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ABSTRACT

The Problem. The problem was to determine whether or not significant change in spirituality occurred in people who attended a Life, Death, and Transition workshop during the period June 1977 through February 1979.

Procedures. To measure change in spirituality, an instrument, the Spirituality Change Survey, was designed and tested. The instrument, which contained seven open-ended items and eleven semantic differential items, was determined to have moderately high internal reliability, 0.759, based on Coefficient Alpha.

Two forms of the instrument were used. Eighty-seven participants from two workshops responded to a pretest-posttest mode, while 157 participants from eleven additional workshops responded to a mailed version. The open-ended items asked respondents to subjectively evaluate their perception of change in attitudes toward death, life, spirituality, themselves, others, values, and the workshop. They were then requested to indicate on each of eleven scales a numerical perception of their relative position, both prior to, and after, the workshop.
A jury of five qualified judges converted the open-ended responses into numerical values based on the degree of change indicated. The data were then analyzed based on frequency distribution, shift in central tendency, and one way analysis of variance based on each demographic variable available.

**Findings.** It was determined that significant positive change did occur in persons attending the workshops. This was best illustrated by the total responses to open-ended items, with 1322 of 1613, or approximately 82 percent, being positive.

No correlation between the time interval since attendance and response to the survey was found. A possible correlation between poor health and the degree of positive change in spirituality reported was indicated.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

What the caterpillar calls the end of the world
the master calls a butterfly.

Richard Bach
Illusions

In a very real sense, we are all terminal patients from the time that we are born, but to think of one's own death usually exceeds the realm of comprehension. The fear of death is universal even after we believe we have mastered it. Modern society fosters increased anxiety as the rapid rate of technological advances far outpaces our social and cultural changes. The medical profession has found ways to prolong physical existence, and in doing so, extended the period of dying. Coincidentally, the use of extraordinary life-saving measures has frequently served to isolate the patient from his/her family during this process. Thereby, families are increasingly abdicating to the bureaucracies of medicine, insurance companies, and government our responsibilities of kinship.

Death remains a mystery to most including those who delve into the field of thanatology. Philosophers, theologians, psychologists, and psychiatrists have all conjectured
on the meaning of life and death, and still the questions remain. After extensive study and work in the field, Kubler-Ross stated:

... one of the most productive avenues for growth is found through the study and experience of death. Perhaps death reminds us that our time is limited and that we'd better accomplish our purpose here on earth before our time runs out. ... individuals who have been fortunate enough to share in the death of someone who understood its meaning seem better able to live and grow because of their experience. (69:117).

Slightly over a decade ago, the field of thanatology was catapulted forward with the publication of Kubler-Ross' book, On Death and Dying. Since then, her works have led the field as new techniques have been developed to help both the living and the dying. This study was designed to explore a new dimension in the realm of death and dying education, the dimension of spiritual change.

Throughout the years of research, the dying have taught us much about life. Perhaps the greatest lesson was this, "LIVE, so you do not have took back and say: God, how I've wasted my life." (69:xix).

Statement of the Problem

This study was designed to determine on a longitudinal basis whether or not significant changes in spirituality have been experienced by persons who attended a Kubler-Ross Life, Death and Transition workshop during the period June 1977 to February 1979.
Problem Significance

Life, Death and Transition was a program designed for living. It illuminated and personalized the ubiquitous and natural transition known as death. As described in the following section, the workshop appeared to have profound emotional impact on many of the people in attendance. To the present, no organized attempt had been made to collect or to analyze data relevant to workshop or post-workshop attitudinal change. This study provided the necessary data analyses to apprise the designers and implementors of the workshop as to the actual outcomes in the dimension of spirituality. Comparison of those data with programmed objectives will facilitate future structural reconfiguration or extension of the present format to other institutions.

The Life, Death, and Transition workshop format was designed and implemented by Kubler-Ross following her recognition of the need for such a program. It was her book, *On Death and Dying* (70), that transported thanatology from an obscure, predominantly medical science into the public view. Through her experience and popularity, people were attracted to her, reiterating the necessity of providing a forum to address openly and frankly the situations surrounding the mystique of death and dying.

