed

to Individual Members

Session One	Session Eight	Session Fourteen
1. Self disclosed feelings.	1.Was warm and supportive.	1.Was warm and supportive.
2a. Self disclosed experiences.	2. Asked open ended questions.	2a. Self disclosed feelings.
2b. Was warm and supportive.	3a. Self disclosed feelings..	2b. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.
3a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	3b. Focused on here and now interactions.	3a. Self disclosed personal reactions.
3b. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	3c. Actively listened.	3b. Gave feedback.
3c. Focused on here and now interactions.	3d. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	3c. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.
3d. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	3e. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	4a. Focused on here and now interactions.
3e. Asked open ended questions.	4a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	4b. Actively listened.
3f. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	4b. Gave feedback.	4c. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.
3g. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	4c. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	4d. Used humor.

The group as a whole designation also resulted in seven out of the ten characteristics

being reported as consistently contributing to psychological safety of the group. The

characteristics, listed in Table 7, group leaders saw the group as a whole contributing to

psychological safety were very similar to those reported in the individual member category.

Table 7

Group Leaders' Ten Highest Reported Characteristics of Psychological Safety Attributed to the Group as a Whole

Session One	Session Eight	Session 14
1a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	1. Self disclosed feelings.	1a. Self disclosed feelings.
1b. Self disclosed feelings.	2a. Was warm and supportive.	1b. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.
2a. Self disclosed experiences.	2b. Focused on here and now experiences.	2a. Self disclosed personal reactions.
2b. Gave feedback.	2c. Self disclosed personal reactions.	2b. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.
2c. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	2d. Actively listened.	2c. Actively listened.
3a. Was warm and supportive.	3a. Self disclosed experiences.	3. Was warm and supportive.
3b. Focused on here and now experiences.	3b.Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	4a.Focused on here and now experiences.
3c. Actively listened.	3c. Received feedback.	4b. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.
3d Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	3d. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	4c. Used humor.
3e. Received feedback.	3e. Asked open ended questions.	4d. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.

The stable characteristics of the group as a whole category included, "self disclosing feelings", "self disclosing personal reactions", "being free, spontaneous, and immediate",

"warmth and support", "focusing on here and now interactions", "active listening", and "verbally demonstrating acceptance".

The leader designation, as reported by the group leaders, resulted in fewer stable characteristics of psychological safety compared to the other two attributional designations of individual member and group as a whole. The characteristics most attributed to leaders are listed in Table 8. Five out of the top ten characteristics were consistently reported across all three time measures and were therefore viewed as consistent characteristics of psychological safety. The characteristics of psychological safety contributed by the leaders that did not change over time were "warmth and support", "responding in an emotional, feeling manner", "self-disclosing feelings", "being free, spontaneous, and immediate", and "active listening".

In examining all three attributional categories, results of consistency of the characteristics of psychological safety can be observed. In each of the attributional categories, at least half of the characteristics of psychological safety were reported by group leaders across all three time measures. The results indicated that, similar to the reports of group members, group leaders report the concept of psychological safety as having some core characteristics that do not change over the span of time given the specific attributional category.

Table 8

Group Leaders' Ten Highest Reported Characteristics of Psychological Safety Attributed

to Group Leaders

Session One	Session Eight	Session Fourteen
1a. Was warm and supportive.	1a. Actively listened	1. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.
1b. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	1b. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	2a. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.
2a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	1c. Asked open ended questions.	2b. Self disclosed feelings.
2b. Self disclosed feelings.	2a. Was warm and supportive.	2c. Was warm and supportive.
3a. Modeled ethical awareness.	2b. Self disclosed feelings.	2d. Actively listened.
3b. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	2c. Focused on here and now interactions.	2e. Focused on here and now interactions.
3c. Self disclosed experiences.	2d. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	3a. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.
4a. Gave feedback.	2e. Verbally demostrated acceptance.	3b. Gave feedback.
4b. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	3a. Related to those members most like myself emotionally.	3c. Asked open ended questions.
4c. Actively listened.	3b. Demonstrated an understanding of the issues being discussed.	3d. Received feedback.

Discussion

Psychological safety is a concept which repeatedly appears in the group counseling

literature as a necessary component to the change process. Since Maslow (1954), many

group theorists and practitioners have remarked on the importance of psychological

safety, yet to date, none have examined the components which make up this vital piece in the change process. The purpose of this study was to conduct a foundational exploration of psychological safety to provide some information on the concept's characteristics and some indication of who group members and group leaders view as being the primary facilitators of psychological safety within the group process.

The exploration of the attribution of the facilitation of psychological safety began with the defining of the three components of the group process. For group members the three categories were self, other members, and leader. Group leader had congruent categories of individual, whole group, and self (leader). The results indicated that for group members, the attributional pattern was almost identical for all groups across all three time measures.

In the first time measure, questionnaires filled out after the first group session, group members in all six groups attributed the group leader as the primary facilitator of psychological safety. Remarks concerning members' reports can be compared to other group dynamics occurring during the initial stages of development due to the fact that after the first group, it would be highly improbable for the group to be out of the Forming stage. Relying on the group leader during the initial stages of group is a common group dynamic. Corey and Corey (1992) summarized that initially, group members are distrustful of the group process and look to the leaders to provide the atmosphere of growth and safety. The reports of the group members indicated that, like many group processes, psychological safety is facilitated by the group leader early in the life of the group.

The group members viewed other members as the secondary facilitators of psychological safety in all six groups after the first session. Although the leader is expected the live up to the title "leader" in terms of establishing psychological safety, individuals also rely on the behaviors of other members in their group for the creation of a safe environment. The importance of the other member role is the key to the group modality. Weiner (1984) discussed how multiple interaction, feedback, and identification are unique aspects of group counseling. In terms of psychological safety, group members are experiencing the creation of safety through the actions of the leader and others in the group.

Also in the first session measurement, group members in all six groups chose self as last in the attribution of psychological safety within their groups. Once again, this finding is congruent with other discussions of initial group process. Donigian and Molnati (1997) remarked that the focus of any beginning group is "less on self and more on social interactions" (p.57). Overall, the results on psychological safety agree that members place less emphasis on themselves as individuals for the creation of safety, while placing more on other members and the leader during the initial sessions of group.

The following discussion on the eighth session measure assumes that the groups were functioning at a middle stage of development. For some groups this assumption may be erroneous due to the fluid nature of group development. As Berg and Landreth (1990) noted, "developmental phases within a group are rarely autonomous and free-standing, but tend to overlap with boundaries that frequently are fuzzy" (p.224). Therefore, the continued focus on the leader could be an indication that these groups were continuing to

form and still exhibiting characteristics of the initial stages. On the other hand, the groups may have already worked through the middle stages and may have been dealing with closure issues which are discussed at the fourteenth session measure. Aware of the uncertainty concerning each group's functioning during the eighth measure, comments include comparison with expected middle stage dynamics, keeping in mind that the group may be functioning at a more or less advanced stage of development.

For the second time measure, recorded at the end of the eighth session, a majority of the groups (four out of six) chose the leader as the primary facilitator of psychological safety in the group. With its continued focus on the leader, psychological safety seems to differ from other group dynamics of the middle sessions, which tend to be more group or self focused. According to Corey and Corey (1992), middle stages of group development are associated with conflict and greater introspection (Conflict stage) or greater reliance on self and cooperation with other members (Working stage), with each stage categorized by a less active role by the leader as the group begins to work on its own. However, psychological safety in the middle sessions was attributed to leaders.

The continued focus on the leader could be a result of the foundational nature of psychological safety as it relates to change. As members put their energy and focus into risking, sharing, and practicing new behaviors, all characteristics of the middle stages, psychological safety must be maintained by some other source than the individual. Members relied on leaders early in the life of the group for the climate of safety and seemed to feel comfortable with the leaders continuing in that role.

Also in the eighth session measurement, members chose other members as the secondary source of psychological safety in four out of the six groups. The other two groups selected self as secondary facilitator. In the middle stages of group development, as groups begin to work on issues, the group takes on a life of its own, resembling what Yalom (1985) referred to as group as a social microcosm, where the group itself becomes a staging ground for change and experimentation with new behaviors.

The self designation was reported in three out of six groups as the third facilitator of psychological safety. Two groups chose the leader as last, a choice congruent with the role of the leader during this time measurement as noted by Corey and Corey (1992) for general group dynamics. The choice of self as third in the hierarchy suggested that individual members were still looking to others, especially the leader, to enact behaviors that would promote a individual sense of safety. At this point in time in the group, when traditional models of group development suggest that group members are relying less on leaders, the evidence in this study suggests the opposite is true for the important factor of safety.

