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An Evaluation of the Planning for
Living Workshop  (May 1974)

Herbert P. Koplowitz, B.A., Cornell University
M.S., University of Massachusetts
Directed by: Dr. James M. Royer

Thirty-five undergraduates participated in the Planning for Living Workshop. Data were collected that indicate the workshop can help participants clarify their goals, especially if they enter the workshop feeling unclear about their goals. It could not be established that the workshop affects locus of control. It was found that success of the workshop in clarifying goals does not depend on ability of the participant to interact on an intimate level. Suggestions were made for further research.
INTRODUCTION

Students at all levels are being offered greater freedom to pursue their studies according to their own desires. This increased freedom calls for greater support of the student to help him make his choices in his best interests. One such form of support would be to help the student become clearer about his goals inside and outside of school. In this paper, the needs for goal clarification are discussed, and a workshop that has been used to help students clarify their goals is described. Research relevant to this workshop is discussed, and a study of the effects of the workshop is described.

Student Freedom

In the past decade or so, an increasing number of educators have argued that students should have greater freedom than is traditionally allotted them to decide what and how they will learn. Several kinds of evidence have been presented supporting increased student control over his own education.

A. S. Neill (1960) has claimed that the child is "innately wise and realistic. If left to himself without adult suggestion of any kind, he will develop as far as he
is capable of developing." Neill's statement is based on his experience at Summerhill school which does allow greater freedom to its students. While evidence is not presented in Summerhill proving that children cannot benefit from "adult suggestion of any kind," the book does show that students can learn well with fewer restrictions and regulations than are usually placed upon them.

Like Neill, Carl Rogers has decided on the basis of his teaching experience that students are happiest and best adjusted when they learn what they themselves want to learn in their own learning styles. In Freedom to Learn, Rogers (1969) supports his views with anecdotal evidence from elementary school, college, and university classrooms in which amount of freedom given to students was varied.

On the basis of studies which were much more controlled than Neill's and Rogers', Mager and Clark (1963) concluded that it is worthwhile to give students freedom to learn according to their own learning styles, even when the material to be learned is the same for all students. Their studies were done on an industrial training program which had used lectures and an apprenticeship period to teach new employees the knowledge and skills necessary to work in the company. In the experimental condition, trainees were given a list of the objectives of the training course and the freedom to learn the material in any way they wished. Trainees
in the experimental condition were allowed to make whatever use they felt necessary of the company's personnel and other resources. The experimental group learned the material in less time and with less use of company personnel than did groups taught in the traditional manner.

The increasing number of open classrooms in the lower grades, and the decreasing number of requirements and restrictions in colleges and universities testify that arguments such as these are being heard. And it seems reasonable to expect that not everyone learns best in the same way, and that in any given educational setting the same learning goals will not be most appropriate to everyone. However, practices which enforce a uniformity of learning goals and learning methods on all students do play a supportive role which is fairly consistently ignored by arguers against such restrictions. The freedom to choose goals and methods is also a requirement to do so—a requirement which a student may be unprepared to fulfill.

Consider the student graduating from a high school with little freedom and entering a college with much freedom. He can now choose to learn what he wants to, and in many courses may choose from a number of ways of learning the course material. However, his previous experience leaves him unprepared to make choices in his best interests. He has little experience in discovering and resolving conflicts
among his purposes. He may be unskilled at relating his goals to the resources of his institution. In short, freedom may lead a student to failure, or to pursuit of education in a way even less suited to him than one which might be prescribed him by a restrictive institution.

In the "free" learning situations described by Neill (1960) and Rogers (1969), teachers played a supportive role in helping students decide what and how to learn. In the Mager and Clark (1963) study, students were given a twenty-four page description of what they were required to know. The typical college student has no such help in setting a direction for himself. The result may simply be his not making optimal use of the freedom he has been offered, or it may be lack of direction and identity, and alienation.

Thus, Lois Murphy writes:

We are familiar with students who find the multitudinous changes involved in leaving their home settings to come to Sarah Lawrance over-stimulating, especially when the home setting is very different from what they find in college. The experience of overstimulation is increased by the multitude of choices that must be made and the degree of responsibility for planning one's own program, the lack of structured groups, the need to find oneself socially as well as intellectually. In other words, some students feel themselves buffeted about by so many new currents and new experiences, new opportunities, demands, and challenges, that it is hard to organize their lives (Chickering, 1967, pp. 294-95).
Planning for Living Workshop

Students, then, often need help in clarifying their goals. For the purposes of this paper, a person will be said to have moved toward clarification of his goals if he does any of the following:

1. Becomes more aware of any of his goals.
2. Comes to realize what he must do in order to accomplish his goals.
3. Comes to realize what accomplishment of his goals would enable him to do.
4. Learns how his goals are interrelated.
5. Relates his goals to the resources and limitations of his environment.
6. Becomes more aware of the antecedents of his having the goals he has.

It can be seen from the above that goal clarification may entail goal construction. For example, a student may wish to help people learn. In clarifying this goal, he may come to realize that he could more easily accomplish it if he a) studied psychology and b) got a Ph.D.; he might then adopt these as goals.

There is a goal clarification process, the Planning for Living Workshop, suitable for use by students who want to bring their school-related purposes into sharper focus. The Planning for Living Workshop (hereafter referred to as
the workshop) was designed by Herb Shepard for TRW Industries. Shepard saw that middle level managers based their actions on the expectations of higher level managers rather than on their own desires and plans for the future. He designed the workshop as a means of helping middle level managers focus more on their own goals and thus, presumably, be better adjusted and more productive.

The workshop consists of seven questions (see Appendix A) which are answered by each participant. Participants then share their answers with other participants who discuss the answers, acting as consultants for each other. Groups consist of about half-a-dozen participants and one or two facilitators.

The design of the workshop allows one counselor to give attention to several people simultaneously, gives each participant the benefit of several people's perspective on his own situation, and gives each participant training in a process he can use again for goal clarification. Counselors who have used the workshop report that participants come to them immediately or months after the workshop saying that it has helped them put their lives in focus (Al Southworth, Van Richards, personal communications). However, the workshop typically lasts six to eight hours. The time commitment on the part of the participants and the counselor suggests that the effectiveness of the workshop should be evidenced by more than anecdotes. If the workshop is effective,
it would be of interest to know how it works. To date, however, very little research has been done on the workshop. The remainder of this paper will be concerned with research relevant to the workshop and on a study done by the writer on its effectiveness.

There are four areas of research that bear on the workshop:

1. There is a growing literature on the effectiveness of training groups (T-groups). T-groups are similar to the workshop in methods and purposes, and so T-group research gives some idea of the degree of change that the workshop can be expected to produce. Also, some of the methods used for evaluating T-group effectiveness would be applicable to the study of the workshop.

2. There is some experimental evidence implying that a person is more likely to accomplish a given goal if he believes that he himself (rather than fate) can determine whether the goal will be accomplished. There is also research suggesting that some of the activities that happen in the workshop are similar to treatments that increase people's feelings of control. If the workshop does help participants accomplish their goals, it may be due to an increase in the participants' feelings of control.

3. Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966) have run a number of studies which indicate the usefulness of values clarification
in increasing student effort, initiative, and achievement. Although their values clarification methods are quite different from the workshop, their work does suggest that helping a person get perspective and focus on his life does increase his achievement.

4. Lastly, there have been a few studies on the workshop itself.

Research on T-groups

The concept of the T-group is not well defined, but a few comments will be made here about the range of methods and purposes of what are called T-groups. This is especially important as the workshop differs in several ways from the T-groups which have been studied and this limits the relevance for this proposal of much of the T-group research.

Campbell and Dunnette (1968) in a review of research on T-group effectiveness list six participant outcomes as goals common to most T-groups:

1. Increased self-insight and self-awareness concerning one's behavior and its meaning in a social context.
2. Increased sensitivity to the behavior of others.
3. Increased awareness and understanding of the types of processes that facilitate or inhibit group functioning.
4. Heightened diagnostic skill in social, interpersonal, and intergroup situations.
5. Increased ability to intervene successfully in inter-
or intra-group situations so as to increase member satisfaction, effectiveness, or output.

6. Learning to analyze continually one's own behavior.
(Paraphrased from p. 75.)

Unlike the workshop, most T-groups do not have fixed formats. Rather, the T-group members "develop group norms, standards, power and friendship structures, patterns of communication, and shared problems on which to work . . . in an initially unstructured setting with the usual group controls absent (Burke and Bennis, 1961, p. 166)." The T-group leader typically refrains from behaving as an authority and acts only to keep the group members focused on the interpersonal and group problems occurring within the T-group itself.

A comparison between T-groups and the workshop will be made below, and this comparison will be related to the research on T-groups. The research reviewed is in two areas: studies of behavioral changes resulting from T-groups participation, and research on the relationship between T-groups and personality. Campbell and Dunnette (1960) note that in many of the T-group studies, the authors were unable to conclusively prove the effectiveness of T-groups or the relevance of any personality variable. This may be due to poor design or to the variance in quality of T-groups. The value of T-groups research here, however, is to document the changes that groups can produce, and to suggest research methods.
suitable for the study of the workshop. This review will then focus on a few studies which were able to produce conclusive results.

**Behavioral Changes Resulting from T-groups**

Among the studies which were able to show behavioral changes produced by T-groups is one by Burke and Bennis (1961) studying the effects of T-groups on the behavior of participants as viewed by themselves and others and on the behaviors participants would ideally exhibit. The authors asked participants to make descriptions at the beginning and end of an eight-week T-group of: their own behavior (S), their behavior as they would ideally wish it to be (I), and the behavior of others in their groups (O). The descriptions were made in terms of nineteen bi-polar adjective pairs, such as friendly/unfriendly, strong/weak, and active/passive. Their findings were as follows, where a "1" subscript indicates pre-test descriptions, and a "2" subscript indicates a post-test description:

1. Summing over participants and adjectives, $\sum (S_1 - I_1)^2 > \sum (S_2 - I_2)^2$. That is, at the end of the workshop participants saw their behavior as being closer to their ideals than they did at the beginning of the workshop.