The present seminar configuration was adopted in June 1977 after Kubler-Ross experienced the Barham method of psychodrama. (242). The medium of psychodrama was
incorporated to develop and intensify the emotions exhibited by the participants in the workshop. It was hypothesized that prior to acceptance of new thanatological material there was a need to address the "unfinished business," i.e. psychologically unresolved issues, that exacerbates the emotional turmoil frequently associated with death. (242). Few in attendance were not emotionally stimulated when confronted with personal accounts of debilitating illnesses or impending death. Extreme anger, frustration, guilt, and sorrow were frequently displayed in these sessions.

During the conduct of the workshops, transitory psychological support systems were developed to meet immediate emotional requirements. Of significance was the transition of the individual back to his primary environment whence he/she must readapt to the established support systems. It was in this environment that it was deemed necessary to record and evaluate the significance and permanence of change, if any.

Of note was the presentation of material regarding near-death experiences similar to those popularized by Moody in his recent bestseller, Life After Life. (91). In addition, first-hand accounts of other documented mystical experiences which have the potentiality of impacting significantly on the religious/spiritual orientation of the attendee were presented.
In excess of one thousand people have attended the workshops during the period June 1977 through February 1979. Attendance at a Life, Death, and Transition workshop was voluntary and selection was normally based on chronological application. Special consideration was given to terminal patients, parents of children diagnosed as terminal, and octogenarians. The largest professional representation was from the field of medicine including counselors. Clergy also filled a significant number of vacancies.

Design Considerations

An attempt to evaluate change in spirituality represented an innovative departure from the norm of psychometric measurement. In the review of literature, the attitude surveys that have been accomplished in the field of death education will be addressed. The research that has been conducted has been primarily oriented toward attitudinal or anxiety change and found of little or no significance in relationship to death and dying. It has been suggested, however, that significant change does take place in the dimension of spirituality.

The next question to be addressed was the precedence of research in a dimension as fraught with controversy and subjectivity as spirituality. As Glock stated:
In the face of this great diversity the student of the individual and his religion is faced with the formidable task of deciding how to conceptualize the phenomenon of religiousness and how to distinguish people in terms of their degrees of religious commitment. These are not, certainly, questions that have been entirely ignored by students of religion. There have been attempts to distinguish people religiously and to discover what leads people to be religious or not. But the efforts have been surprisingly few, and on careful examination, incomplete. All things considered, the task of constructing a conceptual framework for the systematic study of differential commitment to religion still lies ahead of us. (46:18).

He went on to define five dimensions of religiosity which he labeled experiential, ideological, ritualistic, intellectual, and consequential. He concluded:

There is no single piece of research in literature which has looked at all five dimensions simultaneously . . . . (46:21).

Other important observations by Glock, in addressing the need for further research, included the following:

What it means to be 'religious' is not the same to all men . . . . The intrinsic importance in the life of man would be enough to justify the study of individual religiosity. But having a way to measure differential commitment to religion would do more than simply satisfy our curiosity. It is a prerequisite to moving on to the more compelling questions of what are the sources and the consequences of religious involvement . . . . (46:9).

Several studies concluded that religiousness was multidimensional, not unidimensional. (46:9; 216:7047A; 214:6339B; 96:26). As such, it was appropriate to select subjectively a segment from the totality of spirituality/religiousness for further scrutiny.
The instrument design allowed the respondent to evaluate and apply subjectively his/her concepts of spirituality/religiousness to each item. No specific denominational constraint or religious doctrine was presented during the functioning of the workshop as members of many different religious orientations attended. Rather, it was an interdenominational awareness that served as a catalyst for change in the degree of an individual's perception of spirituality.

Hypotheses

To test for changes in spirituality in people after attending a Life, Death, and Transition workshop, the following hypotheses were proposed:

1. No significant change in spirituality will be reported by people who attended a Life, Death, and Transition workshop during the cited time period.

2. If the first hypothesis is rejected and significant change in spirituality is reported, then that change will demonstrate no increase longitudinally in correlation with the intervening time period.

Limitations of the Study

Although a careful attempt was made to conduct a thorough and systematic investigation, certain limitations were inherent in this study:
Time Frame

Even though Kubler-Ross has conducted workshops for several years, the format changed significantly after the addition of the Barhams as her assistants. Due to that, only thirteen workshops since June 1977 were evaluated.