In the last time measure, at the end of the fourteenth and last group, group members in five out of the six groups selected group leaders as the primary facilitator of psychological safety, others members as second, and self as third. The last sessions of a group are generally regarded as a termination stage when closure needs are being explored. Corey and Corey (1992) suggested that as members attempt to bring the group to an end and transfer learning to their outside lives, the group may look to the leader for guidance. As detachment occurs, many authors concur with the results of this study in

observing that members look to the leader for stability for the maintenance of psychological safety within the group.

Overall, from the group members' reports, attribution of psychological safety followed a consistent pattern of leader, other members, and self, over all three time measures. The evidence suggests that group members view psychological safety as the domain of the leader regardless of the point in time in the life of the group. Armed with the knowledge that members are waiting and relying on leaders throughout the span of the group to facilitate psychological safety, leaders can be aware of their role and place some emphasis on the area of safety. To see if leaders also had the same expectation about the attribution of psychological safety, one must look to the attribution hierarchies of the leaders' reports.

To explore the group leaders' report on the attribution of psychological safety, patterns of specific groups and patterns overall were examined. Overall, there was no general pattern of attribution as seen with the group members. Across all time measures, leaders generally disagreed about which designation was the primary, secondary, or tertiary facilitator of psychological safety. One reason for the result may be the low sample size of leaders (n = 5) when compared to the healthy sample of members (n = 44). Unfortunately, the ratio of member to leader is always set up with the larger sample of members due to the nature of group counseling. This dilemma may explain why group counseling literature rarely investigates the point of view of the counselor in relation to that of the member.

Although no overall pattern of attribution was detected from the group leaders, patterns did surface across the time measures of each specific group. Each group leader, with the exception of Group D, displayed their own fairly consistent pattern of attribution across each of the time measures. These patterns suggest that within group leaders' views, psychological safety was seen as consistently attributed to certain entities regardless of time.

An important issue regarding attribution is whether or not group leaders and members agree on who is facilitating psychological safety. The group members' perception is fairly clear: leader, other members, then self. In the leader reports, only one group leader, leader C, matched the members' attributional pattern. The other leaders' reports varied, but all showed a mismatch with the members. Leader A, for example chose the individual as first and the leader as last, a direct opposite of what the members were experiencing.

From a leader's perspective, knowing that group members have a high expectation that the leader will facilitate safety underscores the need for leaders to know what they can do, as leaders, to create psychological safety. To know this, leaders must have an understanding of the characteristics of psychological safety.

The exploration of the characteristics of psychological safety found its methodological procedure from the baseline research on empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and unconditional positive regard (Truax & Carkhuff, 1967). For the group members' point of view, 44 members gave their input over three time measures. To answer the research question "What are the characteristics of psychological safety?", the

list in Table 1 and the complete list in Appendix C supplied the answer, arranged in a simple format for group leaders to utilize. The characteristics are discussed in terms of the attributional designation to aid the group practitioner in knowing what characteristics of psychological safety are facilitated by each designation.

For the self designation, "humor", "warmth and support", "active listening", "demonstrating an understanding of issues being discussed", and "responding in an emotional feeling manner" were all characteristics members attributed to themselves across all time measures. For individual members in the group, these characteristics provide a stable foundation of psychological safety that members look to themselves to provide for their own sense of safety within the group throughout the life of the group. However, because group members look to leaders for the primary facilitation of psychological safety, leaders could effectively facilitate safety at any time in the life of the group by promoting the stable characteristics reported by members.

The other characteristics reported in the self category are not seen in every time measure but are still reported as important behaviors individuals use to create safety within themselves during the different time measures. Knowing from the attribution evidence that individuals are primarily looking to leaders to facilitate safety, leaders can facilitate psychological safety most effectively by helping the individual members share in the ways listed in Table 3. For example, from the first time measure, characteristics which relate to getting to know others, "related to members who were like me emotionally", "related to members who were like me intellectually", "self disclosing experiences", and "receiving feedback" can all be seen as ways individuals attempt to

create psychological safety by connecting with others early in the group. Leaders can help fulfill members expectations about safety and aid in individual creation of psychological safety by facilitating actions which help members relate with each other during the first sessions.

The session eight measure highlighted that issues surrounding acceptance were characteristics that appeared for the first time in the self category. Activities which promote acceptance could be enacted by the leader to help facilitate psychological safety in the middle stages of the group. For example, members chose "verbally demonstrated acceptance" as the highest reported characteristic of psychological safety for the eighth time measure. Leaders could actively facilitate psychological safety, as expected by members, by encouraging sharing of personal reactions, also a characteristic listed, which could promote acceptance in a verbal manner.

The session fourteen report closely resembles the session report for the self category with only two characteristics, "was free, spontaneous, and immediate", and "modeled ethical behavior" differing from the earlier report. The information for leaders here suggests that, at termination, leaders can facilitate psychological safety by focusing on the stable characteristics of safety, acceptance issues, and participation in an immediate manner.

The other members category provided a very stable list of characteristics of psychological safety over the three time measures. The characteristics individuals see other members consistently contributing to psychological safety include, "humor", "warmth and support", "self disclosing feelings", "active listening", "verbally

demonstrating acceptance", "nonverbally demonstrating acceptance", "self disclosing experiences", and "self disclosing personal reactions". With eight out of ten characteristics being stable across all time measures, leaders can facilitate psychological safety through the group as a whole by promoting self disclosure, acceptance, and support among the members.

Members also reported the leader as having many stable characteristics of psychological safety across the time measures. The characteristics of "warmth and support", "demonstrating an understanding of the issues being discussed", "nonverbally demonstrating acceptance", "active listening", "verbally demonstrating acceptance", and "responding in an emotional, feeling manner" were reported as behaviors leaders could do in all time measures to facilitate psychological safety.

The lists of ten highest characteristics attributed to the leader were very similar across time measures with a few exceptions. The characteristic "gave feedback" appeared in the first two measures, but was absent from the last measure, where it dropped to item 12 as seen in Appendix D. Group leaders can use information such as this to plan interventions, for example more feedback during the first and middle sessions, less emphasis on feedback during termination, if the focus is to increase psychological safety in the group.

Self disclosure was another grouping of characteristics that changed over time for the leader. For the first time measure, "self disclosing feelings" was seen as important from the members' point of view. The eighth measure revealed group leaders should "self disclose experiences" and the fourteenth session measure noted "self disclosing feelings"

and "self disclosing personal reactions" as strategies or practices which enhance psychological safety. Once again, group leaders could use this information to guide the types of self disclosures they make in order to increase the psychological safety in their groups.

A few characteristics were listed in every attributional category, in every time measure. These characteristics, "warmth and support" and "active listening", can be noted as the core of psychological safety as reported by group members. Group leaders interested in facilitating psychological safety in the group should make a concentrated effort to cultivate those two core characteristics in each individual, in the group as a whole, and within self as leader in order to be successful with psychological safety.

Some of the characteristics were consistently at the bottom of the psychological safety hierarchies. In every category, across all time measures, the characteristics of "was guarded or tense," "was quiet and non-expressive" and a mix of confrontation characteristics such as "utilized confrontation" or "was confronted by a group member" all appeared at the bottom of each list and were reported as having a negative effect on psychological safety. This finding is congruent when compared to the core characteristics of psychological safety which were reported. For psychological safety to be most potent, members preferred an open, warm, verbal atmosphere.

The characteristics concerning confrontation are noted by many authorities as being important to the group process. Berg and Landreth (1990) observed that confrontation, defined as "pointing out discrepancies between words and action" (p.64), is essential for helping members become a fully integrated member of the group. Several explanations

exist which explain the low scores of confrontation. One source may be the nature of the confrontation. As a rule confrontations often expose a member's defenses or sources of resistance (Shaffer & Galinsky, 1989). Individuals may feel initially threatened by the confrontation and psychological safety may decrease. Another explanation may be that the word "confrontation" may have a negative connotation, regardless of the actual process during the group (Posthuma, 1996). Future attempts at research into psychological safety could examine the effects of confrontation and may use different phrasings of the word such as "pointing out discrepancies", or "prompting a closer examination of my behavior".

Overall, from the group members' reports, psychological safety can be seen as having some core components that do not change over time in each of the attributional categories. Pairing these reported characteristics with the attribution results, leaders can take an active role in the facilitation of psychological safety by promoting the highest listed characteristics for the given attribution category. Whether the leader is focusing on the individual, group as a whole, or one's own leader skills, focusing on certain behaviors can enhance the psychological safety in the group.