2. Summing over subjects and adjectives, $\sum (S_1 - S_2)^2 > \sum (I_1 - I_2)^2$. That is, the changes in the ways participants saw their behavior were greater than the changes in the ways
they wanted their behavior to be. Thus, their first result, that participants became closer in behavior to the way they wanted to be, was due more to changes in their behavior than to changes in their ideals.

3. Summing over participants and adjectives, \( \Sigma (S_1 - O_1)^2 > \Sigma (S_2 - O_2)^2 \). That is, participants' descriptions of a given participant were closer to his own description of himself at the end of the workshop than they were at the beginning. This result, however, could probably be obtained in any group where participants who did not know each other well work together for eight weeks.

Burke's and Bennis' conclusions lose some credibility in their dependence on self-report. A study by Bunker (1965) overcame this weakness by adding reports of coworkers to self-reports. In this study, behavioral changes in experimental subjects, who had been in a T-group, were compared to behavioral changes in control subjects. Control subjects were nominated by experimentals on three bases: the control subject must have a job similar to the experimentals, the control subject must not have participated in a T-group, and he must have been willing to participate in a T-group. Both experimental and control subjects nominated five to seven peers, subordinates, and superiors, as raters of their behavioral changes.
Eight to ten months after the experimentals had participated in a T-group, they and their nominated control subjects were given the following questionnaire:

Over a period of time, people may change in the ways they work with other people. Since (month and year of the T-group) do you believe you have changed your behavior in working with people in any specific ways as compared with the previous year? Yes No. If yes, please describe.

A similar questionnaire was sent at the same time to the other raters of behavioral changes in experimental and control subjects in order to obtain their ratings.

After all responses were collected, the behavioral changes noted by respondents were divided into 15 categories. Bunker reported that "agreement between individual scoring decisions of trained scorers exceeded 90%." It should be noted that all of the categories were for behavioral improvements; all categories were defined in terms such as "subject is more receptive to new data" or "subject is more aware of . . . " and never "subject is less willing to . . . " or subject is less aware of . . . ". As the categories were derived from the changes reported by respondents, and were constructed so as to provide a category for all of the changes reported, it might be concluded that the only changes reported were positive ones. Bunker does not clarify this point.

What he did state was that more experimentals than control subjects were reported to have changed positively
in all but one of the categories. These differences were statistically significant in eleven categories. Three categories relevant to goal clarification in which experimentals were significantly better than controls are:

1. Awareness of human behavior—subject is more conscious of shy people act, more analytic of others' actions.

2. Tolerance of new information—subject is more receptive to new data and perspectives.

3. Insight into self and role—subject is more aware of what his job entails and more insightful of his own behavior.

The conclusions of the Burke and Dennis study and of the Bunker study will be discussed below with their relevance to goal clarification.

T-groups and Personality

As was noted above, studies of T-group effectiveness have given mixed results, Burke and Bennis and Bunker being among those who were able to document behavioral changes produced by T-groups. Research on T-groups and personality, however, has not been mixed; researchers have been consistently unable to prove a relationship between personality type and T-group outcome.

Campbell and Dunnette also cite several studies in which no significant differences in personality measures were found between pre-test and post-test scores. The Counseling Center for the University of Massachusetts (1971)
also found no significant pre-test to post-test differences in participants in a sensitivity group.

Campbell and Dunnette also cite several unsuccessful attempts to discover personality types best suited for T-groups. In these studies, researchers apparently had no hypothesis in mind, but simply administered general personality tests before a T-group, and some measure of effects of the T-group afterwards. It might prove more useful to give a specific personality measure with a specific hypothesis in mind.

One such hypothesis is the following. In order for a participant to benefit from a T-group or from the workshop, he must interact at a fairly intimate level with people he may never have met before. It would seem that a participant's score on a test of his ability to interact on an intimate level should correlate positively with a measure of change in him produced by a T-group or the workshop. In the present study the Capacity for Intimate Contact scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory was used to test this hypothesis.

**T-group Research and the Workshop**

A note is in order here on the relevance of T-group research to the workshop. There are differences between the intended outcomes of the workshop and those of T-groups, and differences in the means used to obtain these outcomes. However, both the workshop and T-groups make use of focused
group discussions facilitated by a leader, in order to change the participant's behavior and help him analyze his own behavior. T-group research indicates research methods that might be appropriate to the study of the workshop, and changes that one might reasonably expect the workshop to produce. Specific considerations drawn from T-group research are:

1. It seems unreasonable to expect the workshop to produce significant changes in personality.

2. It is plausible that the workshop can produce behavioral changes in participants, and that these changes would be ones participants would find favorable. Burke's and Bennis' use of bi-polar adjective pairs to describe behaviors could be used appropriately in studying the workshop.

3. Bunker (1965) has indicated a method suitable for workshop research of finding appropriate control subjects. In the present study, experimental subjects were asked to nominate peers as control subjects.

**Research on Locus of Control**

Campbell and Dunnette (1970) conclude that T-group research suffers from the lack of a theoretical base. Research on locus of control, however, is markedly influenced by a strong theoretical base, largely set forth by Julian Rotter (1966; Rotter, Chance and Phares, 1972). Rotter defines internal control as the belief that reinforcement is a result of ones own behavior and therefore under ones own
control. External control is defined as the belief that reinforcement is a result of chance, fate, or others' actions, and therefore not under one's own control. Research reviewed will be focused on correlates of internal control, and means of making the locus of control more internal.

In educational settings, internality of control correlates positively with achievement. Gottesfeld and Dozier (1966) reported that internals learned more than did externals in an O.E.O. training program. McGhee and Crandall (1968) likewise found internals to have better marks in school in grades 3, 5, 6, 8, and 12 (the only grades included in that study). They also found internals to have higher reading and arithmetic achievement scores in grades 3 and 5.

McGhee and Crandall interpret the greater achievement as being the result of internality of belief, and not vice versa. They believe that externals, believing that reinforcement is not a result of their own actions, are less likely to take actions which will, in fact, lead to reinforcement. In contrast, internals are more likely to take actions which will lead to reinforcement. McGhee and Crandall did not discuss the possibility that greater achievement is the cause of internality of control. The notion that one is responsible for his own success and failures is much more palatable to the successful person than it is to the failure.

It is plausible that internality of control and achievement each lead to the other, and McGhee and Crandall
refer to research which supports their interpretation. Internals have been found to spend more time in free-play activities of an intellectual nature, spend more time doing homework, and be more persistent in puzzle solving tasks than externals. Also, Davis and Phares (1967) found internals likely to seek more information than do externals when they are given the task of changing someone's opinion. The behaviors described by McGhee and Crandall and by Davis and Phares could very plausibly be results of internal control and would lead to success. Increasing the internality of someone's control would, then, facilitate his achieving success.

Lefcourt (1967) mentions that very little research has been done on means of moving locus of control inward. He cited an earlier study which supported the hypothesis that externals can be made to behave more as internals at tasks where the task has been linked with earlier ones at which the subject has had some success. In this study, a group of blacks who had been identified as externals increased their persistance at a task when led to believe that the skills necessary for the task were related to achievement in jazz.

Lefcourt (1967) was able to lead externals to act as internals by explicitly stating how success at a task was dependent on the subject's skill. The task was Rotter's Level of Aspiration board, a simple game where the player's score is dependent both upon the player's ability to predict
his success at a physical task, and upon his ability at that task. One group of subjects was simply told that the board was well-liked by children, but that it was not known how adults would react to it. A second group of subjects was told that success at the task was related to motor control skills. The third group was told that success depended on self control of motor movements and insight into ones abilities. On a number of dependent measures, externals resembled internals the most under the strong cue condition, and least under the no cue condition.

Gottesfeld and Dozier (1966) used Rotter's I-E Scale to measure locus of control in trainees in an O.E.O. program and in community organizers who had been at work for some period of time after having completed the training program. The latter group was significantly more internal than was the former.

The Gottesfeld and Dozier study suggests that familiarity with the ways in which one has control over his own reinforcement, and practice in exercising that control lead to internal control. The studies discussed by Lefcourt (1967) indicate that an external can be led to act as an internal when success at a task is related to the subject's skills, and when the task is related to tasks at which the subject has had some success. The workshop can make a participant more aware of ways in which he has control over his own
reinforcement, can show how accomplishment of his goals is dependent on certain of his skills, and can relate for the participant some of his goals to tasks at which he has had past success. The workshop may, then, move the locus of control of the participants inward.

It is of interest to find whether the workshop moves locus of control because there is reason to believe that internal control facilitates goal accomplishment. It would also be of interest to find the effects of the workshop on locus of control because of Herb Shepard's intents in designing the workshop. It was created to help middle level managers to take control over their lives. One step in this direction would seem to be to increase the belief the participant has in his control over his reinforcement.

Values Clarification

In order for a person to accomplish his goals efficiently, it is not sufficient for him to believe himself to be in control over his reinforcement; he must also have a clear sense of himself and his purposes. This can be achieved through goal clarification or through values clarification. Raths, Harmin, and Simon (1966) have made a number of studies on means and effects of values clarification in elementary and high school classrooms. Although values are different from goals, and values clarification is different from goal clarification, there are meaningful similarities between the
two kinds of clarification. There is also reason to believe that goal clarification may have some of the effects that values clarification has.

Some characteristics common to values clarification methods are:

1. The student is induced to take a position on a moral question, to state what it is about a particular activity that makes him like it, or otherwise discover and affirm a value of his.