United States Residents

Only people living in the United States were contacted. Although attendees came from foreign countries, time and expense in contacting them were considerations.

Subjectivity

There was a high degree of subjectivity associated with the terms of religiousness and spirituality. It was the intent of the survey to accommodate the subjectivity by focusing on the shift as perceived by the individual and based on his/her own concepts of the subject.

Voluntariness

Voluntary response was required in filling out and returning surveys. It was estimated that an appreciable percentage would not be returned. Further, it was anticipated that those who did respond might be those most favorably disposed toward the workshop.
Death

As the workshop had a number of terminal patients in attendance, some unavoidable loss was experienced.

Assumptions of the Study

The following were assumptions of the study:

1. That the jury panel members were qualified to evaluate the open-ended question responses and assign numerical values to changes in spirituality that they detected.

2. That the participants of the thirteen workshops were representative of participants at all workshops.

3. People attending the Life, Death, and Transition workshop would enter with differing attitudes toward and/or degree of spirituality.

4. That the participants were able to conceptualize their spirituality and transfer same to the survey instrument.

5. Although individuals would have differing backgrounds, workshop groups would maintain demographic similarities.

6. That because of the state of health of some participants, a loss in the number of sample might occur through death.

7. That the researcher would conduct the telephone survey without bias.
Definition of Terms

Life, Death, and Transition Workshop

The title of a specific, five-day intensive workshop conducted by Kubler-Ross with the assistance of Jay and Martha Barham.

Mystical Experience

An affecting event interpreted as relating to an intimate knowledge of, or direct communion, with God (as through contemplation or visions).

Out of Body Experience

A state reported by individuals who are consciously aware of being separated from their physical body.

Protagonist

The main character in a psychodrama.

Psychodrama

Psychotherapy modeled on life whereby the subject explores situations as he perceives them by acting out that situation so as to transfer the outcome back to reality.

Scene

A part of a psychodrama with a beginning, an ending, and no change in characters. Leaders often find it useful to divide a psychodrama into various scenes, each with a specific purpose.
Shanti Nilaya
A personal growth center established by Kubler-Ross near Escondido, California.

Spirituality/Religiousness
The individual's awareness of something greater than himself as conceptualized by the constructs of the individual.

Terminal Patient
A patient who has been diagnosed as having an illness or condition that would result in his/her death in a foreseeable timeframe.

Unfinished Business
Psychological issues that continue to impact on an individual, though often unconsciously, after an incident has physically terminated.

Summary
Fear of death is an ubiquitous problem that has recently received increased attention. As a result of her research in the field of thanatology, Kubler-Ross designed and implemented a workshop known as Life, Death, and Transition. The workshop provided a forum for participants to explore their own fear of death, while also learning of deep-seated fear, anger, guilt, and sorrow which provided clues to their own "unfinished business."
The objective of the workshops was to facilitate people living their lives more fully. The objective of this study was to determine if changes in the dimension of spirituality occurred as a result of attendance at a workshop, and if so, in what direction and to what degree.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter was to review selected research that has been reported in professional journals, books, doctoral dissertations, and other sources related to the study.

A preliminary overview of the literature and related research revealed that there was a scarcity of information directly addressed to the measurement of spirituality as it related to death and dying education. Although little has been written which directly addressed the specific factors to be examined in this study, much has been written concerning the many facets of thanatology, spirituality, and humanistic psychology that bear some relevance to the topic being investigated.

This chapter will examine the areas of death education, fear of death, spirituality, measurement of religiosity, psychodrama, workshop design theory, life after death research, and the legitimacy of investigations of mystical experiences.
Thus death education is really an aspect of health education in the most catholic, global sense . . . . If the death-educated person becomes sensitive to the death-dealing forces within the environment, then perhaps remedial action would result. This is the hope.

Daniel Leviton (168:20).

The need for expanded awareness has been ever increasing. As Strauss and Glaser noted, vastly improved medical technology has served to reduce the number of patients dying of acute disease and increased the number with chronic disease, the duration of which has also been extended. (116:126).

The number and variety of death education courses and workshops have experienced a substantial increase in the past decade. The academic range is now from grade school through post graduate level. To meet the bibliographical demand of death education material, Mills et al published a guide for teachers. This book addressed recommended curriculum for the various levels at which courses were being taught. (88).