The characteristics of psychological safety as reported by group leaders was also examined, and lists were generated accordingly (Tables 6-9 & Appendix D). The group leaders were questioned in order to gain some insight into the congruence between group members' and group leaders' perceptions of psychological safety with the assumption that to be effective, leaders must have an understanding of the client's needs and perceptions of change, and in this case psychological safety (Weiner, 1984). For the individual

member category, leaders reported seven out of the ten highest characteristics of "self disclosing feelings", "warmth and support", "self disclosing personal reactions", "being free, spontaneous, and immediate", "focusing on here and now interactions", "verbally demonstrating acceptance", and "responding in an emotional, feeling manner" as stable characteristics individuals create across all time measures. The results indicate that leaders, despite not having an agreement on attribution of safety, see psychological safety as having some core elements across time.

Despite the high number of consistent characteristics reported among group leaders, only two, "warmth and support" and "responding in an emotional, feeling manner", appeared on the group members' list of characteristics for this attributional category. The discrepancy in characteristics could create some problems as expectations for creation and facilitation are not met by individuals or leaders. Leaders can use the results to meet the expectations of the group in terms of focusing on those characteristics that are reported by members as facilitating their psychological safety.

The group as a whole designation resulted in seven out of the highest ten characteristics being stable across all time measures. "Self disclosing feelings", "self disclosing personal reactions", "being free, spontaneous, and immediate", "warmth and support", "focusing on here and now interactions", "active listening", and "verbally demonstrating acceptance" were all characteristics group leaders saw the group as a whole consistently contributing to psychological safety. As with the individual category, group leaders see psychological safety as being very consistent with regards to characteristics over time. The group members and group leaders tended to agree more on

the core characteristics of the group as a whole category matching the characteristics of "warmth and support", "self disclosing feelings", "active listening", "verbally demonstrating acceptance", and "self disclosing personal reactions".

One explanation for the higher congruence in the other members category may be that both members and leaders have an easier time observing the group as a whole and have greater problems pinning down characteristics of individual entities such as self and leader. This conclusion is also supported by the result of the number of stable characteristics reported in each self report made by leaders and members. In each case, both leaders and members found the least amount of stable characteristics in the category attributed to themselves. Thus, the characteristics of psychological safety are not only more easily attributed to entities other than self in the group, but the characteristics are more easily and consistently identified in others.

For the leader category, group leaders reported five out of the ten highest characteristics as stable over time. The characteristics "warmth and support", "responding in an emotional, feeling manner", "self disclosing feelings", "being free, spontaneous, and immediate", and "active listening" were all characteristics group leaders believed they consistently contributed to psychological safety. The group members agreed with the characteristics "warmth and support", "active listening", and "responding in an emotional, feeling manner".

Overall, three characteristics were listed in every attributional category for every time measure. "Self disclosing feelings", "warmth and support" and "responding in an emotional feeling manner" can be seen as the core elements of psychological safety as

reported by group leaders. Only one, "warmth and support" appeared on the group members' list of core elements.

Common characteristics appeared consistently as having a negative effect on psychological as reported by group leaders. "Was guarded or tense", "was quiet and non-expressive", "gave advice", and "responded in a cognitive, logical manner", were all characteristics which were reported in most attribution categories in all time measures as having a low to negative effect on psychological safety. When compared to the group leaders' list, the group members largely agree on the negative traits. Group leaders, like group members, see psychological safety as being fostered through open, warm, emotional sharing. Giving advice and responding in a cognitive manner, although different from the members' report, reflects the general consideration that emotionally distant styles of communication do not contribute to psychological safety.

Although it was not the goal of this research to do an in depth comparison of the group leader and group member responses, the difference in perception between the two was noted. Future research into the area of psychological safety can probe into the reasons behind the differences in perception and what effect, if any, those differences have on the outcome of the group.

Future Directions

This study provided a foundational examination of the concept of psychological safety by exploring the reports of group members and group leaders in the areas of attribution and characteristics of psychological safety. Some considerations for future research were mentioned in the previous section and other ideas for extension are

included under this heading. Building on this study, a closer look at the characteristics of psychological safety in various types of groups is warranted. One limitation of the study was the homogeneous classification of the members. Studies which examine the characteristics of psychological safety with populations other than master's level counseling students may prove beneficial to the area of group counseling. Psychological safety could be explored and compared in different settings (inpatient, outpatient, etc.), among different theoretical leadership styles, and with different types of groups (psychoeducational, support, etc.). Also, future research may examine the different characteristics of psychological safety in open and closed groups.

Future research could examine the effect of gender on psychological safety. The vast majority of member subjects in this study were female. Future research should focus on a more equal distribution of gender and could even examine differences and similarities in attribution and characteristics of psychological safety by gender.

Future research on attribution of psychological safety may explore the effect a discrepancy in attribution between member and leader has on group effectiveness or what effect it has on the level of psychological safety within the group. Other areas for exploration could include an attempt to gain a larger sample of group leaders to improve the number of reports on attribution from a leader's point of view.

The difference between trust and psychological safety is also an avenue which can be explored in a later study. The relationship between trust and safety has only been hinted at in the current literature and could not be seriously examined without a clear definition of the psychological safety concept. Building on the definition of

psychological safety, future work could explore trust as it differs and compliments safety through the actions of leader, self and other throughout different points in the life of the group.

As noted earlier, future research is warranted on the role of confrontation in the process of group counseling. Specifically, future examinations on the concept of psychological safety could isolate and investigate the effect of confrontation on the group process. A closer investigation could answer whether confrontation actually decreases safety or whether individuals have a negative connotative bias toward the word "confrontation".

Future research is warranted on the characteristics of psychological safety within each of the stages of group development. The current study did examine whether the characteristics changed over time, however, comparing specific stages, characteristics and level of psychological safety could aid group facilitators in promoting faster movement into the working stages of group.

The logical extension of this study would be to do extensive research on the effect psychological safety has on outcome in group counseling. The purpose of this study was to generate a definition of psychological safety by attribution category so group leaders could more effectively facilitate psychological safety. However, research has not established that psychological safety is even desirable in group counseling. Sources mention the concept as necessary for change, but without a definition of the concept or research to show its necessity, the sources make hollow claims. Using the hierarchies of

characteristics generated from this research, future studies can examine empirically the effect psychological safety has on the process of change.

Along with researching the effect psychological safety has on change, future research may gain some insight into psychological safety's place in the hierarchy of change postulated by Bloch and Crouch (1985). Gaining knowledge on whether and when psychological safety produces change would shed some light on whether psychological safety is a condition for change, a new therapeutic factor, or just a catch all term for a list of techniques.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

I agree to have Kevin A. Fall, a doctoral candidate in Counselor Education at the University of North Texas, include the data I provide in his dissertation research on the characteristics of psychological safety in group counseling.

I understand that I will complete three (3) questionnaires, which will be filled out at the end of the first, eighth, and last group sessions. I also understand that information will be collected from all members and leaders in my group setting, and when reported in the dissertation, will conceal my identity as well as the identity of the group I participated in. I further understand that my group will be assigned a number to protect confidentiality.

I understand that the foreseeable risk in filling out the questionnaire is minimal, in that I will only be reporting on what I have experienced in the previous group sessions. Knowing this, I agree to participate.

I understand that the benefit of participating in this study is in the opportunity to add to the existing research on group counseling, and specifically to help define the characteristics of psychological safety. Knowing this, I agree to participate.

I understand that should I have any questions about the research, concerns about research procedures, or concerns about my rights as a research participant, I can contact the researcher at:

Kevin A. Fall
1115 MacArthur #4806
Carrollton, TX 75007
(214) 242-5481, or (817) 565-4407

I also understand that I can reach the researcher's faculty supervisor, Dr. Bob Berg, at (817) 565-2915. This project has been reviewed and approved by the UNT Committee for the Protection of Human Subjects (817) 565-3940.

I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary, and that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or loss of benefits to which I am otherwise entitled as a group member or university student. My decision to participate or not participate will have no effect on my current or future standing as a student in the Counselor Education program.

I have read and understand the above information and agree to participate in this study.

Printed Name_____Signature _____

Date _____

APPENDIX B

PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY QUESTIONNAIRES

Psychological Safety Questionnaire- Group Member Form

This packet contains three Psychological Safety Questionnaires. The point of view specifier (other members, group leader, or self) is noted in the question stem at the top of each questionnaire. Each specifier has its own questionnaire and paper color. Please read each question stem and circle the corresponding number of how you feel each behavior effected the level of psychological safety within your group. If the behavior was not noted in your group, please circle (0). Please **do not** skip any questions. **DO NOT** put your name on any of the questionnaires. Thank You!