2. The teacher refrains from moralizing, giving advice, or pushing a student. This is to prevent the student from affirming a value because of perceived pressure to affirm some value, rather than out of his beliefs.

3. The teacher attempts to look at the student's statements through the latter's point of view, accepts and supports any affirmation of values, and attempts to induce the student to explore his own values and how they are related to each other and to his actions.

There are obvious parallels here to the workshop. In the workshop, participants must state, and therefore become more aware of, their goals. The workshop leader should not moralize, advise, or push participants. The workshop is designed to help the participant explore his goals and how they are related to each other and to actions he must take. Both values clarification and goal clarification should serve
to enable the participant to assimilate the world by his own terms rather than accommodate to the expectations of the people, society, and systems around him.

The experiments and quasi-experiments discussed by Raths et al. were all done on elementary school and high school children, but it seems reasonable to generalize their results to college populations.

Values clarification was found to have the following effects:

1. Slow learners became more purposeful and active.
2. Students became more purposeful and active.
3. The following kinds of behavior were reduced: apathy, flightiness, uncertainty, inconsistency, drifting, overconformity, overdissenting, and role playing.

All of the above results would make a person more likely to accomplish his own goals, which gives more reason to believe that the workshop might help a person achieve his own goals.

Research on the Workshop

Research on values clarification dates back to the 1960's as does locus of control research, and studies of T-groups date back further. Research on the workshop, however, is in its very beginnings, and this writer has seen only one study on the workshop.

Ursula Delworth (1972) researched the effects of the
workshop on its participants, concentrating on three areas:

1. Participants' feelings about the helpfulness of the workshop. Delworth reported that 80% of the respondents to her post-workshop questionnaire viewed the workshop as being a "helpful or very helpful experience." (The return rate for the questionnaire was 59%.)

2. Effects of the workshop on locus of control. It was reported that the pre-workshop I-E scores were higher (indicating more external control) than post-workshop I-E scores.

3. Students' success in accomplishing their behavioral goals. It was reported that data were collected on the success of participants in accomplishing their goals, but the results were not reported.

Delworth also cites an earlier study which found the workshop to have "marked influence on the participants' perception of 'self' and 'others.' In each case there was an increase in saliency or 'meaningfulness' of the concepts."

The lowering of I-E scores in the Delworth study confirms hypotheses discussed above on means of internalizing locus of control. Her finding that at least one-half of the participants find the workshop useful would be more meaningful if these feelings were correlated with behavioral changes.

Very different conclusions were drawn from a pilot study run by this writer in conjunction with Al Southworth of the University of Massachusetts Counseling Center. The workshop was offered to students entering their first year of
the psychology graduate program as part of an orientation program. The pilot had the same overall purposes as the present study: to measure participants' feelings of the value of the workshop, and to determine the success of the workshop in clarifying participants' goals, facilitating their goal accomplishment, and moving locus on control inward.

Only ten students took advantage of the workshop, and the only instrument that was reasonable to administer was a questionnaire to gauge participants' feelings about the value of the workshop in clarifying their goals. Six questionnaires were returned. All of the responses were overwhelmingly negative, indicating the participants felt the workshop to be of no value in clarifying their goals. Most participants did indicate, however, that they felt the workshop to be useful as a means of learning about the department and other people in it.

The questionnaire responses and conversations with people invited to participate in the workshop lead to the following conclusions:

1. It is of questionable value to offer the workshop to people first entering an institution. The workshop was offered to new students to enable them to become clearer about their purposes, so they might better assimilate the department and its resources. The students indicated, however,
that at the beginning of the graduate program they were much more interested in becoming clear about the expectations of people in the department in order to better accommodate to them. First year students were thus not very interested in participating in the workshop, and those who participated did not do so enthusiastically.

2. The questionnaire used was not positively biased. Response to the questionnaire indicated that participants are able to reject the workshop as useless for purposes of goal clarification, and are able to separate its usefulness for other purposes from the question of its goal clarifying value.

The Present Study

The present study had two general purposes. The first was to systematically gather opinions on the value and effects of the workshop, and ideas on how the workshop might be improved. This was done through the use of two questionnaires, one administered three days after the workshop, and the other four to six weeks afterwards. The questionnaires consisted of both specific (yes/no) questions with room for elaboration of answers, and of open-ended questions. The major focus of the questionnaires was on effects of the workshop on goal clarity, but there were also questions on goal accomplishment and on other aspects of the workshop.
The second purpose of the study was to test some specific hypotheses about the workshop. These were as follows:

1. For two of the following hypotheses, a measure was needed for the degree of success of the workshop in clarifying participants' goals. As twenty of the questions on the first questionnaire asked the participant if the workshop had had a particular clarifying effect on his goals, it seemed appropriate to use the number of "yes" answers to these questions as that measure. To create a consistency check on that measure, participants were also asked to rate the goal-clarifying value of the workshop on a scale from one (indicating the workshop was useless as a clarifier) to ten (indicating it was very valuable for that purpose). It was hypothesized that ratings on the value question would correlate positively with number of "yes" answers to the twenty questions of goal-clarifying effects of the workshop.

2. For several reasons, the workshop might be expected to increase participants' belief in their control over their own lives. First, the workshop is designed to lead the participant to identify his goals, the resources he has to accomplish them, and the steps he must take to accomplish them; these would seem to be the first steps in gaining control over ones life. Also, the workshop might have within it several factors which have been found experimentally to internalize locus of control (Lefcourt, 1967; Gottesfeld and
Dozier, 1966). These include increasing the participant's awareness of how accomplishing his goals depends on actions he can take, and increasing the participant's awareness of similarities between present goals and past accomplishments.

The most accepted measure of locus of control is Rotter's I-E Scale. This was given to half of the participants before the workshop and to all participants afterwards. A low score on the test indicates internal locus of control, and a high score indicates external locus of control. It was hypothesized that the mean I-E score for the group that took the test only after the workshop would be lower than the mean pre-workshop score for the other group.

3. As was mentioned above, the workshop might contain factors which have been found experimentally to internalize locus of control. There has not been much work on factors which internalize locus of control, and this study provided the opportunity to test some earlier findings. The questionnaire administered three days after the workshop contained five questions asking the participant if the workshop had had specific effects on him which had been found in other studies to internalize locus of control. For the group that took the I-E both before and after the workshop, it was hypothesized that decrease in I-E score (indicating internalizing of control) would correlate positively with number of "yes" answers to those five questions.
4. Internality of control had been found to correlate positively with achievement of goals set by authorities in and O.E.O. training program (Gottesfeld and Dozier, 1966) and in grade school children (McGhee and Crandall, 1968). This study provided the opportunity to study the relationship between locus of control and achievement of self-set goals in college students. All participants had been asked in the first questionnaire, administered three days after the workshop, to list goals they had set for themselves to accomplish in the time before the second questionnaire would be administered. In the second questionnaire, administered four to six weeks after the workshop, each participant was presented with a list of goals, three of which were goals he had set for himself; he was asked to check off all of the goals on the list which he had accomplished. The number of self-set goals checked by each participant was counted. It was hypothesized that number of self-set goals accomplished would correlate negatively with I-E score.

5. It was hoped that participation in the workshop would facilitate not only goal clarification but also goal achievement. To test this, each participant was instructed to nominate a peer who would, in the same manner as did the participant, first state goals he had set for himself, and four to six weeks later indicate how many goals he had accomplished. It was hypothesized that mean number of self-set goals accomplished would be greater for participants than
for peers.

6. It would seem that becoming clear about one's goals would help one accomplish them. It was hypothesized that degree of effect of the workshop on goal clarity (as measured by number of positive responses to the twenty questions described in (1) above) would correlate positively with goal accomplishment (as measured in (4) above).

7. A factor was sought which might predict degree of effectiveness of the workshop on clarity of participants' goals. Ability to interact with others in discussions of intimate matters might be such a factor. It seems that a participant must share fairly personal aspects of his life with other participants in order to benefit from the workshop. In this regard, it would seem that the greater one's ability to interact at an intimate level with others, the greater would be the effect of the workshop on him. Participants were administered the Capacity for Intimate Contact (CIC) scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory. The scale is a measure of ability to interact at an intimate level, and a high score on it indicates high ability. It was predicted that score on the CIC would correlate positively with number of "yes" answers to the twenty questions described in (1) above.
METHOD

Subjects

Thirty-five undergraduate and graduate students at the University of Massachusetts participated in workshops and served as experimental subjects (see Table 1). In addition, each experimental subject chose a peer to serve as a control subject.

The experimental subjects were recruited from psychology courses. They were told that the workshop was intended for students who were unclear about their purpose for being in school, and that a study was being made to find out how well the workshop served its function. They were also informed they would receive a small amount of academic credit in their psychology course for participation in the workshop.

TABLE 1
DATA ON PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juniors</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>34</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Procedure

Each participant attended one workshop, at which time he also took several personality measures; he also filled out one questionnaire three days after the workshop and one at the end of the semester (four to six weeks after the workshop).

A total of seven workshops were held, each lasting between five and eight hours. The length of workshops seemed to depend most upon the number of participants, which varied from three to seven; the greater the number of participants, the longer a workshop would take. Although data were not collected systematically on the matter, quality of participation in the workshops did not seem to depend on number of participants. A counselor in a University counseling center ran one of the workshops, and the writer led the other six.

At the beginning of each workshop the participants were again told that a study was being conducted to determine the effects of the workshop and that any personal information about participants would be held confidential. Each participant was then given a numbered envelope containing the materials he would need that day, and questionnaire A (see Appendix B). The envelopes were numbered consecutively, thus assigning a subject number to each participant.