In addition to the accredited educational institutions, other organizations are sponsoring and conducting instruction designed to meet societal needs that exist beyond the realm of academia. These workshops, too, are varied in nature.

Harris suggested that there are five identifiable, but not separate, approaches to death education. The first was labeled the philosophical approach which enabled the
student to develop a personal outlook on death and dying based on discussion. Secondly, the sociological approach allowed the student to examine cultural and social aspects of death. The psychological approach exposed the student to an awareness of death and extolled an understanding of the grief process. The medical-legal approach encompassed medical terminology and complex questions such as the definition of death. Finally, Harris identified the health and educational approach which emphasized information gathering and values clarification. (151:162).

In a more recent book, Death and Dying Education, Ulin addressed many of the serious problems facing educators in the field of thanatology today. These questions include: What is death? Why does death exist? and What should be taught? Ulin also suggested that the long delay in public attention in death and dying gives credence to the theory that conscious or unconscious avoidance behavior has repressed the field. He emphasized that the topic cannot be ignored, but there are tough questions to face. (122:8). However, Croskery found in a study of clergy, teachers, and school board members in the state of Ohio were all against death education as a formal part of the curriculum. (197:638A).

Knott and Prull also raised another serious question. What are the behavioral/attitudinal objectives for both instructors and students? They suggested this critical
first step may be missing in many death education courses and go on to call for more rigorous attention to "accountability." (164:180).

College instruction has been the most widely taught at both undergraduate and graduate levels in diverse fields. Those students are certainly the most studied. Cherico published *Thanatology Course Outlines* which contained the syllabi for death awareness courses taught in colleges and universities across the United States. (21). The University of Florida alone has conducted five different thanatology courses in recent years. Emphasis during the courses exposed students to seriously ill patients as well as professionals who frequently deal with death. Other courses tend to concentrate on the cognitive domain. Such an eighteen week course was described by Bell. (138:199).

The lengths of the courses and total hours of exposure varied significantly with the shortest reported as four, two-hour sessions and the longest, the eighteen week course reported by Bell. Combs tested two distinctly different curricula, one didactic and information oriented, and the other, experiential. (195:1334A). Similarly, Kurlychek reported on two models, information and experiential. (207:3368). Another format employed in college education was the death awareness workshop. Whelan studied the effects of such an experiential workshop. The
design elicited personal involvement of the participants through a confrontation with their own deaths. (234:2161A). Thomas also reported on an intensive weekend workshop. (231:4076A).

Several studies addressed death education as taught at grade school and high school level. Balkin, Epstein, and Bush commented on the lack of research available concerning attitude formation towards death by children. (134:183). They continued to point out that teachers must be aware of their own defense mechanisms toward death thoughts and concerns. (134:188). Two other studies addressed death education in high schools. One approached the course from a religious perspective while the other adopted a cognitive approach.

Some members of the medical profession have been advocating increased emphasis on death education for years. Despite their recommendations, the call too frequently has been ignored. A reason for avoidance was explained by Garfield:

The problem lies in equating death with the failure of the physician. This equation is most often erroneous and unfair to both the physician and patient. (42:107).

Hendin, in addressing this problem, stated:

The best answer to these dilemmas lies in more education for all physicians. Just as every doctor specializes in health and life he must, in a special sort of way, also specialize in death. (57:119).
Barton et al found that too little material was available in medical literature concerning student instruction in the field of death and dying despite the physicians’ proximity to those events. They noted that the limited instruction available was well received. (136:945). In another report, Barton attributed the physicians’ attitudes toward death as a cause for the paucity of formal instruction in medical school curriculum. He criticized the indirect and impersonal approach typified by instruction on how to obtain autopsy reports. (135:170).

Liston reviewed thanatology courses as taught in American medical schools in 1973. His findings concurred with Barton in that little was known about the subject. He also found that those courses taught were viewed as beneficial. The courses studied varied in length from two to forty-five hours. The composition and format likewise varied drastically. (170:577).

Many of the courses had been strongly influenced by the work of Kubler-Ross. Her tests were standard material in virtually every course examined. Her innovation of two-way participation between student and terminally ill was employed by seventy percent of the programs surveyed in 1973. (170:577).

Bloch, in 1976, after surveying the recent increases in death education, made comments on format and curriculum. He recommended a small group setting with experientially
based training. (140:272).