How did other member's behavior (listed below) effect the feeling of psychological safety within your group?

When other members....	My Psychological Safety:					
	Decreased Greatly	Decreased Slightly	Wasn't Effected	Increased Slightly	Increased Greatly	Behavior Not Experienced
1) Were warm and supportive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2) Were directive and structured in interactions with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3) Self disclosed:						
a) personal reactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4) Focused on members' past experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5) Modeled ethical awareness.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6) Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7) Gave feedback to group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8) Were free, spontaneous, and immediate with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
9) Utilized confrontation with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
10) Received feedback from the group.	1	2	3	4	5	0
11) Were quiet and non-expressive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
12) Focused on here-and-now interactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
13) Were confronted by a group member.	1	2	3	4	5	0
14) Actively listened to group members' problems and issues.	1	2	3	4	5	0
15) Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
16) Gave advice; suggested alternative behaviors or emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
17) Asked questions:						
a) open-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) closed-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
18) Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
19) Related more frequently to those members who were most like them:						
a) physically.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotionally	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) intellectually.	1	2	3	4	5	0
20) Used humor in interacting with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
21) Responded or shared with the group in:						
a) a cognitive, logical manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotional, feeling manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
22) Were guarded and/or tense.	1	2	3	4	5	0
23) Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1	2	3	4	5	0

How did your group leader's behavior (listed below) effect the feeling of psychological safety within your group?

When my group leader....	My Psychological Safety:					
	Decreased Greatly	Decreased Slightly	Wasn't Effected	Increased Slightly	Increased Greatly	Behavior Not Experienced
1) Was warm and supportive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2) Was directive and structured in interactions with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3) Self disclosed:						
a) personal reactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4) Focused on members' past experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5) Modeled ethical awareness.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6) Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7) Gave feedback to group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8) Was free, spontaneous, and immediate with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
9) Utilized confrontation with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
10) Received feedback from the group.	1	2	3	4	5	0
11) Was quiet and non-expressive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
12) Focused on here-and-now interactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
13) Was confronted by a group member.	1	2	3	4	5	0
14) Actively listened to group members' problems and issues.	1	2	3	4	5	0
15) Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
16) Gave advice; suggested alternative behaviors or emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
17) Asked questions:						
a) open-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) closed-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
18) Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
19) Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her:						
a) physically.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotionally	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) intellectually.	1	2	3	4	5	0
20) Used humor in interacting with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
21) Responded or shared with the group in:						
a) a cognitive, logical manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotional, feeling manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
22) Was guarded and/or tense.	1	2	3	4	5	0
23) Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1	2	3	4	5	0

How did your behavior (listed below) effect the feeling of psychological safety within your group?

When I....

	Decreased Greatly	Decreased Slightly	Wasn't Effected	Increased Slightly	Increased Greatly	Behavior Not Experienced
1) Was warm and supportive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2) Was directive and structured in interactions with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3) Self disclosed:						
a) personal reactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4) Focused on members' past experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5) Modeled ethical awareness.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6) Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7) Gave feedback to group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8) Was free, spontaneous, and immediate with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
9) Utilized confrontation with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
10) Received feedback from the group.	1	2	3	4	5	0
11) Was quiet and non-expressive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
12) Focused on here-and-now interactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
13) Was confronted by a group member.	1	2	3	4	5	0
14) Actively listened to group members' problems and issues.	1	2	3	4	5	0
15) Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
16) Gave advice; suggested alternative behaviors or emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
17) Asked questions:						
a) open-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) closed-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
18) Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
19) Related more frequently to those members who were most like me:						
a) physically.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotionally	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) intellectually.	1	2	3	4	5	0
20) Used humor in interacting with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
21) Responded or shared with the group in:						
a) a cognitive, logical manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotional, feeling manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
22) Was guarded and/or tense.	1	2	3	4	5	0
23) Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1	2	3	4	5	0

Psychological Safety Questionnaire- Group Leader Form

This packet contains three Psychological Safety Questionnaires. The point of view specifier (group as a whole, individual member, or yourself) is noted in the question stem at the top of each questionnaire. Each specifier has its own questionnaire and paper color. Please read each question stem and circle the corresponding number of how you feel each behavior effected the level of psychological safety within your group. If the behavior was not noted in your group, please circle (0). Please **do not** skip any questions. Please pass the envelope provided around your group and instruct all members to place their questionnaires in the envelope before they leave the group. Seal the envelope and leave it in the group room. **DO NOT** put your name on any of the questionnaires. Thank You!

How did your behavior (listed below) effect the feeling of psychological safety within the group?

When I (as group leader)....	The Group's Psychological Safety:					
	Decreased Greatly	Decreased Slightly	Wasn't Effected	Increased Slightly	Increased Greatly	Behavior Not Experienced
1) Was warm and supportive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2) Was directive and structured in interactions with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3) Self disclosed:						
a) personal reactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4) Focused on members' past experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5) Modeled ethical awareness.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6) Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7) Gave feedback to group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8) Was free, spontaneous, and immediate with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
9) Utilized confrontation with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
10) Received feedback from the group.	1	2	3	4	5	0
11) Was quiet and non-expressive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
12) Focused on here-and-now interactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
13) Was confronted by a group member.	1	2	3	4	5	0
14) Actively listened to group members' problems and issues.	1	2	3	4	5	0
15) Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
16) Gave advice; suggested alternative behaviors or emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
17) Asked questions:						
a) open-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) closed-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
18) Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
19) Related more frequently to those members who were most like me:						
a) physically.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotionally	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) intellectually.	1	2	3	4	5	0
20) Used humor in interacting with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
21) Responded or shared with the group in:						
a) a cognitive, logical manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotional, feeling manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
22) Was guarded and/or tense.	1	2	3	4	5	0
23) Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1	2	3	4	5	0

How did individual member's behavior (listed below) effect the feeling of psychological safety within the group?

When an individual member....	The Group's Psychological Safety:					
	Decreased Greatly	Decreased Slightly	Wasn't Effected	Increased Slightly	Increased Greatly	Behavior Not Experienced
1) Was warm and supportive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2) Was directive and structured in interactions with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3) Self disclosed:						
a) personal reactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4) Focused on members' past experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5) Modeled ethical awareness.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6) Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7) Gave feedback to group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8) Was free, spontaneous, and immediate with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
9) Utilized confrontation with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
10) Received feedback from the group.	1	2	3	4	5	0
11) Was quiet and non-expressive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
12) Focused on here-and-now interactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
13) Was confronted by a group member.	1	2	3	4	5	0
14) Actively listened to group members' problems and issues.	1	2	3	4	5	0
15) Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
16) Gave advice; suggested alternative behaviors or emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
17) Asked questions:						
a) open-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) closed-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
18) Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
19) Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her:						
a) physically.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotionally	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) intellectually.	1	2	3	4	5	0
20) Used humor in interacting with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
21) Responded or shared with the group in:						
a) a cognitive, logical manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotional, feeling manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
22) Was guarded and/or tense.	1	2	3	4	5	0
23) Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1	2	3	4	5	0

How did the whole group's interactive behavior (listed below) effect the feeling of psychological safety within the group?

When the group as a whole....   **The Group's Psychological Safety:**

	Decreased Greatly	Decreased Slightly	Wasn't Effected	Increased Slightly	Increased Greatly	Behavior Not Experienced
1) Was warm and supportive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
2) Was directive and structured in interactions with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
3) Self disclosed:						
a) personal reactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) feelings.	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
4) Focused on members' past experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
5) Modeled ethical awareness.	1	2	3	4	5	0
6) Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	1	2	3	4	5	0
7) Gave feedback to group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
8) Was free, spontaneous, and immediate with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
9) Utilized confrontation with group members.	1	2	3	4	5	0
10) Received feedback from the group.	1	2	3	4	5	0
11) Was quiet and non-expressive.	1	2	3	4	5	0
12) Focused on here-and-now interactions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
13) Was confronted by a group member.	1	2	3	4	5	0
14) Actively listened to group members' problems and issues.	1	2	3	4	5	0
15) Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
16) Gave advice; suggested alternative behaviors or emotions.	1	2	3	4	5	0
17) Asked questions:						
a) open-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) closed-ended.	1	2	3	4	5	0
18) Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	2	3	4	5	0
19) Related more frequently to those members who were most like them:						
a) physically.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotionally	1	2	3	4	5	0
c) intellectually.	1	2	3	4	5	0
20) Used humor in interacting with others.	1	2	3	4	5	0
21) Responded or shared with the group in:						
a) a cognitive, logical manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
b) emotional, feeling manner.	1	2	3	4	5	0
22) Was guarded and/or tense.	1	2	3	4	5	0
23) Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1	2	3	4	5	0