Participants began by taking a pencil and paper test (see Table 2). Odd-numbered subjects took a test containing the questions from Rotter's I-E and the questions from the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day of workshop:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-workshop</td>
<td>Odd-numbered participants take CIC and Rotter's I-E scale. Even-numbered participants take CIC.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>All participants participate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-workshop</td>
<td>All participants take Rotter's I-E scale and take home copies of questionnaire A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three days after workshop:</td>
<td>Participants return questionnaire A to experimenter's office with participant and peer sections filled out.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last week of classes (four to six weeks after workshop):</td>
<td>Participants pick up questionnaire B at experimenter's office and return it within the week with participant and peer section filled out.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Capacity for Intimate Contact (CIC) scale from the Personal Orientation Inventory mixed together randomly. Even-numbered subjects took the CIC. When all participants had finished their tests, the workshop proceeded in the usual manner, described in the Introduction.

At the end of the workshop, all participants took the I-E. They were then instructed to fill out questionnaire A in three days, to have a peer fill out the appropriate part of the questionnaire, and to return it to the experimenter. They were informed that the peer should be someone who, though willing to attend a workshop, had not done so, and who was as similar as possible to the participant in year in school and major.

Questionnaire A consisted of three parts. The first part asked for data on the participant, and asked his opinion on the effects of the workshop and how it could be improved. The second part asked the participant to list between three and ten goals that he hoped to accomplish before the end of the semester, and to give the probability that he would accomplish each one. In the third part the participant's peer was to similarly list his goals for the rest of the semester with their probabilities.

Of the 35 participants, 34 filled out questionnaire A and returned it to the experimenter's office. They were instructed to return to that office during the last week of
school to pick up a copy of questionnaire B. Those who did not pick up questionnaire B were contacted by phone.

Questionnaire B was constructed as follows. From each list of participant and peer goals in questionnaire A, the three goals given highest probability were chosen and put in random order into two lists. One list consisted of all the goals taken from odd-numbered participants and their peers, and the other consisted of all goals taken from even-numbered participants and their peers. Two copies each of the appropriate list were then included in each participant's questionnaire B. On one copy, the participant was to check off every goal on the list he had accomplished regardless of whether the goal was one he had written in questionnaire A. The peer was to fill out the other copy of the list similarly. Questionnaire B also contained five questions on the effects of the workshop to be answered by the participant (see Appendix C). Twenty-eight participants and 23 peers filled out their parts of questionnaire B.
RESULTS

It had been assumed that all participants came to the workshop because of a felt need to clarify goals. However, some came because they wanted to learn how to help other people clarify their goals, and some came just for the academic credit. Although the information was not specifically sought, 14 participants indicated at some point on their questionnaires that they already felt clear about their goals before the workshop and came to it for other reasons. Some of the statistics taken from the 34 participants who filled out questionnaire A differ from those taken only from the 20 who are assumed to have come to the workshop out of a felt lack of clarity of goals. Where there is a sizeable difference, statistics from both groups will be reported; otherwise all statistics are taken from data from all 34 participants.

Specific Hypotheses

1. Questions 3-22 on questionnaire A mentioned twenty ways in which the workshop might have clarified a participants goals, and asked the participant whether his goals had in fact been clarified by the workshop in the mentioned ways. The total number of positive answers to these questions is
used below as a measure of the success of the workshop in clarifying a participant's goals. To create a consistency check, each participant was also asked (on question 25 of the questionnaire A) to rate the value of the workshop in clarifying his goals; the ratings were done on a scale of one to ten, a high rating representing high value. The correlation between these two measures of the success of the workshop in clarifying the participants' goals was .76 (p<.001, n = 34), indicating consistency.

2. To test whether the workshop had an internalizing effect on participant locus of control, odd-numbered subjects took Rotter's I-E test both before and after the workshop, and the even-numbered subjects took it only afterwards. Odd-numbered subjects averaged 12.3 before and 10.2 after; even-numbered subjects averaged 12.7 in their post-workshop test. (Possible scores range from 0-23 with low scores indicating internal control.) An internalizing effect was not indicated, as the post-workshop score for the even group was greater than the pre-workshop score for the odd group (See Table 3).

Other data on the matter came from question 5 on questionnaire B which asked the participant if the workshop had increased his feeling of having control over his own life. Of twenty-three clear answers to this question, five were positive.

3. Questions 19-23 on questionnaire A are concerned with factors that have been found to internalize locus of control.
These questions tended to be answered positively (see Appendix B), indicating that the workshop contained such factors. To test whether those factors would increase a person's belief in his control over his life in the context of the workshop, the number of positive answers to questions 19-23 was correlated with decrease in I-E score. (This could only be done for odd-numbered subjects, as they were the only ones to take the I-E both before and after the workshop.) The obtained correlation of .44 (p < .06, n = 15) supports the hypothesis that the factors do internalize control. As will be discussed below, however, the meaningfulness of this correlation is in question because of indications that the workshop does not internalize locus of control.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Odd-numbered Participants</th>
<th>Even-numbered Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-workshop</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-workshop</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. This study provided an opportunity to test the relationship between locus of control and achievement. Locus of control was measured by the post-workshop I-E test, and
achievement was measured by number of self set goals that the participant indicated on questionnaire B that he had achieved. The hypothesis that internality of control correlates positively with achievement predicts a negative correlation between I-E and number of goals achieved. The obtained correlation was, in fact, small and positive, being .04 (p > .41, n = 28) for the whole group and .34 (p < .11, n = 15) for those who came to the workshop unclear about their goals.

5. To see if the workshop facilitated accomplishment of goals, both participants and their peers were asked to indicate on questionnaire B goals they had accomplished, and the number of self-set goals accomplished by each person was counted. As Table 4 indicates, the mean number of self-set goals achieved was 2.10 for participants and 1.76 for their peers, and the difference approaches significance (p .15). As is discussed below, this result is probably conservative as participants tended to write fewer goals than did their peers on questionnaire A.

6. It had been predicted that number of personally set goals accomplished would correlate positively with effect of the workshop on goal clarity as measured by number of positive answers to questions 3-22 on questionnaire A. For all participants, the obtained correlation was .29 (p < .07, n = 28), and for participants who came to the workshop unclear about their goals it was .49 (p < .04, n = 15).
TABLE 4
GOAL SETTING AND GOAL ACCOMPLISHMENT
OF PARTICIPANTS AND PEERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Participants</th>
<th>Peers</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean number goals written in A</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number goals accomplished</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean number self-set goals accomplished</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>&lt;.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other data on goal accomplishment came from answers to the first three questions on questionnaire B. The first question asked if the workshop had affected any decisions made by the participant since the workshop. Twelve participants answered positively, and 12 answered negatively. In elaborations to positive answers, 5 participants said the workshop had made them better organized, 3 said that it made them motivated to act on their goals, and 3 said that it had focussed them on their goals. The issue of motivation was also raised in some participants' answers to some questions on questionnaire A. Several reported that looking at their fantasies and goals got them moving to make them reality;
several others reported that the workshop helped them see what it was they wanted, but did not motivate them to act on their goals. A few participants stated that the workshop made them realize that if they were to get where they wanted to go they would have to initiate appropriate action.

The second question of questionnaire B asked if the workshop had affected the participant's ability to achieve his goals. Ten responded positively and 14 negatively. Reasons cited for increased ability to achieve goals included better self-organization, increased motivation, clearer focus on goals, better knowledge of resources, and greater self-confidence.

Question 3 asked whether the participant had acted on any decision he had made or information he had received in the workshop. There were 16 positive and 7 negative replies. Of those who responded positively, 10 listed decisions they had acted on, and 5 indicated there was information they had received at the workshop which they had since acted on.

7. The Capacity for Intimate Contact (CIC) scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory was given to all participants as it was thought that it might predict a subject's participation in the workshop, and therefore the value of the workshop for him. The correlation obtained between total number of positive responses to questions 3-22 and score on the CIC was in fact insignificant ($r = -.10$, $p > .27$, $n = 34$).
Although scores on the CIC ranged from 12-26 (out of a possible 0-28) participation in the workshop was fairly consistent across participants. Except for two or three participants who did not speak except to give minimal answers to questions about themselves, all participants spoke freely about their own lives and commented freely on other participants' statements. Although no effort was made on the part of the facilitator to steer conversation towards the intimate, the statements of some participants would clearly be, in most social contexts, embarrassingly revealing. Most of the participants in all of the workshops accepted and supported other participants' attempts to benefit from participation. One participant wrote, "My faith in people to feel, to share, to care for one another, was restored. I also enjoyed the chance to talk and get feedback on what I felt and thought was important." Another wrote, "[The workshop] got me talking, which is a miracle in itself. I usually have a hard time opening myself up like this to strangers--[it] made me feel at ease around strangers."

**Other Effects of the Workshop**

The major interests of the writer in this study were on the effects of the workshop on goal clarity and goal accomplishment. Participants' reports make it clear, however, that the workshop had equally large effects on other areas.
A surprising number of participants reported they enjoyed the workshop because of people they met there, or that they remembered the workshop mainly in terms of other participants. The fourth question on questionnaire B asked whether the participant had thought about the workshop in ways unrelated to goals and decisions. Seven replied negatively and 16 replied positively. Of the latter group, 6 answered in terms of people they had met. Typical statements were, "I thought of others involved and whether they had accomplished their goals or not," and "I saw one of the girls that was in the workshop I was in. When I saw her, I felt I knew quite a lot about her, just from the workshop."

Question 27 on questionnaire A asked whether the participant would go to a similar workshop in a year. Eighteen responded positively and 16 negatively. The most common reason given for positive answers was "to meet people."

Question 31 on questionnaire A asked what part of the workshop was most useful. Thirteen said that listening to others was the most important part, 4 said that talking to others was, and 3 said it was meeting people.