The need for death education has been proclaimed in other sectors of our society. Religious institutions have established seminars which have attracted great interest. Hospice volunteer groups have designed and conducted extensive training programs. These programs often culminated with the participant directly involved with a terminal patient. Some self awareness and personal growth movements have incorporated the death awareness material. Esalen Institute is an example of a place where such material was available. (236:31). Various independent organizations have invited noted speakers such as Kubler-Ross to present seminars of varying lengths. (165:91). Others, such as Kavanaugh, Garfield, or Ram Dass, the founder of the Human Foundation Dying Project, also conducted intensive workshop experiences. Funeral directors, too, have been involved in death awareness workshops. Surprisingly, Kavanaugh noted, they demonstrated a high level of personal avoidance in dealing with death. (65:195).

The SHANTI Project was organized by Garfield in response to the realities of emotional alienation and social distancing experienced by many terminal patients. The project was designed to provide counseling to patients and families; education to professionals and the public; and to conduct research on the impact of the project as a social service. (42:356).
To meet the informational requirements of the burgeoning thanatology field, numerous periodicals devoted to the subject have come into existence. Three professional journals, Omega, Suicide, and the Journal of Thanatology, have been published for some time. More recently, Death Education has been added to the field. (188). Less formal publications also are becoming increasingly available. Examples include the Hanuman Foundation Newsletter, established in March 1978; Eclipse, begun by the SHANTI Project in February 1975; and the Transitions Newsletter, started in 1977. (188).

The literature revealed that death education is expanding rapidly. The courses are varied to meet the needs of widely diversified audiences. It was also shown that educational material was being provided to support the increased needs of these audiences.

Fear of Death

As we define life
So will we define Death.

Robert E. Kavanaugh
(65:194).

Social and technological changes in recent decades have been ultimately responsible for increased fear of death in many individuals, a fear that has been intensified by the dramatic increases in our destructive capabilities. (70:2). Kubler-Ross addressed this issue in On Death and Dying:
A chance for peace may thus be found in studying the attitudes toward death in the leaders of the nations, in those who make the final decisions of war and peace between nations. (70:13).

Many researchers have focused their data collection attention on the fear of death attitudes that are so pervasive in modern societies. Becker pointed out:

... the accumulation of research and opinion on the fear of death is already too large to be dealt with and summarized in any simple way. The revival of interest in death, in the last few decades, has alone already [sic] piled up a formidable literature, and this literature does not point in any single direction. (8:12).

There are many fears associated with death, found Parry. Included among those fears are the unknown, pain, sorrow, loneliness, and loss of friends, body, or identity. (217:49). Freud addressed our attitude toward death when he said:

That attitude was far from straightforward. . . . we were of course prepared to maintain that death was a necessary outcome of life . . . that death was natural, undeniable and unavoidable. In reality, however, we were accustomed to behave as if it were otherwise. We showed an unmistakable tendency to put death on one side, to eliminate it from life. (41:216).

As death education has expanded dramatically in recent years, so have the attitudinal changes studies increased. Numerous instruments have been designed and validated to measure various aspects of hypothesized change. The most common measurement was that of fear of death or anxiety associated with death.
Templer's Death Anxiety Scale (DAS) was an instrument frequently used in death education studies. The instrument contained fifteen true-false questions directly addressing the individual's relationship with death. The DAS was proven to be a reliable instrument for the measurement of anxiety associated with death through correlation with three anxiety scales contained in the MMPI. (186:165).

Lester also developed and tested a Fear of Death scale that has been incorporated in several studies. (142:179). In later publications, he addressed the need for continued consistency testing in face of the lack of consistency in existing studies. (167:34). In another study, Dickstein constructed and tested a Death Concern Scale (DCS). The instrument contained thirty statements mostly addressing the individual's death or concern with death. The subject responded often, sometimes, rarely, or never to each of the first eleven items and strongly agree to strongly disagree to the remaining nineteen. Testing indicated that the instrument had high reliability in terms of internal consistency. (145:567). Dickstein concluded, however, that the correlation between death as a personality variable and other personality variables is extremely complex. (145:570). Klug and Boss later developed a fourteen item version of the Dickstein DCS which has been employed in some later studies. (162:907).