APPENDIX C

HIERARCHIES OF CHARACTERISTICS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY LISTED

BY TIME MEASURE - GROUP MEMBERS' REPORT

Session One Measurement

Self	Score	Other Members	Score	Leader	Score
1. Used humor.	6.02	1. Used humor.	6.91	1. Was warm and supportive.	6.8
2. Was warm and supportive.	4.98	2. Was warm and supportive.	6.72	2. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	6.71
3. Actively listened.	4.92	3. Self disclosed feelings.	6.21	3. Noverbally demonstrated acceptance.	6.57
4. Related to members who were most like me emotionally.	4.91	4. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	6.24	4. Actively listened.	6.34
5. Self disclosed experiences.	4.77	5. Actively listened.	6.18	5. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	6.3
6. Related to members who were most like me intellectually.	4.57	6. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	6.07	6. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	6.29
7. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	4.54	7. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	5.91	7. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	6.07
8. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	4.46	8. Self disclosed experiences.	5.78	8. Used humor.	5.98
9. Received feedback from the group.	4.45	9. Gave feedback.	5.36	9. Self disclosed feelings.	5.96
10. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	4.11	10. Self disclosed personal reactions.	5.32	10. Gave feedback.	5.75

Session One Measurement
(cont.)

Self	Score	Other Members	Score	Leader	Score
11. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	3.99	11. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	5.02	11. Self disclosed experiences.	5.69
12. Self disclosed personal reactions.	3.98	12. Received feedback.	4.98	12. Modeled ethical awareness.	5.39
13. Self disclosed feelings.	3.84	13. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	4.92	13. Self disclosed personal reactions.	5.11
14. Gave feedback.	3.75	14. Modeled ethical awareness.	4.41	14. Asked open ended questions.	4.98
15. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	3.52	15. Focused on members' past experiences.	3.47	15. Focused on here and now interactions.	4.05
16. Focused on members' past experiences.	3.48	16. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	3.2	16. Received feedback.	3.79
17. Modeled ethical awareness.	3.32	17. Focused on here and now interactions.	2.91	17. Responded in a cognitive, logical, manner.	3.69
18. Focused on here and now interactions.	3.14	18. Asked open ended questions.	2.9	18. Was directive and structured.	2.69
19. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	2.36	19. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them intellectually.	2.66	19. Focused on members' past experiences.	2.64
20. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me physically.	2.16	20. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them emotionally.	2.59	20. Gave advice.	2.32
21. Was directive and structured.	1.48	21. Was directive and structured.	2.39	21. Asked closed ended questions.	2.25

Session One Measurement
(cont.)

Self	Score	Other Members	Score	Leader	Score
22. Gave advice.	1.36	22. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	2.29	22. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	2.11
23. Asked open ended questions.	1.21	23. Asked closed ended questions.	2.19	23. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her emotionally.	1.71
24. Asked closed ended questions.	1.07	24. Gave advice.	1.36	24. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her intellectually.	1.61
25. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	0.84	25. Was confronted by a group member.	0.64	25. Was confronted by a group member.	0.8
26. Was confronted by a group member.	-0.02	26. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them physically.	0.54	26. Was quiet and non-expressive.	0.55
27. Utilized confrontation.	-0.04	27. Utilized confrontation.	0.13	27. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her physically.	0.54
28. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-0.11	28. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-1.45	28. Utilized confrontation.	0.16
29. Was guarded or tense.	-3.41	29. Was guarded or tense.	-2.18	29. Was guarded or tense.	-0.54

Session Eight Measurement

Self	Score	Other Members	Score	Leader	Score
1. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	7.19	1. Was warm and supportive.	8.88	1. Was warm and supportive.	9.47
2. Actively listened.	6.72	2. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	8.58	2. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	9.1
3. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	6.64	3. Self disclosed experiences.	8.51	3. Actively listened.	7.86
4. Was warm and supportive.	6.43	4. Used humor.	7.76	4. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	7.71
5. Used humor.	6.42	5. Self disclosed feelings.	7.71	5. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	7.19
6. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	6.35	6. Actively listened.	7.54	6. Gave feedback.	6.69
7. Self disclosed experiences.	5.91	7. Self disclosed personal reactions.	7.07	7. Self disclosed experiences.	6.34
8. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	4.52	8. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	6.87	8. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	6.13
9. Gave feedback.	5.1	9. Modeled ethical awareness.	6.85	9. Modeled ethical awareness.	6.11
10. Self disclosed personal reactions.	5.01	10. Was free, spontaneous and immediate.	6.49	10. Was free, spontaneous and immediate.	6.05
11. Self disclosed feelings.	4.93	11. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	5.89	11. Self disclosed personal reactions.	5.95

Session Eight Measurement
(cont.)

Self	Score	Other Members	Score	Leader	Score
12. Related more frequently with those members who were most like me emotionally.	4.66	12. Gave feedback.	5.16	12. Self disclosed experiences.	5.68
13. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	4.52	13. Asked open ended questions.	4.57	13. Used humor.	5.51
14. Focused on here and now interactions.	4.01	14. Received feedback.	3.73	14. Was directive and structured.	5.18
15. Asked open ended questions.	3.94	15. Modeled ethical awareness.	3.63	15. Asked open ended questions.	5.16
16. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me intellectually.	3.89	16. Focused on members' past experiences.	3.52	16. Focused on here and now interactions.	4.79
17. Modeled ethical awareness.	3.77	17. Focused on here and now interactions.	3.33	17. Received feedback.	2.85
18. Responded in a cognitive logical manner.	3.59	18. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	3.05	18. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	2.13
19. Gave advice.	3.26	19. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them emotionally.	2.88	19. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	1.98
20. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	2.76	20. Was directive and structured.	2.42	20. Asked closed ended questions.	1.63
21. Received feedback.	2.65	21. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	2.22	21. Related to those members who were most like him/her emotionally.	1.14

Session Eight Measurement
(cont.)

Self	Score	Other Members	Score	Leader	Score
22. Was directive and structured.	2.57	22. Asked closed ended questions.	1.79	22. Focused on members' past experiences.	0.93
23. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me physically.	1.64	23. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them intellectually.	1.74	23. Related to members who were most like him/her intellectually.	0.92
24. Focused on members' past experiences.	1.49	24. Gave advice.	1.61	24. Gave advice.	0.68
25. Asked closed ended questions.	1.31	25. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them physically.	0.73	25. Utilized confrontation.	0.56
26. Utilized confrontation.	0.15	26. Utilized confrontation.	-1.01	26. Was confronted by a group member.	0.2
27. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-0.05	27. Was confronted by a group member.	-2	27. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her physically.	-0.17
28. Was confronted by a group member.	-1.58	28. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-3.04	28. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-1.27
29. Was guarded or tense.	-4.19	29. Was guarded or tense.	-4.97	29. Was guarded or tense.	-1.97

Session Fourteen
Measurement

Self	Score	Other Members	Score	Leader	Score
1. Used humor.	8.04	1. Was warm and supportive.	8.49	1. Was warm and supportive.	9.86
2. Was warm and supportive.	7.88	2. Used humor.	7.99	2. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	8.32
3. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	7.15	3. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	7.93	3. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	7.62
4. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	7.11	4. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	7.47	4. Used humor.	7.37
5. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	6.15	5. Actively listened.	7.24	5. Actively listened.	7.3
6. Actively listened.	5.63	6. Self disclosed feelings.	7.08	6. Modeled ethical awareness.	7.1
7. Was free, spontaneous and immediate.	5.52	7. Was free, spontaneous and immediate.	6.89	7. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	6.86
8. Gave feedback.	5.37	8. Self disclosed personal reactions.	6.79	8. Self disclosed feelings.	6.54
9. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	5.36	9. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	6.38	9. Self disclosed personal reactions.	6.33
10. Modeled ethical awareness.	4.82	10. Self disclosed experiences.	6.33	10. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	6.25
11. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me emotionally.	4.69	11. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	6.08	11. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	6.25

Session Fourteen
Measurement (cont.)