A second effect of the workshop on some participants was to increase their energy and self-confidence. One participant felt the increase of self-confidence came from other participants' being interested when he spoke of his own goals. Several spoke of increased self-confidence from learning that
other students were quite unsure about what they wanted to do. Writing of her increased energy, one participant said, "With the sudden surge of energy I experience during and after the workshop, I had to consider why I felt this way. I relearned that I am able to think better about myself with others' support and feedback rather than alone."

A third effect of the workshop may have been to make some participants more future oriented. Question 24 on questionnaire A asked if the workshop had made the participant think of his direction and presence in school more in terms of where he wanted to go than in terms of others' expectations of him. Nineteen of 34 participants responded positively, and of the 20 participants who came to the workshop unclear about their goals, 14 responded positively. In other areas of the questionnaires, several participants indicated that since the workshop they had begun to make plans for the first time, and that they were more particular in choosing their courses.

**Degree of Effect of the Workshop on Participants**

One of the strongest impressions one gets from reading the 62 questionnaires is that the effects of the workshop on the 34 respondents varied greatly both in amount and in kind. The one generalization that can be made is that almost all of
the participants enjoyed the workshop. This was apparent to the writer during the six workshops he led, and is reflected in the questionnaires. Not one participant took advantage of the lunch break to drop out of a workshop, though all knew the session might last an additional four hours after lunch. As to why the workshop was enjoyable, or as to what benefits the participant received from participation, there is no consistency.

An effort was made to group participants according to whether the workshop had a slight, moderate, or great effect on them, and to draw generalizations about the groups. Participants were grouped first according to their responses to question 25 on questionnaire A, which asked the participant to rate the goal clarifying value of the workshop on a scale of 1-10. Participants were considered slightly effected if they responded with 1, 2, or 3, moderately affected if they responded with 4, 5, 6, or 7, and highly effected if they responded with 8, 9, or 10. After the initial groups were made 6 participants were moved to different groups because their answers to other questions on the questionnaire indicated that their answers to question 25 were not representative of the overall effect the workshop had on them. Of these, 4 were moved because it was felt their response to question 25 was unrepresentatively low, and 2 because their answers were unrepresentatively high.
Eleven participants were almost entirely negative about the workshop in terms of its having any effect on their thoughts or behavior. None of them said he would go to a similar workshop in a year, but 9 would recommend the workshop to a friend who was unclear about his goals. Ten of the 11 indicated they were clear about their goals before entering the workshop. Several said they had enjoyed listening to others. Several said they came to learn how to help others clarify their goals, and one came only for the academic credit.

Although all eleven returned questionnaire B, their answers tended to be negative and to have little elaboration. A few mentioned that it had been a pleasant day or that they had thought about people they had met at the workshop.

Fourteen people indicated that the workshop had a moderate effect on their thought or behavior. There is no apparent way of summarizing effects reported, and it seems more appropriate to quote some comments from questionnaire A. (Numbers in parentheses refer to the question being answered.)

(22) "It made me realize something I always knew—that you have to work on something to get it done and you always have to start it first."

(25) "The workshop was a good experience . . . . It didn't change my opinions about my goals that much. It served as a clarification only in that I had to tell people
what my goals are. I had to explain them."

(25) "The only reason it helped me was because I noticed how happy I felt when I activated my goal in my fantasy week. That made me feel like--yes that's what I've got to do."

(25) "I already knew what my goals were so the workshop didn't help in that respect. However, I didn't attend for clarifying my goals but mainly to listen to others and learn what I could from them. So for the reason I attended I think the workshop was well worthwhile."

(27) "It's always fun to rap about your life with others."

(28) "It was worthwhile . . . because other people thought of things maybe I wouldn't have thought much about. People have done pretty much what I want to do and I could see how it worked."

(28) "My faith in people to feel, to share, to care for one another was restored. I also enjoyed the chance to talk and get feedback on what I felt and thought was important."

(29) "The workshop clarified some goals somewhat but more it made you really think who you are what you are doing etc. and gave a person a better understanding of people to a degree but most to try to understand yourself."

Eleven people in this group returned questionnaire B. Of these, 3 had since forgotten about the workshop or felt it had had no effect on them at that point. There was a wide range of effects reported in the eight other questionnaires,
including actions on decisions made in the workshop, feelings about people met in the workshop, increased confidence in ideas, and use made of workshop exercises in other contexts.

Nine participants were enthusiastic about the workshop, and of them 8 said they would go to a similar workshop in a year. Again, there is no apparent way to generalize about the effects of the workshop on these participants, and some quotations would be appropriate.

(3) "[I became aware] that I really would like to be a teacher."

(10) "It gave me confidence in my own decision."

(20) "It made me aware that I pursue something with a great deal of energy that involves no peer competition and then drop it when competition does appear even though I had developed the ability to compete. This gave me a different perspective in choosing courses."

(22) "[I realized] I have to assert myself and become more aggressive in finding out adequate information."

(25) "It opened my eyes to other people's experiences and feelings. Can't explain why but it felt good and made me think a little clearer."

(10) "It really showed me how other people have been ruling my life. Now I'm going to start doing what I want to do and not what others want me to do or become."

(27) "It was a good experience which gave direction not
only to me but to a group of people for eight hours— that's good."

(27) "I completely enjoyed the experience and found it valuable in terms of it being the first time that I had to think about certain things."

(28) "The workshop showed me that I am not the only one who was unsure of his future goals."

Of this group, only seven returned questionnaire B, and of these one did not answer questions one through five on it. The six that were filled out were all positive and focused on action (increased motivation, resources used, goals achieved) rather than on people met. One respondent wrote:

The workshop made me ask, probably for the first time, who the hell am I—what am I really doing that I really thought for the first time about my past life etc. which enables you to set your goals etc. better and carry them out. It was an enjoyable and very helpful experience in many ways besides and including goal direction.

Improvements for and Strong Points of the Workshop

An effort was made to obtain information on how the workshop can be improved. Unfortunately, there is nothing resembling a consensus on this question. Some participants wanted more abstract and fantasizing exercises, while others found the fantasy exercises to be a waste of time and wanted more exercises on concrete planning. Several people felt it was too long to be held on one day and should have been broken
down into several days; at least one felt there was value in having the whole workshop in one intensive day. Several participants felt the workshop would have been more valuable had it extended over several weeks or months as a support group. Some felt it should be restricted to freshmen or to people who were unclear about their goals.

In answer to question 31 of questionnaire A ("What part of the workshop was most useful to you?") 8 favored fantasy exercises, 6 preferred exercises on resources, and 5 cited the lifeline exercise as being most valuable. Those who found the lifeline to be the most valuable part tended not to indicate why they preferred it. Participants who found fantasy exercises best cited the fun of it and the lack of opportunity to do it in daily life as their reasons for preferring them. Some reported that fantasizing was motivating, while others said it was frustrating in that it showed them what they wanted but did not motivate them to pursue it.

The issue of resources appears in answer to this question and in other parts of questionnaires. The writer felt the sharing of information about resources to be a prominent part of the workshops. Many participants reported having acted on information about resources that they received at the workshop.
DISCUSSION

The discussion will be in two parts: first an evaluation of specific hypotheses, and second a critique of the present study with recommendations for further research. An intended section on suggested improvements for the workshop is precluded by the absence of consistent data on the matter.

Specific Hypotheses

1. The number of positive answers given to questions 3-22 on questionnaire A is used as a measure of the value of the workshop in clarifying a participant's goals. To check the consistency of this measure with the participant's opinion, question 25 on questionnaire A asked the participant to rate the goal clarifying value of the workshop on a scale of one to ten. The obtained correlation of .76 (p<.001, n = 34) between these two measures established their consistency.

2. It had been predicted that post-workshop locus of control (as measured by Rotter's I-E scale given to one group after the workshop) would be more internal than pre-workshop locus of control (as measured by the I-E given to another group before the workshop). The virtual equality of the post- and pre-workshop measures indicates that locus of control was not affected by the workshop. There is, however, one puzzling fact to be explained. The odd-numbered subjects,
who provided the pre-workshop measure, also took the I-E afterwards. Their scores dropped by an average of 2.1 points, indicating increased internality of control. Possible interpretations of this decrease will be given below.

3. It was hypothesized that the workshop would internalize the locus of control of a participant to the extent that it showed him how his present goals were similar to tasks he had succeeded at previously, and that it showed him how his success could be affected by actions he could take. The correlation of .44 (p<.06, n = 15) between number of positive answers to questions 19-23 on questionnaire A and decrease of I-E score tends to support this hypothesis. However, the data on hypothesis 2 above indicate that the workshop did not affect locus of control. It is difficult to make sense of the decrease in I-E scores for odd-numbered subjects, and of the correlation between the decrease and the number of positive answers to questions 19-23. As subject numbers were assigned randomly, it seems unlikely that the odd-numbered group actually started out with more internal control than the even-numbered group. There are at least two other possibilities.

First, it is possible that taking the I-E before the workshop changes the experience by making one more aware of control issues during the workshop. In this case, it would
be concluded that the workshop internalizes locus of control, but only for people who have just been forced to make decisions about locus of control. Degree of decrease of I-E score would then depend on the effect of the workshop on the issues mentioned in questions 19-23.

Second, it is possible that participants felt, at some level of consciousness, a responsibility to indicate that the workshop increased their feeling of control over their lives. At least one participant indicated on a questionnaire that he felt an emphasis on the issue of control in the workshop. In this case, odd-numbered subjects might remember their pre-workshop answers on the I-E, and fill out the test more internally after the workshop. Felt responsibility to indicate movement of locus of control would then depend on the effect of the workshop on the participant as measured by number of positive answers to questions 19-23. (Effect of the workshop could also be measured by number of positive answers to questions 3-22, as the correlation between that measure and decrease in I-E is .49.) Assuming the workshop does not affect locus of control, the even-numbered group would score the same after the workshop as they would have before the workshop had they taken a pre-workshop I-E. Unlike the odd-numbered group, the even-numbered subjects had no standard by which they could indicate a change in locus of
control; they did not take the I-E before the workshop, and so could not know how they would have answered the test questions before the workshop.