A death orientation scale labeled the Threat Index
was reported by Rainey and Epting in 1977. The Threat Index evolved from a lengthy, structured interview to a shortened form of self-report on areas such as fear of death. The instrument has been tested and demonstrated acceptable reliability. (181:19).

Despite many variations in educational techniques and treatment group demographics, significant change in anxiety reduction was rarely recorded. Taube experimented with subjects who participated in a fantasy confrontation with their own death and found no significant anxiety reduction. (230:800A). Pennington employed the Collett-Lester Fear of Death Scale in college death and dying courses. No significant difference was found between that group and a general psychology course. (218:5917A).

Likewise, Kurlychek found no difference between death education students and others when the Collett-Lester FOD scale was used. (207:3368). Male tested a high school thanatology class with the same instrument and obtained the same results. (212:688A). Using the Death Anxiety Scale on participants of a sixteen home death laboratory, Thomas found that no positive impact was recorded. (231:4967A). Sullivan again used the Templer Death Anxiety Scale and found no difference in fear of death in those college students who had taken death education and those who had not. (228:382B).

Bohart employed both the Fear of Death Scale and Death
Anxiety Scale on college students engaged in a death desensitizing experiment. No significant change was recorded on either scale. (192:4853A). Other studies, Polderman, Callas, Mueller, Klein, and Weinstein, reported similar results. (220:4161B; 193:1400B; 215:1408A; 206:5026B; 232:139A).

Employing the same instruments, Pettigrew attempted to manipulate death anxiety through hypnosis and biofeedback. Again no significant decrease in anxiety was noted. (219:3411B). Manganello found no change when experimenting with counselors of terminally ill patients. (213:1891B).

Conflicting evidence was presented in the following cases. Combs, using the Death Anxiety Scale and Death Concern Scale, found that the subject's acceptance of death increased while no significant change in anxiety was experienced. (195:1334A).

The effects of a two-day death and dying workshop on the death anxiety level experienced by nurses was reported by Laube. She stated that a reduction in anxiety was recorded immediately following the workshop. That trend was still evidenced three months later. Templer's Death Anxiety Scale was the instrument employed in the experiment. (166:117).

Whelan tested graduate students who attended a death awareness workshop. He reported a lessening in
anxiety and improved acceptance of death. (234:2161A). Conversely, Pratt reported an increase in fear of one's own death after subjects attended a death education laboratory. (221:4026B).

The study of the relationship between religious orientation and fear of death has yielded conflicting findings. Minton and Spilka found that complex, multidimensional factors were involved in those relationships. (173:266). Lester, after examining the available research, concluded that the intensity of fear of death was not affected by religious belief. He pointed out that problems existed in levels of awareness of anxiety and the definitions of religion. (167:33).

Two recent additional studies, O'Rourke and Sullivan, also failed to demonstrate a significant difference in death anxiety based on religious orientation. In both studies, Templer's Death Anxiety Scale was used as the measurement instrument. (216:7046A; 228:382B). Carey stated that religious orientation was an important factor in the emotional adjustment of the terminally ill. He further stated the most important aspect of the religious variable was not mere affiliation, but rather the quality or integration of their belief system into their lives. (18:79). Additional studies have failed to show statistically significant differences between groups of differing religious orientation and death anxiety. Among
the studies available which failed to show significance were McCarthy, who studied Roman Catholic female undergraduate students; Leming, who studied a random sample of Weber County, Utah residents; Jennings, who studied a psychiatric population in a Veterans Administration hospital; and Everts, who tested Protestant church members. (211:5646B; 208:7674A; 204:1904B; 198:2473B).