Self	Score	Other Members	Score	Leader	Score
12. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me intellectually.	4.38	12. Modeled ethical awareness.	5.35	12. Gave feedback.	6.03
13. Asked open ended questions.	4.31	13. Gave feedback.	5.25	13. Was directive and structured.	5.92
14. Self disclosed experiences.	4.26	14. Asked open ended questions.	4.65	14. Self disclosed experiences.	5.74
15. Was directive and structured.	4.22	15. Focused on here and now interactions.	4.61	15. Asked open ended questions.	5.33
16. Self disclosed feelings.	3.78	16. Received feedback.	4.35	16. Focused on here and now interactions.	4.37
17. Received feedback.	3.76	17. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them emotionally.	3.69	17. Received feedback.	4.35
18. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	3.72	18. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them intellectually.	3.57	18. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	3.74
19. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	3.58	19. Was directive and structured.	3.48	19. Asked closed ended questions.	3.21
20. Self disclosed personal reactions.	3.49	20. Focused on members' past experiences.	2.76	20. Focused on members' past experiences.	2.1
21. Focused on here and now interactions.	3.48	21. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them physically.	2.64	22. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her intellectually.	0.65

Session Fourteen
Measurement (cont.)

Self	Score	Other Members	Score	Leader	Score
22. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me physically.	3.35	22. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	2.19	22. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her emotionally.	1.82
23. Asked closed ended questions.	2.49	23. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	2.06	23. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	1.81
24. Focused on members' past experiences.	1.97	24. Gave advice.	1.92	24. Utilized confrontation.	1.31
25. Gave advice.	1.93	25. Asked closed ended questions.	0.92	25. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her physically.	1.12
26. Utilized confrontation.	-0.45	26. Was confronted by a group member.	0.04	26. Gave advice.	0.97
27. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-0.76	27. Utilized confrontation.	-1.31	27. Was confronted by a group member.	0.81
28. Was confronted by a group member.	-0.93	28. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-1.39	28. Was guarded or tense.	0.65
29. Was guarded or tense.	-4.05	29. Was guarded or tense.	-4.14	29. Was quiet and non-expressive.	0.21

APPENDIX D

HIERARCHIES OF CHARACTERISTICS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SAFETY LISTED

BY TIME MEASURE - GROUP LEADERS' REPORT

Session One Measurement

Individual	Score	Whole Group	Score	Leader	Score
1. Self disclosed feelings.	1.8	1a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	1.8	1a. Was warm and supportive.	1.8
		1b. Self disclosed feelings.	1.6	1b. Responded in an emotional, and feeling manner.	1.8
2a. Self disclosed experiences.	1.6	2a. Self disclosed experiences.	1.6	2a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	1.6
2b. Was warm and supportive.	1.6	2b. Gave feedback.	1.4	2b. Self disclosed feelings.	1.6
3a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	1.4	2c. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	1.4	3a. Modeled ethical awareness.	1.4
3b. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	1.4	3a. Was warm and supportive.	1.4	3b. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.4
3c. Focused on here and now interactions.	1.4	3b. Focused on here and now experiences.	1.4	3c. Self disclosed experiences.	1.4
3d. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.4	3c. Actively listened.	1.4	4a. Gave feedback.	1.2
3e. Asked open ended questions.	1.4	3d Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.4	4b. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	1.2
3f. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.4	4a. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.2	4c. Actively listened.	1.4
3g. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	1.4	3e. Received feedback.	1.4	5a. Focused on members' past experiences.	1.2
4a. Received feedback.	1.2	4b. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	1.2	5b. Focused on here and now interactions.	1.2
4b. Actively listened.	1.2				1

Session One Measurement
(cont.)

Individual	Score	Whole Group	Score	Leader	Score
4c. Used humor.	1.2	5a. Asked open ended questions.	1	5c. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1
5a. Utilized confrontation.	1	5b. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them physically.	1	5d. Used humor.	1
5b. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1	5c. Used humor.	1	5e. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1
6a. Focused on members' past experiences.	0.8	6a. Focused on members' past experiences.	0.8	6a. Utilized confrontation.	0.8
6b. Gave feedback.	0.8	6b. Related more frequently to those members who were like them intellectually.	0.8	6b. Asked open ended questions.	0.8
6c. Was confronted by a group member.	0.8	6c. Demonstrated an understanding of issue being discussed.	0.8	7a. Was directive and structured.	0.6
7a. Modeled ethical awareness.	0.6	7a. Modeled ethical awareness.	0.6	7b. Received feedback.	0.6
7b. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her physically.	0.6	7b. Utilized confrontation.	0.6	8a. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	0.2
7c. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her emotionally.	0.6	7c. Was confronted by a group member.	0.6	8b. Related more frequently to those members who were more like me physically.	0.2

Session One Measurement
(cont.)

Individual	Score	Whole Group	Score	Leader	Score
7d. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her intellectually.	0.6	7d. Gave advice.	0.6	8c. Related more frequently to those members who were more like me emotionally.	0.2
8. Asked closed ended questions.	0.4	7e. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them emotionally.	0.6	8d. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me intellectually.	0.2
9a. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	0.2	8a. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	0.4	9a. Was quiet and non-expressive.	0
9b. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	0.2	8b. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	0.4	9b. Gave advice.	0
10. Gave advice.	0	9. Asked closed ended questions.	0.2	9c. Asked closed ended questions.	0
11. Was directive and structured.	-0.2	10. Was directive and structured.	0	9d. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	0
12. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-0.4	11. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-0.6	10. Was confronted by a group member.	-0.2
13. Was guarded or tense.	-1	12. Was guarded or tense.	-1	11. Was guarded or tense.	-0.4

Session Eight Measurement

Individual	Score	Whole Group	Score	Leader	Score
1. Was warm and supportive.	1.8	1. Self disclosed feelings.	1.8	1a. Actively listened	1.6
2. Asked open ended questions.	1.6	2a. Was warm and supportive.	1.6	1b. Responded in an emotional, and feeling manner.	1.6
3a. Self disclosed feelings.	1.6	2b. Focused on here and now questions.	1.6	1c. Asked open ended questions.	1.6
3b. Focused on here and now interactions.	1.4	2c. Self disclosed personal	1.6	2a. Was warm and supportive.	1.4
3c. Actively listened.	1.4	2d. Actively listened.	1.6	2b. Self disclosed feelings.	1.4
3d. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.4	3a. Self disclosed experiences.	1.4	2c. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.4
3e. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	1.4	3b. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	1.4	2d. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	1.4
4a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	1.2	3c. Received feedback.	1.4	2e. Focused on here and now interactions.	1.4
4b. Gave feedback.	1.2	3d Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.4	3a. Related to those members most like myself emotionally.	1.2
4c. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	1.2	3e. Asked open ended questions.	1.4	3b. Demonstrated an understanding of the issues being discussed.	1.2
5a. Received feedback.	1	4. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.2	4a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	1
5b. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1	5a. Focused on members' past experiences.	1	4b. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1

Session Eight Measurement
(cont.)

Individual	Score	Whole Group	Score	Leader	Score
5c. Used humor.	1	5b. Modeled ethical awareness.	1	4c. Used humor.	1
5d. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1	5c. Gave feedback.	1	5a. Self disclosed experiences.	0.8
6a. Was directive and structured.	0.8	5d. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them emotionally.	1	5b. Focused on members' past experiences.	0.8
6b. Self disclosed experiences.	0.8	5e. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	1	5c. Was confronted by a group member.	0.8
6c. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her emotionally.	0.8	6a. Utilized confrontation.	0.8	6a. Modeled ethical awareness.	0.6
6d. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her intellectually.	0.8	6b. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them intellectually.	0.8	6b. Gave feedback.	0.6
7a. Focused on members' past experiences.	0.6	6c. Used humor.	0.8	6c. Utilized confrontation.	0.6
7b. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	0.6	7. Was confronted by a group member.	0.6	6d. Received feedback.	0.6
7c. Was confronted by a group member.	0.6	8a. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	0.4	6e. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me physically.	0.6

Session Eight Measurement
(cont.)