This study contains little evidence on the particulars of these possible explanations. The more important question is whether the workshop internalizes locus of control. One further kind of evidence comes of participants' opinions on the question, given in answer to questions in questionnaires A and B on whether the participant felt more in control of his life as a result of the workshop. Thirteen out of 34 participants responded positively to the question in questionnaire A, while 5 out of 23 respondents answered positively on questionnaire B. One participant wrote,

I do think very much more that I have control over my life but more important I have begun to feel that control. The workshop is responsible because it helped me to define goals (needs, etc.) resource:s and processes and therefore made the realization of the goals a reality. In some cases it became really clear to me what I would have to do to gain what I wanted. Therefore the "mystery" was taken out of the task.

Few respondents gave such positive elaborations to their answers to the questions on effects of the workshop on locus of control. However, the number of positive answers to these questions and other data presented above warrant further study on the possibility of this effect of the workshop. Possible ways of studying the question will be suggested below.
4. It had been hypothesized that participants with more internal control would accomplish more of their self-set goals than would participants with external control. Thus, a negative correlation was predicted between I-E score at the end of the workshop and number of self-set goals accomplished. In fact, a slight positive correlation was obtained which approached significance in data taken from participants who were unclear about their goals before entering the workshop. It is difficult to understand why people who do not believe they control their lives would achieve more of their goals than would people with internal control. It is possible that people with external control choose relatively easy goals, perhaps through choosing goals that fit well with the expectations the participants' peers and authority figures have of them. In any case, this study provides no data to resolve the question.

5. It was predicted that participants would achieve more of their self-set goals than would their peers. The difference between the means of 2.10 goals accomplished by participants and 1.76 accomplished by peers is significant only at the .15 level. This may be a conservative estimate, however, as peers tended to write more goals on questionnaire A than did participants (5.1 compared to 4.7). Thus, the 2.10 goals achieved, on the average, by the participants represent
an even greater proportion of the goals they have given top priority to than do the 1.76 goals achieved by the peers of their top priority goals. Although the comparison of number of self-set goals accomplished did not reach statistical significance, a number of participants indicated on questionnaire B that the workshop had increased their ability to accomplish their goals. The workshop was said to have increased participants' motivation, improved their self-organization, given them clearer focus on their goals, increased their knowledge of resources, and improved their self-confidence.

6. It had been predicted that number of self-set goals accomplished would correlate positively with number of positive answers to questions 3-22 on questionnaire A. The obtained correlation for all participants was .29 (p<.07, n = 28) and .49 (p<.04, n = 15) for those who came to the workshop unclear about their goals. The difference between these two correlations is of interest. The prediction was based on the hypothesis that the clearer a person is about his goals, the likelier he is to accomplish them. Number of positive answers to questions 3-22 does not, however, measure goals clarity, but rather effect of the workshop on goal clarity. Thus, it would be expected that a person who entered the workshop very clear about his goals might answer very few of questions 3-22 positively but might accomplish all of his
goals, while one who entered the workshop totally confused might answer many of questions 3-22 positively while accomplishing only one of his goals. The predicted correlation is based on an assumption that all participants enter the workshop at about the same state of clarity about their goals. While this can only be an approximation, it is likely to be truer of the group of participants who came to the workshop unclear about their goals than of the entire group of participants. Thus, it is reasonable that the correlation would be higher for the former group than for the latter.

7. The predicted correlation between Capacity for Intimate Contact and number of positive answers to questions 3-22 did not obtain, and the assumptions on which it was based were not validated by the experience of the writer in the workshops. It had been assumed that participants unable to share personal aspects of their lives with relative strangers would have limited participation in the workshop and obtain limited benefit from it. In fact, almost all of the participants became actively involved in the exercises of the workshop. It is possible that the structure of the workshop kept participants to the task at hand, and that the workshop facilitated an environment in which participants would find support and acceptance for sharing more of their lives than they would in normal social environments. In conversation, Herb Shepard
has suggested that capacity for intimate contact, though not necessarily an important variable among college-aged participants, might be very important for older participants who might be less willing to share personal data, even in the environment of the workshop.

Critique and Recommendations

Patterns of Effect

The present study was undertaken with the thought that the major effect of the workshop was to clarify participants' goals, with possible side effects of aiding goal achievement and internalizing locus of control. Some participants reported, however, that the workshop also motivated them to achieve their goals, or increased their information about resources, or increased their self-confidence, or increased their focus on their own goals and future, or gave them information about other participants. A major difficulty in studying the effects of the workshop is that its effects are spread out. The participant who becomes no clearer about his goals may, however, become motivated to achieve them, or may become more self-confident. Of the twenty goal clarifying effects listed in questions 3-22 on questionnaire A, only three were reported to have happened to more than half of the participants; but the average total number of effects reported
was 7.5 for all participants and 10.2 for those who came to the workshop unclear about their goals. Although all but two participants said they would recommend the workshop to a friend who was unclear about his goals, no single question on effects of the workshop was answered so positively.

It seems unreasonable, then, to ask how large an effect the workshop has, or even to look for a large effect in any one dimension. It might be more reasonable to look for patterns of effects of the workshop. In order to assess correlations among workshop effects, extensive data must be collected on several variables, not just on goal clarification. Although questionnaires are of questionable validity, they seem to be the only practical means of acquiring the information; it would be quite difficult to assess the effects of the workshop on thirty or more participants on the clarity of their goals, their self-confidence, and on half-a-dozen more variables by means of behavioral or even paper and pencil tests. After questionnaire data were collected, patterns of effects could be sought, perhaps through factor analysis. If patterns could be identified, it might then be desirable to validate the findings through means of surer validity.

If patterns of effect are found, participant characteristics which determine what pattern of effects the workshop has on a given participant should be sought. The patterns
themselves might suggest the characteristics, and it is quite possible that the characteristics might not be such stable personality dimensions as capacity for intimate contact, but might be more related to needs the participant has at the time of the workshop. Thus, in the present study, participants who came to the workshop out of a felt need to clarify their goals reported greater goal clarifying effects than did other participants. Similarly, although the workshop may have internalized locus of control for some participants, those who claimed to feel in control at the beginning of the workshop reported that it had no effect on their feeling of control. It seems reasonable that what a participant gets from the workshop depends heavily on his reason for participating.

**Locus of Control**

Results of this study pertaining to locus of control are not at all conclusive. However, locus of control remains an important dimension in education, and factors which move it inward should be sought. Dellworth's findings and some data from this study justify further research into effects the workshop may have on feelings of control. A major problem in such research is that Rotter's I-E, although the best tested instrument for measuring locus of control, is not well suited for this purpose. Half of the items on the I-E refer to testees' control over national and international politics. This writer would consider as positive a finding that the
workshop increased participants' belief in their ability to end war; however, he would be satisfied with a finding that the workshop increased participants' belief in their ability to make use of college courses to learn what they want to learn. Development of a new test for locus of control, which would not only be appropriate for this context but which would also be valid for testing and retesting in an eight hour span, would in itself be a major task. A behavioral test that might be relevant to the question will be suggested below.

Extending the Investigation

The present study was limited in two important dimensions. First effects of the workshop were tested no more than six weeks after the experience. While most respondents still felt positively about the workshop at the time questionnaire B was administered, it would be of interest to know whether the workshop has a longer effect, or whether it gives participants a short burst of energy or insight which is soon overwhelmed by the demands of school.

The second limitation of this study is that most of the data for it came from written material. Although the questionnaires used asked participants to give evidence justifying their answers, other methods could be used which would be of surer validity. To begin with, a similar line of inquiry could be carried out through interviews, where greater emphasis could be placed on documenting answers.
Another line of investigation would be through behavioral tests. Although one is fairly sure of validity when comparing participants to an appropriate control group on a behavioral test, such a procedure may, in a sense, be insensitive. The present study indicates that the workshop is likely to have a large effect in any one dimension on no more than a third of the participants. Any study of one effect of the workshop is likely to underestimate the total effect the workshop has on participants. Nevertheless, if one is interested in specific effects, observation of behavior may constitute the best test.

For example, a question of interest is whether the workshop affects the amount of responsibility and control participants take of their education. A behavioral test of this question could be made in a large class which offered options in class work and testing which varied from options which were totally structured by the instructor to options constructed by the student. The options could be offered at a point in time shortly after the workshop was held with class members as participants. Records could be kept on the options chosen by participants and on the interactions between the participants and the instructor, and these could be compared to data taken from a control group. An appropriate control group could consist of class members who indicated they wanted to participate in a workshop, but who
were randomly assigned to one to be held later in the semester.

The Workshop and Equilibrium

One puzzling aspect of the workshop is the great degree of benefit some participants claim to obtain from it. Three or four of the participants in this study could be described as ecstatic about the workshop, claiming it brought them great changes in outlook on life and in habits, and led them to make major decisions. Herb Shepard (in conversation) described a man who had attended a half-day workshop which was designed more to demonstrate life planning than to accomplish it. Several years later, the man related to Shepard that the experience had completely changed his life, and that as a result of it he had quit his job, moved to another state, and opened a new business.