To optimize the benefits derived from death education, researchers and educators must first have a better understanding of the intrapersonal changes that are occurring. Leviton, in his death education course, devoted the first half of the sessions to data orientation. He stated that valid information was essential for modifying attitudes toward death. (169:5). Other studies have addressed the need for continued study of the various aspects of death education. Balkin, Epstein, and Bush talked to the need for research on racial-ethnic and socio-economic factors as they pertain to the development of attitudes toward death. (134:188). Bell addressed the need to study the relationship between death attitudes and exhibited behavior. (138:203). This need for behavioral objectives also was proposed by Knott and Prull. (164:180). Continued refining of the Threat Index was urged by Rainey and Epting. (181:28). Liston recommended continued questioning of issues related to death education in the medical field. (170:578).
Lester, after surveying the literature, stated that the understanding of fear of death by those associated with the field of thanatology has not significantly increased in recent years. He also admonished the lack of adequate measurement instruments and restrictive choice of variables as the cause. (167:34). Additional research in varied areas was suggested by many other studies, such as Klein, Weinstein, Callas, Taube, Dickstein, O'Rourke, Jennings and McCarthy. (206:5026B; 232:139A; 193:1400B; 230:800A; 145:570; 216:7047A; 204:1904B; 211:5646B). The studies listed appeared to be clearly indicative of a need to develop new instruments for measurement and to examine new variables in the field of death education.

The literature on fear of death demonstrated that substantial work has been accomplished in the field. A majority of studies reported that no significant change in fear of death was observed in subjects who had been exposed to death education programs. However, some conflicting evidence was reported and a need for additional instruments and studies was given.

**Spirituality**

Any study that delves in eschatology must be cognizant of the spiritual aspects involved. Regardless of the scientific attitudes or philosophical bent of the researcher, religion/spirituality was an ubiquitous subject that required addressing. To accomplish this, a necessary first step
is to define and discuss spirituality.

The definitions of the terms defy simplistic approach. Many authors have addressed the topic at great length. Some offer partial coverage on a subdivisional basis; few claim to have a singular definition. (104:329; 121:24; 47:5; 114:25; 58; 68:9; 46:15). Differences in technical language also have posed problems in previous studies involving both theological and psychological aspects. (114:27). Glock and others reported that religiousness/spirituality was multidimensional in nature. (46:9; 96:26; 214:6339B; 132:12; 114:62).

Kubler-Ross noted that a problem might arise if only the word "religious," or its derivations were used in data collection. (244). Some society members today, Saladin stated, have tended to reject dogma and mythology to which religion gave rise. (185:43). Evans reported that Rogers, when questioned by theological students on his views of religion, stated that he heard a lot of concern for moral and ethical issues, but continued, "I have very little use for the institution of religion or for religious institutions." (35:74). Novak stated that the word "religious" may be perceived as a trap and makes many people uncomfortable with its use. (98:76). Many cannot honestly "sign on the dotted line" in a declaration of religious conviction, suggested Weatherhead. (126:15). Tillich stated that some even conceive of "religion" as the work of the Devil. (119:3).
The problem with some contemporary religion, O'Dea suggested, was a lack of relevancy to present social issues. (99:202).

To accommodate those who object to dogmatic interpretation of the word "religious" a broader perspective was offered by allowing the individuals surveyed in this study to assign his/her own value to the term. Novak spoke to the issue of broad interpretation after reviewing the available literature. Several, he stated, argue that "religious must be understood in a context broader than the context of limited historical institutions: denomination, sects, [sic] churches." (98:36). He went on to suggest that man's religious view could be characterized as his central orientation by which he/she relates to the world. Allport addressed intrinsic and extrinsic religious values indicating that differing orientations are incorporated within the context of religion. (4:264; 3:300). Johnson described the importance of the individual's interpretation of religion by suggesting that religious experience was a response to the individual's conceptualization of reality. He, too, added a broad definition calling religion "human search for divine values." (60:47). Fox suggested that what Christians want more of today is spirituality and less religion. He continued by describing spirituality as a way of people living together and stated:

Religion is what empires need to sustain themselves; spirituality is what people need to sustain themselves. (148:731).
To reduce any potential negative connotation of the word "religious," the work "spiritual" was employed in the instrument. This, too, Maslow found difficult to define and left the final interpretation to the individual. (85:176). Schaeffer described spirituality as an internal experience, while Marty called it an actualization of what was in his heart. (113:7; 83:183). All laws of life compel man to search for his spiritual source, Tillich suggested. (120:x). Reviewing the work of Murray, Smith defined "spiritual" as going beyond the church and embracing all things sacred, wherever they are found. (115:230). Jackson offered a broad definition by calling spirituality a function of consciousness related to the non-physical. (238).

Dixon called spirituality, "a shriek of joy a child emits ... a burst of enthusiasm ... an intense moment of awe." (146:345). She went on to describe the concept of spirituality as a process that allows inner feelings to have exterior expression. (146:348).