Individual	Score	Whole Group	Score	Leader	Score
7d. Asked closed ended questions.	0.6	8b. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	0.4	7. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me intellectually.	0.4
8a. Modeled ethical awareness.	0.4	9a. Was directive and structured.	0.2	8a. Was directive and structured.	0.2
8b. Utilized confrontation.	0.4	9b. Asked closed ended questions.	0.2	8b. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	0.2
9a. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her physically.	0.2	10a. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	0	9. Was quiet and non-expressive.	0
9b. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	0.2	10b. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them physically.	0	10a. Asked closed ended questions.	-0.2
10. Was quiet and non-expressive.	0	11. Gave advice.	-0.2	10b. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	-0.2
11. Gave advice.	-0.4	12. Was guarded or tense.	-0.4	11. Gave advice.	-0.6
12. Was guarded or tense.	-0.6	13. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-0.6	12. Was guarded or tense.	-0.8

Fourteenth Session
Measurement

Individual	Score	Whole Group	Score	Leader	Score
1. Was warm and supportive.	2	1a. Self disclosed feelings.	1.8	1. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	1.6
2a. Self disclosed feelings.	1.8	1b. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	1.8	2a. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.4
2b. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	1.8	2a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	1.6	2b. Self disclosed feelings.	1.4
3a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	1.6	2b. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.6	2c. Was warm and supportive.	1.4
3b. Gave feedback.	1.6	2c. Actively listened.	1.6	2d. Actively listened.	1.4
3c. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	1.6	3. Was warm and supportive.	1.4	2e. Focused on here and now interactions.	1.4
4a. Focused on here and now interactions.	1.4	4a. Focused on here and now experiences.	1.2	3a. Responded in an emotional, and feeling manner.	1.2
4b. Actively listened.	1.4	4b. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance	1.2	3b. Gave feedback.	1.2
4c. Verbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.4	4c. Used humor.	1.2	3c. Asked open ended questions.	1.2
4d. Used humor.	1.4	4d. Responded in an emotional, feeling manner.	1.2	3d. Received feedback.	1.2
5a. Asked open ended questions.	1.2	5a. Self disclosed experiences.	1	4a. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1
5b. Nonverbally demonstrated acceptance.	1.2	5b. Gave feedback.	1	4b. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	1

Session Fourteen Measurement
(cont.)

Individual	Score	Whole Group	Score	Leader	Score
6. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her emotionally.	1	5c. Asked open ended questions.	1	5a. Was confronted by a group member.	0.8
7a. Self disclosed experiences.	0.8	5d. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them emotionally.	1	5b. Related more frequently to those members who were more like me emotionally.	0.8
7b. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her intellectually.	0.8	6a. Received feedback.	0.8	5c. Used humor.	0.8
8a. Was free, spontaneous, and immediate.	0.6	6b. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	0.8	6a. Self disclosed personal reactions.	0.6
8b. Demonstrated an understanding of issues being discussed.	0.6	7a. Modeled ethical awareness.	0.6	6b. Self disclosed experiences.	0.6
9a. Focused on members' past experiences	0.4	7b. Was confronted by a group member.	0.6	6c. Focused on members' past experiences.	0.6
9b. Utilized confrontation.	0.4	7c. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them intellectually.	0.6	6d. Modeled ethical awareness.	0.6
10a. Modeled ethical awareness.	0.2	8a. Utilized confrontation.	0.4	7. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me intellectually.	0.4

Session Fourteen Measurement
(cont.)

Individual	Score	Whole Group	Score	Leader	Score
10b. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	0.2	8b. Related more frequently to those members who were most like them physically.	0.4	8. Utilized confrontation.	0
10c. Asked closed ended questions.	0.2	9a. Was directive and structured.	0.2	9a. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	-0.2
10d. Related more frequently to those members who were most like him/her physically.	0.2	9b. Focused on members' past experiences.	0.2	9b. Related more frequently to those members who were most like me physically.	-0.2
11. Was directive and structured.	0	10. Focused on external, outside of group experiences.	0	10a. Was directive and structured.	-0.4
12. Was confronted by a group member.	-0.2	11. Asked closed ended questions.	-0.4	10b. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-0.4
13. Gave advice.	-0.2	12a. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-0.6	11a. Asked closed ended questions.	-0.6
14. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	-0.8	12b. Gave advice.	-0.6	11b. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	-0.6
15. Was guarded or tense.	-1	12c. Responded in a cognitive, logical manner.	-0.6	12. Gave advice.	-0.8
16. Was quiet and non-expressive.	-1.2	12d. Was guarded or tense.	-0.6	13. Was guarded or tense.	-1.2

REFERENCES

Back, K. (1951). Influence through social communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46, 9-23.

Back, K. (1979). The small group: Tightrope between sociology and personality. In M. Lakin (Ed.), What happened to small group research? Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 15(3), 283-295.

Bednar, R.L., & Kaul, T.J. (1978). Experiential group research: Current perspectives. In S.L. Garfield & A. E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of behavior change: An empirical analysis. New York: Wiley.

Berg, R.C., & Johnson, J.A. (1971). Group counseling: A source book of theory and practice (p. x). Fort Worth, TX: American Continental.

Berg, R.C., & Landreth, G. L. (1990). Group counseling: Concepts and procedures. Muncie, IN: Accelerated Development.

Berzon, B., Pious, C. & Farson, R.E. (1963). The theraputic event in group psychotherapy: a study of subjective reports by group members. Journal of Individual Psychology, 19, 204-212.

Bloch, S., & Crouch, E. (1985). Therapeutic factors in group psychotherapy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bloch, S., & Reibstein, J. (1980). Perceptions by patients and therapists of therapetuic factors in group psychotherapy. British Journal of Psychiatry, 137, 274-278.

Bloch, S., Reibstein, J., Crouch, E., Holroyd, P., & Themen, J. (1979). A method for the study of therapeutic factors in group psychotherapy. British Journal of Psychiatry, 134, 257-263.

Braaten, L.J. (1990). The different patterns of group climate critical incidents in high and low cohesion sessions of group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 40(4), 477-493.

Budman, S.H., Demby, A., Feldstein, M., Redondo, J., Scherz, B., Bennett, M.J., Koppenaal, G., Daley, B.S., Hunter, M., & Ellis, J. (1987). Preliminary findings on a new instrument to measure cohesion in group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 37, 75-93.

Budman, S.H., Soldz, S., Demby, A., Feldstein, M., Springer, T., & Davis, M.S. (1989). Cohesion, alliance, and outcome in group psychotherapy. Psychiatry, 52, 339-350.

Butler, T., & Fuhriman, A. (1980). Patient perspective on the curative process: A comparison of day treatment and outpatient psychotherapy groups. Small Group Behavior, 11, 371-388.

Butler, T., & Fuhriman, A. (1983). Level of functioning and length of time in treatment variables influencing patient's therapeutic experience in group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 33, 489-505.

Cartwright, D., & Zander, A. (1960). Group dynamics: Research and theory (2nd ed). New York: Harper and Row.

Clojin, S., Hoencamp, E., Snijders, H., Van Der Spek, M., & Duivenvoorden, H. (1991). A comparison of curative factors in different types of group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 41(3), 365-378.

Corey, G., Corey, M.S., Callanan, P., & Russell, J.M. (1992). Group techniques (2nd ed.). Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Corey, M.S., & Corey, G. (1992). Groups: Process and practice (4th ed.). Pacific Grove,CA: Brooks/Cole.

Corsini, R.J., & Rosenberg, B. (1955). Mechanisms of group psychotherapy: Processes and dynamics. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 51, 406-411.

Dickoff, H., & Lakin, M. (1963). Patient's views of group psychotherapy: Retrospection and interpretations. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 13, 61-73.

Dinkmeyer, D.C., & Muro, J.J. (1979). Group counseling: Theory and practice. Itasca,IL: F.E.Peacock.

Donigian, J. & Molnati, R. (1997). Systemic group therapy: A triadic model. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole.

Egan, G. (1973). Face to face. Monterey,CA: Brooks/Cole.

Erikson, E. (1963). Childhood and society (2nd ed.). New York: W.W. Norton.

Erikson, E. (1968). Identity: Youth and crisis. New York: Norton.

Ettin, M.F. (1988). "By the crowd they have been broken, by the crowd they shall be healed": The advent of group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 38(2), 139-167.

Ewen, R.B. (1988). An introduction to theories of personality (3rd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Festinger, L., Schachter, S., & Back, K. (1950). Social pressures in informal groups: A study of human factors in housing. Stanford,CA: Stanford University Press.

Flowers, J.V. (1987). Client outcome as a function of agreement or disagreement with the modal group perception of curative factors in short-term, structured group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 37, 31-37.

Freedman, S., & Hurley, J. (1979). Perceptions of helpfulness and behavior in groups. Group, 4, 51-58.

Friedlander, M.L., Thibodeau, J.R., Nichols, M.P., Tucker, C., & Snyder, J. (1985). Introducing semantic cohesion analysis: A study of group talk. Small Group Behavior, 16,285-302.

Gendlin, E.T. (1964). A theory of personality change. In P. Worchel & D. Byrne (Eds.), Personality change. New York: Wiley.

Gendlin, E.T., & Beebe, J. (1972). An experiential approach to group therapy. In R.C. Diedrich, & H.A. Dye (Eds.). Group procedures, purposes, processes and outcomes. New York: Wiley.

Gibb, J.R. (1964). Climate for trust formation. In Bradford, L.P., Gibb, J.R., & Benne, K.D.(Eds.). T-group theory and laboratory method. New York: Wiley.