It seems unlikely that a one day experience could account completely for behavioral or personality changes of a magnitude usually not attained after months of psychotherapy. It would be of interest to discover what other factors are at play here. One possibility is that the workshop has its greatest effects on participants who are in the midst of changing their life style, or who are already experiencing dissatisfaction with their present life style. In such cases, the workshop could serve as an organized way to help the participant reestablish equilibrium. This explanation is based
on the premise that it is unlikely that the workshop would move a participant to make great changes in his life, but that for a person already wanting to make a change, the workshop might help him decide how to change. The present study already indicates that participants who did not come to the workshop to work on their goals were not greatly affected by it. The question could be pursued by gathering information on the participants' satisfaction with present life style before the workshop.
APPENDIX A

WORKSHOP EXERCISES

1. Life line. Using the rest of this page draw a line to represent your life, and put a check mark on it to show where you are right now. The line can be straight, slanted, curved, convoluted, jagged, etc.; it can be "psychological" or "chronological." It's a subjective thing—it represents something about how you think about your life. After you've drawn it, you will share it with other in your group.

2. Who am I? This exercise is to explore the check mark on your life line. Write ten different answers to the question "Who am I?" in the space provided below. You may choose to answer in terms of the roles and responsibilities you have in life, in terms of groups you belong to and beliefs you hold, in terms of certain qualities or traits you have as a person, in terms of behavior patterns, needs or feelings that are characteristic of you, etc. Try to list those things that are really important to your sense of yourself.

1.-10.

Now review the list above, and try to order your items in terms of their importance to you; write a "1" next to the most important item, "2" next to the second most important item etc. When everyone is done, we will share our lists.

3. Fantasy day. Construct a fantasy day some time in the future. The day can be a "special day" that you would really love to experience. Or it can be the kind of typical day that you really wish would characterize your life. Or you can create a week instead of a day, etc. The important thing is to create an experience you really want some time in the future. You may want to jot down a few notes about your fantasy to help you share it with others in the group.

4. Are there any answers to the "Who am I?" list you would like to add or delete?

5. Life inventory. In this exercise, generate as many answers as you can to the four questions asked. Others in the group may be able to help you to give more answers, and you may wish to add other people's answers to your lists.

What are the peak experiences you have had? These should be broadly interpreted, being those times living was especially
worthwhile and you felt yourself to be complete and whole. Also, put down special thrills that fall within the framework of making life worth living.

What things do you do well? These should be interpersonal, avocational, appreciation things, as well as skills you have that you are to some degree master of.

What would you like to learn to do well? Include aspects of interpersonal competence you aspire to, skills you would like to learn, and kinds of experiences you would like to provide yourself with.

What values of yours would you like to realize? A variety of things are relevant here. Friendship, material things, professional goals, children, surrounding yourself with natural beauty, travel, religion, etc.

6. Resources. Review your fantasy day, the list of "Who am I's" you would like to add to your original list, the things you want to learn to do well, and the list of values to be realized. Choose from all of that two or three goals you would like to work on. Below each goal, list as many resources as you can think of that might be available to you to help you reach that goal. Such resources would include skills you have, friends, organizations or agencies on or off campus, professors, government agencies, the yellow pages etc. Perhaps others in the group can help add more items to your lists.

1--3.

7. Action plan. Now choose one or more of the goals you have listed on question six, and come up with a plan of action for the next few weeks or few months that will help you accomplish that goal. Remember to use in your plan all of the available resources you need, especially the skills you have. Outline the plan(s) below. Perhaps others in the group can help you modify your plan, or show your strengths in your plans you were not aware of.
Following is questionnaire A with summaries of answers to its questions. Answers to questions one and two are summarized in Table 1, page . For questions 3-24 and 25 and 27, percent of respondents answering "yes" are indicated, and in parentheses, percent of respondents who were unclear about their goals before the workshop who answered "yes." Table 5 rank orders questions 3-22, which are concerned with effects of the workshop on goal clarity, in terms of percent of participants who answered "yes," and percent of initially unclear participants who answered "yes."

Workshop Questionnaire

The purpose of this questionnaire is to find out how useful the Planning for Living Workshop was to you, and in what ways it might have been helpful. Please understand that I have no investment in any particular result. It is just as valuable to me to find the workshop does not change the way people feel about school, for example, as to find it makes them feel better or feel worse about being in school. Basically, I want to know how well and in what ways the workshop does what it is supposed to do.

Please answer the questions as fully as you can, making use of whatever space is available. (If your answer continues on to the back, please write down the number of the question you are answering.) If you feel the information asked for in any question is too private, just say so, or leave the answer space blank. (Remember, however, that neither I nor anyone else will know which questionnaire came from which person.)

Please return the questionnaire and the goal lists from you and a friend in three days to 519 Tobin Hall. If you have any questions, feel free to get in touch with me at my office, 545-0083, or at home, 253-2797.

Thank you for helping me with this.

herb koplowitz
1. What is your age and your sex?
2. What year of school are you in?
3. Did the workshop make you aware for the first time of any goals or purposes of yours that school might help you accomplish? If so, please list below. .26 (.40)
4. Do you have a better idea of your occupational goals because of your having participated in the workshop. If so, in what way? .29 (.50)
5. Did you become aware of skills or areas of knowledge you want to learn? If so, please describe. .47 (.65)
6. Did you become clearer in the workshop of what area in your field or major you would like to specialize in, or of what you might want to major in? .20 (.33)
7. Did the workshop show you ways in which your goals in school relate to other goals you have in life? If so, please describe. .47 (.65)
8. Did the workshop show you conflicts between your goals in school and other goals you have? If so, please describe. .32 (.45)
9. Did you come upon any solutions to these conflicts? If so, please describe. .24 (.45)
10. Do you believe the workshop has increased your ability to make decisions about school in terms of your own purposes rather than in terms of other people's (professors', friends', etc.) expectations of you? If so, how? .32 (.45)
11. Has the workshop increased your ability to explain to others your reasons for being in school? .35 (.50)
12. Has the workshop made you feel better about being in school? If so, how? .38 (.45)
13. Has the workshop made you feel worse about being in school? If so, how? .18 (.30)

14. Do you find yourself making choices now more with your goals in mind than you did before the workshop? If so, please give an example if you can. .35 (.55)

15. Did the workshop help you see what getting your degree, learning some skill, or fulfilling any of your other goals would enable you to do? If so, how? .38 (.60)

16. Did you, in the course of the workshop, realize any resources that you were previously unaware of that are available to you to help you accomplish any of your goals? If so, what are those resources? .55 (.55)

17. Did you realize as a result of the workshop limits or difficulties you might experience in pursuing your objectives? If so, what are the limits or difficulties? .41 (.45)

18. Did you realize for the first time in the course of the workshop how it was that you came to want to accomplish some particular goal of yours? .29 (.35)

19. Did the workshop give you a better idea of what you must do in the next few weeks in order to accomplish your goals? .41 (.55)

20. Did the workshop give you a better idea of what you must do later on (after the end of the semester) in order to accomplish any of your goals? .62 (.80)

21. Did you realize for the first time in the course of the workshop how any of the things you hope to accomplish are similar to goals you have already met or tasks you have already succeeded in? If so, please elaborate briefly. .38 (.50)

22. Did you realize in the course of the workshop ways in which your accomplishing any of your goals depends on actions you can take? If so, please describe briefly. .59 (.80)
23. As a result of the workshop, do you feel more like it is you, rather than luck, fate, or other people, who controls whether you accomplish your goals? If so, please tell why, if you can. .38 (.50)

24. A student can think of his direction and presence in school in terms of the future (what he wants to do or be) or in terms of the past (experiences he has had that have led him to go to school or study a given subject). Has the workshop made you more future oriented? .56 (.70)

25. Please rate the value of the workshop in clarifying and solidifying your reasons for being in school and other goals you might have (totally aside from whatever other value the workshop may or may not have had for you). Rate "1" for the workshop's being a total waste of time for that purpose, and "10" for the workshop's being excellent—as useful as an experience could be for clarifying your goals.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   5.0 (6.3)

26. Would you recommend the workshop to a friend who was unclear about his or her purposes in school or in life? .94 (.95)

27. Would you attend such a workshop again in a year or two were it offered? Why or why not? .53 (.80)

28. Were there ways in which the workshop was useful to you that this questionnaire did not cover? Please describe.

29. Do you think the above questions reflect fairly the usefulness of the workshop in clarifying your goals? Please explain.

30. How could the workshop be improved?

31. What part(s) of the workshop was most useful to you?

Please list as many goals as you can (at least three, no more than ten) that you intend to accomplish by the end of classes this semester. Next to each goal, please give your subjective probability that you will actually accomplish the goal.

| Goals you intend to accomplish by end of classes this semester | Probability you will accomplish the goal. |
Please recruit a friend or roommate to do on this page exactly what you did on the last page. The person you choose should fit as closely as possible the following description. (I don't expect you'll be able to find someone perfect in every way--just do the best you can):

1. About the same year in school as you.
2. Has similar academic interests or same major.
3. Has similar study habits.
4. Leads a similar social life to yours.
5. Has not attended a Planning for Living Workshop.
6. Would, however, probably be willing to attend one.

In addition it must be someone you will be in touch with during the last week of school so that he or she will also be able to fill out the goal completion check list then.

---

Goals you intend to accomplish by the end of classes

Probability you will accomplish them.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Percent Respondents Answering &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Percent Initially Unclear Respondents Answering &quot;Yes&quot;</th>
<th>Rank for Initially Unclear Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This is the final part of the study on the workshop. It consists of three sections: a goals check list for you, one for your friend who filled out a goals inventory several weeks ago, and an open ended questionnaire.

I need the information from the goals check list, and it should only take you and your friend a few minutes to complete them. In the questionnaire, you might be able to give me very valuable information. However, completing the questionnaire might take time and energy at a time when both are short.