Gibb, J., & Gibb, L. (1968). Emergence therapy: The TORI process in an emergent group. In G.M. Gazda (Ed.), Innovations to group psychotherapy. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Gladding, S. (1992). Trust and the group process. The Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 17(2), p.66.

Gomes-Schwartz, B. (1978). Effective ingredients in psychotherapy: Prediction of outcome from process variables. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46, 1023-1035.

Hansen, J.C., Warner, R.W., & Smith, E.J. (1980). Group counseling: Theory and process. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Jacobs, E.E., Harvill, R.L., & Masson, R.L. (1988). Group counseling: Strategies and skills. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Johnson, D.W., & Johson, F.P. (1987). Joining together (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Kapur, R., Miller, K., & Mitchell, G. (1988). Therapeutic factors within in-patient and out-patient psychotherapy groups. British Journal of Psychiatry, 152, 229-233.

Kirchner, B.J., Dies, R.R., & Brown, R.A. (1978). Effects of experimental manipulation of self-disclosure on group cohesiveness. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 46(6), 1171-1177.

Kivlighan, D.M., & Goldfine, D.C. (1991). Endorsement of therapeutic factors as a function of stage of group development and participant interpersonal attitudes. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38(2), 150-158.

Kivlighan, D.M., & Mullison, D. (1988). Participants' perceptions of therapeutic factors in group counseling: The role of interpersonal style and stage of group development. Small Group Behavior, 19(4), 452-468.

Korda, L.J., & Pancrazio, J.J. (1989). Limiting negative outcome in group practice. Journal for Specialists in Group Work, , 112-120.

Kottler, J. A. (1994). Advanced group leadership. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Krumboltz, J.D., & Potter, B.(1973). Behavioral techniques for developing trust, cohesiveness, and goal accomplishment. In J.Vriend & W.W. Dyer (Eds.) Counseling effectively in groups. New Jersey: Educational Technology.

Lakin, M. (1985). The helping group. Menlo Park,CA: Addison-Wesley.

Leszcz, M., Yalom, I.D., & Norden, M. (1985). The value of inpatient group psychotherapy and therapeutic process: Patient's perceptions. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 35(3), 411-433.

Lieberman, M., Yalom, I.D., & Miles, M. (1973). Encounter groups: First facts. New York: Basic Books.

Littlepage, G.E., Cowart, L., & Kerr, B. (1989). Relationships between group environment scales and group performance and cohesion. Small Group Behavior, 20, 50-61.

Luborsky, L. (1967). Momentary forgetting during psychotherapy and psychoanalysis: A theory and research method. In R.R. Holt (Ed.), Motives and thought

Psychoanalytic essays in honor of David Rapaport (pp. 177-217). New York:

International Universities Press.

MacDevitt, J.W.(1987). Conceptualizing therapeutic components of group

counseling. Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 76-84.

MacKenzie, K.R. (1983). The clinical application of a group climate measure. In

R.R. Dies & K.R. MacKenzie (Eds.), Advances in group psychotherapy: Integrating

research and practice. New York: International Universities Press.

Mahrer, A.R., & Nadler, W.P. (1986). Good moments in psychotherapy: A

preliminary review, a list, and some promising research avenues. Journal of Consulting

and Clinical Psychology, 54, 10-15.

Marcovitz, R.J., & Smith, J.E. (1983). Patients' perceptions of curative factors in

short-term group psychotherapy. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 33,

21-39.

Maslow, A. (1954). Motivation and personality. New York: Harper & Row.

Maslow, A. (1968). Toward a psychology of being. New York: Van Norstrand.

Maslow, A. (1971). The farther reaches of himan nature. New York: Viking.

Morran, D.K. (1982). Leader and member self-disclosing behavior in counseling

groups. Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 7, 218-223.

Mower, R.K. (1980). Level of functioning and length of time in treatment:

Variables influencing patients' therapeutic experience in group therapy. International

Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 33, 484-504.

Mudrack, P. E. (1989). Defining group cohesiveness: A legacy of confusion? Small Group Behavior, 20, 37-49.

Murphy, G. (1968). Psychological views of personality and contributions to its study. In E. Norbeck, D. Price-Williams, & W. McCord (Eds.), The study of personality: An interdisciplinary appraisal. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Murray, E.J. (1954). A case study in a behavioral analysis of psychotherapy. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49, 305-310.

Nicholas, M.W. (1984). Change in the context of group therapy. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Ohlsen, M.M. (1970). Group counseling. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Ohlsen, M.M. (1973). Readiness for membership in a counseling group. In J. Vriend & W.W. Dyer (Eds), Counsleing effectively in groups. New Jersey: Educational Technology.

Orlinsky, D.E., & Howard, K.I. (1978). The relation of process to outcome in psychotherapy. In S.L. Garfield & A.E. Bergin (Eds.), Handbook of psychotherapy and behavior change (pp.283-329). New York: Wiley.

Peteroy, E.T. (1983). Cohesiveness development in an ongoing therapy group. Small Group Behavior, 14(2), 269-272.

Posthuma, B.W. (1996). Small groups in counseling and therapy: Process and leadership (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Pruitt, D.G. (1965). Definition of the situation as a determinant of interactional action. In H.C. Kelman (Ed.), Interactional behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Roark, A.E., & Sharah, H.S. (1989). Factors related to group cohesiveness. Small Group Behavior, 20, 62-69.

Rogers, C.R. (1965). Client-centered therapy. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Rogers, C.R. (1967). The process of the basic encounter group. In Bugenthal, J.F. (Ed.), Challenges of humanistic psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Rogers, C.R. (1970). Carl Rogers on encounter groups. New York: Harper &Row.

Rotter, J.B. (1971). Generalized expectancies for interpersonal trust. American Psychologist, 26, 443-452.

Rugel, R.P. (1987). Achieving congruence in Tavistock groups: Empirical findings and and implications for group therapy. Small Group Behavior, 15(3), 361-374.

Schutz, W.C. (1958). FIRO: A three-dimensional theory of interpersonal behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Seeman, J. (1984). The fully functioning person: Theory and research. In R.F. Levant & J.M. Shlien (Eds.), Client-centered therapy and the person-centered approach: New directions in theory, research, and practice (pp.131-152). New York: Praeger.

Shaffer, J, & Galinsky, M.D. (1989). Models of group therapy (2nd ed.). Edgewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Stokes, J.P. (1983). Toward an understanding of cohesion in personal change groups. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 33(4), 449-466.

Stokes, J.P., Fuehrer, A, & Childs, L. (1983). Group member's self-disclosures: Relation to perceived cohesion. Small Group Behavior, 14, 63-76.

Stone, M.H., Lewis, C.M., & Beck, A.P. (1994). The structure of Yalom's curative factor scale. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 44(2), 239-245.

Strupp, H.H., Chasson. J.B., & Ewing, J.A. (1973). Success and failure in time-limited psychotherapy. Archives of General Psychiatry, 37, 595-603.

Trotzer, J.P. (1989). The counselor and the group: Integrating theory, training and practice. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Truax, C.B. & Carkhuff, R.R. (1967). Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy. Chicago:Aldine.

Tuckman, B.W. (1965). Developmental sequence in small groups. Psychological Bulletin, 63, 384-399.

Tuckman, B.W., & Jensen, M.A.C. (1977). Stages of small group development revisited. Group and Organizational Studies, 2, 419-427.

Tschuschke, V., & Dies, R. (1994). Intensive analysis of therapeutic factors and outcome in long-term inpatient groups. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 44(2), 185-208.

Watson, N. (1984). The empirical status of Rogers' hypotheses of the necessary and sufficient conditions for effective therapy. In R.F. Levant & J.M. Shlien (Eds.), Client-centered therapy and the person-centered approach: New directions in theory, research, and practice (pp.17-40). New York:Praeger.

Weiner, M. (1974). Genetic versus interpersonal insight. International Journal of Group Psychotherapy, 24, 230-237.

Weiner, M. (1984). Techniques of group psychotherapy. Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Press.

Whalen, G.S., & Mushet, G.L. (1986). Consumers' views of the helpful aspects of an inpatient psychotherapy group. British Journal of Medical Psycholgy, 59, 337-339.

Worchel, P. (1979). Trust and distrust. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of group relations. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Wright, T.L., & Duncan, D. (1986). Attraction to group, group cohesiveness, and individual outcome. Small Group Behavior, 17(4), 487-492.

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

Yalom, I.D. (1985). The theory and practice of group psychotherapy (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books.

Yalom, I.D., Tinklenberg, J., & Gilula, M. (1985). Curative factors in group therapy. In I.D. Yalom The theory and practice of group psychotherapy (2nd ed.). New York: Basic Books.