Therefore, please be sure you fill out the "PARTICIPANT'S GOALS CHECK LIST" and that your friend fills out the "NON-PARTICIPANT'S GOALS CHECK LIST." Put whatever time you can into the questionnaire.

Please return the check lists and whatever you've done on the questionnaire by this Friday, 11 May, to my office, 519 Tobin Hall. If you have questions about these, call me at 545-0083 or at 253-2797. If there is experimental credit for your participation, please put the name of the course and instructor below--I'll let him know about your participation.

When you have returned this part of the material, I will be glad to answer any questions you might have about what, specifically I was looking for and what I've found out.

Thanks.

herb koplowitz
The following questions are optional. If you have time only to answer the questions "yes" or "no," or if you do not even have time to do that, at this time of year, that's understandable. However, I would appreciate your answering the questions in as great detail as you can.

1. Have any decisions you have made since the workshop been affected by your participation in the workshop? How were they affected? How do you know the workshop affected them?

2. Has the workshop affected your ability to achieve your goals? In what ways?

3. Have you acted on any decisions you made or information you got in the workshop? Please elaborate.

4. Have you thought about the workshop in the past month in any ways not covered by the above questions? What have your thoughts been?

5. Because of the workshop, do you feel more as though you (rather than fate, luck, or other people) control your life? If so, how do you think the workshop had that effect on you?

PARTICIPANT'S GOALS CHECK LIST

Attached is a list of goals, some of which you wrote a few weeks ago. Please read each item on the list and put an "X" to the left of each goal you have accomplished.

Mark every goal you have accomplished, not just those you had on your own list. If, for example, there is a goal "To get admitted to Harvard Law School" and you have been admitted there, put an "X" next to the goal whether or not that goal was on your list, and whether or not it was important to you to gain admission.

Some goals may be difficult to understand. (I sometimes had to use participants' abbreviations because I didn't know what they stood for.) In such cases, do the best you can. You should know how to interpret goals that were on your own list.
You may not know whether you will actually accomplish some of the goals on the list. In such cases, answer according to how you think things will turn out. For example, you probably do not know for sure now whether you will pass all your courses. If there is a goal "To pass all my courses," put an "X" next to it if you think you probably will pass all your courses.

Because of the way the list was made up, things get somewhat repetitious. Please bear with it and answer each question even though your answer to a previous question gives the necessary information.

Thank you.

1. Write a Sociology of Sport optional paper.
2. Pass my courses.
3. Develop social relations deeper.
4. Complete my present courses with good grades.
5. Learn to express myself better both in speaking and in writing.
7. Get a student teaching position.
8. Meditate every day.
9. Take more advantage of educational opportunities.
10. Learn to play guitar better.
11. Find out more about mental retardation and courses offered here.
12. Finish writing 5 term papers of at least "B" quality.
13. Write a short story.
14. Visit the Montague Ashram more.
15. Get plans finalized for moving to California.
16. Find some stability.
17. Buy a sailing vessel.
18. To complete a successful and artistically balanced short story.
20. Get a full time job for the summer.
21. Have my dog completely house trained.
22. Become more involved in school politics.
23. Cut my hair.
25. Have as good a time as I can in any way available.
26. Get a part time job at night.
27. Improve my academic standing.
28. Try to be happy and content with today while striving for a better tomorrow.
29. Get off campus.
30. Get two art projects done.
32. Become more organized.
33. Straighten out my courses from transferring.
34. Leave underdog role, take topdog role.
35. Keep my sanity.
36. Keep physically fit.
37. Prepare myself for being a high school English teacher.
38. Finish macrame project.
39. Listen to people more.
40. Learn to play the harp--buy an instruction book.
41. Do more things that I want to do.
42. Learn to meet people more easily.
43. Buy a refrigerator.
44. Be a smashing success when I teach at St. Michaels.
45. Not be possessive of those close to me.
46. Be more introspective.
47. Find the love of my life.
48. Find an interesting man.
49. Design a flow reactor to simulate an artificial kidney.
50. To have worked away most of the lossness around my belly.
51. To have summer work and living plans set.
52. Decide what to do next year.
53. Grow marijuana.
54. Finish semester without going into debt.
55. Become more knowledgable in my major field of study.
56. Do well in my courses, especially in my major.
57. Loose weight.
58. Define my relationship with school friends.
59. Get some sort of job that will pay for next year.
60. Become better attuned to myself and others in terms of personal responsiveness and personality development.
61. Don't be so quick to criticize.
62. Pass most of my courses.
63. Find a place to live for the summer.
64. Get over a 3.2 cum.
65. Put in at least one hour a week at C.A.S.I.A.C.
66. Take care of myself.
67. Get a story published.
68. Get psyched for summer.
69. Enjoy myself.
70. Stabilize personal relationships.
71. Take more time to read books.
72. Become more active in group discussions.
73. Learn how to learn better.
74. Get a 3.0 cum.
75. Pass all courses with B or better.
76. Learn to play some chants and SAT NAM songs on guitar.
77. Find an educational interest.
78. Learn to spin gelatin successfully.
79. Find a place to live off campus next semester.
80. Get financial situation cleared.
81. Play a couple more league soccer games with Tom Coburn's team.
82. Lose ten pounds.
83. Begin to make my own decisions and stand by them.
84. Broaden my social and intellectual spheres.
85. Read more on everything.
86. To straighten out my financial situation.
87. Find people to share rent (and place to live).
88. Get a waiver on my Stats. 121 requirement.
89. To have fun.
90. Try not to complain so much.
91. Find out where my interests lie.
92. Maintain my equilibrium of mind.
93. Get in B.F.A.
NON-PARTICIPANT'S GOALS CHECK LIST

Attached is a list of goals, some of which you wrote a few weeks ago. Please read each item on the list and put an "X" to the left of each goal you have accomplished.

Mark every goal you have accomplished, not just those you had on your own list. If, for example, there is a goal "To get admitted to Harvard Law School" and you have been admitted there, put an "X" next to the goal whether or not that goal was on your list, and whether or not it was important to you to gain admission.

Some goals may be difficult to understand. (I sometimes had to use participants' abbreviations because I didn't know what they stood for.) In such cases, do the best you can. You should know how to interpret goals that were on your own list.

You may not know whether you will actually accomplish some of the goals on the list. In such cases, answer according to how you thing things will turn out. For example, you probably do not know for sure now whether you will pass all your courses. If there is a goal "To pass all my courses," put an "X" next to it if you think you probably will pass all your courses.

Because of the way the list was made up, things get somewhat repetitious. Please bear with it and answer each question even though your answer to a previous question gives the necessary information.

Thank you.

__1. Write a Sociology of Sport optional paper.
__2. Pass my courses.
__3. Develop social relations deeper.
__4. Complete my present courses with good grades.
__5. Learn to express myself better both in speaking and in writing.
__7. Get a student teaching position.
__8. Meditate every day.
__9. Take more advantage of educational opportunities.
__10. Learn to play guitar better.
__11. Find out more about mental retardation and courses offered here.
__12. Finish writing 5 term papers of at least "B" quality.
13. Write a short story.
14. Visit the Montague Ashram more.
15. Get plans finalized for moving to California.
16. Find some stability.
17. Buy a sailing vessel.
18. To complete a successful and artistically balanced short story.
20. Get a full time job for the summer.
21. Have my dog completely house trained.
22. Become more involved in school politics.
23. Cut my hair.
25. Have as good a time as I can in any way available.
26. Get a parttime job at night.
27. Improve my academic standing.
28. Try to be happy and content with today while striving for a better tomorrow.
29. Get off campus.
30. Get two art projects done.
32. Become more organized.
33. Straighten out my courses from transferring.
34. Leave underdog role, take topdog role.
35. Keep my sanity.
36. Keep physically fit.
37. Prepare myself for being a high school English teacher.
38. Finish macrame project.
39. Listen to people more.
40. Learn to play the harp--but an instruction book.
41. Do more things that I want to do.
42. Learn to meet people more easily.
43. Buy a refrigerator.
44. Be a smashing success when I teach at St. Michaels.
45. Not be possessive of those close to me.
46. Be more introspective.
47. Find the love of my life.
48. Find an interesting man.
49. Design a flow reactor to simulate an artificial kidney.
50. To have worked away most of the losseness around my belly.
51. To have summer work and living plans set.
52. Decide what to do next year.
53. Grow marijuana.
54. Finish semester without going into debt.
55. Become more knowledgable in my major field of study.
56. Do well in my courses, especially in my major.
57. Loose weight.
58. Define my relationship with school friends.
59. Get some sort of job that will pay for next year.
60. Become better atuned to myself and others in terms of personal responsiveness and personality development.
61. Don't be so quick to criticize.
62. Pass most of my courses.
63. Find a place to live for the summer.
64. Get over a 3.2 cum.
65. Put in at least one hour a week at C.A.S.I.A.C.
66. Take care of myself.
67. Get a story published.
68. Get psyched for summer.
69. Enjoy myself.
70. Stabilize personal relationships.
71. Take more time to read books.
72. Become more active in group discussions.
73. Learn how to learn better.
74. Get a 3.0 cum.
75. Pass all courses with B or better.
76. Learn to play some chants and SAT NAM songs on guitar.
77. Find an educational interest.
78. Learn to spin gelatin successfully.
79. Find a place to live off campus next semester.
80. Get financial situation cleared.
81. Play a couple more league soccer games with Tom Coburn's team.
82. Lose ten pounds.
83. Begin to make my own decisions and stand by them.
84. Broaden my social and intellectual spheres.
85. Read more on everything.
86. To straighten out my financial situation.
87. Find people to share rent (and place to live).
88. Get a saiver of my Stats. 121 requirement.
89. To have fun.
90. Try not to complain so much.
91. Find out where my interests lie.
92. Maintain my equilibrium of mind.
93. Get into B.F.A.
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