Baum suggested that spirituality was an internalized attribute that manifested itself in the interaction of the individual with society. (137:266). Spirituality was described by Fox as a way of living that presumes a kind of morality, and it was later depicted as a creative compassion where one might live with share visions of "we" rather than "me" consciousness. (148:736).
Saladin stated that the spiritual experience in a narrow sense was similar to a variety of religious experiences. He went on to address the fact that for many, spiritualism is synonymous with mysticism and mystic experiences. Though these areas may be incorporated into the realm of spiritualism, they cannot constitute the totality of subject. (185:43).

Lilly's entire book, Simulations of God, addressed the function of human belief systems and some of the possible interrelationships available. Each individual was encouraged to explore his/her own systems and metasystem. (76).

Dogma has been mentioned as a stumbling block to the acceptance of ritualistic religion by many. Weatherhead stated that he felt sure many Christians feel excluded from the church due to dogma interfering with his/her intellectual integrity. (126:15).

In his conclusions, William James, while writing The Varieties of Religious Experience, addressed the composition of human element with religion and said:

Ought it, indeed to be assumed that the lives of all men should show identical religious element? In other words, is the existence of so many religious types and sects regrettable? To these questions, I answer 'No' emphatically. (58:487).

And so it was that the definition of spirituality has been left to each individual for personal interpretation.
All of the descriptions of religion and spirituality require personal interpretation for, as Allport stated, "Every man . . . has his own ultimate presuppositions." (2:95). Therefore, it was determined by the researcher that it was valid for each individual to apply his/her own definition of "spiritual" or "religious" when completing the questionnaires.

The approach used in this study offers a new look at the subject. The need for multiple methodologies in studying the dimensional character of death attitudes was called for by Bell. (138:204). Tart addressed the need for disciplined investigators to undertake the difficult examination of religious and mystical experiences. (118:218). In discussing the psychology of religion, Pruyser stated that there is a need to come to grips with such public phenomena as theological treatises. (104:333).

Though some call for scientific study in the field of religious subjects, there has been a tradition of controversy surrounding this issue of the compatibility of science and religion. Lilly addressed the scientific evaluation of religion stating:

Modern science knows this: we know that merely because a culture generated a cosmology of a certain kind and worshipped it, there was no guarantee of goodness of fit with the real universe. In science we now proceed to test, insofar as they are testable, models of our universe rather than to worship them. (76:15).
Glock from survey research in this area reported most scientists studied did not engage in religious activity nor have religious concern. (47:265). Scobie stated, after studying the field, that the study of science yields continuous decline in religious belief. (114:141). Such notables as David McClelland and Karl Menninger have debated this sensitive issue. While McClelland declared that scientists are inhibited from publically espousing religious belief, Menninger stated that these conclusions are:

buttressed by the sophomoric bumptousness with which some otherwise cogent scientists make proclamations of their agnosticism. (86:235).

He went on to recommend that established scientists openly declare their position. But on an optimistic note, Greeley stated that religions have survived assaults of scientism from without before. (52:241).

Perhaps one of the sternest admonishments was issued by Frankl when speaking of the failure to acknowledge man's spiritual nature he said:

I am absolutely convinced that the gas chambers of Auschwitz, Tremblinka, and Maidanek were ultimately prepared not in some ministry or other in Berlin, but rather at the desks and lecture halls of nihilistic scientists and philosophers. (37:xxi).

An attempt at resolution of this conflict is addressed by Kavanaugh, in an article appropriately titled, "Death: A Useful Interface Between Psychology and Religion," who stated: "The mystery of death resists all attempts at usual objectivity." (65:193). He further proposed that
the time is right, and thanatology an appropriate subject, to bring religion and psychology together. This confluence is being enhanced through strides taken by behavioral scientists. The "third force" or existential philosophy has found increased significance in the field of psychology, suggested Scobie. He pointed to the work of Maslow, Allport, and others as being responsible for developing the interface between philosophy and psychology. (114:26).

The field of psychology also offered much information on the topic of religious attitude and belief formation which is germane to this research. Religious beliefs are organized cognitions and perceptions that provide a basis for behavior. They go well beyond speculation. Pruyster found that one of the outstanding features of religion is its seriousness. It is a serious belief whether defined as an attitude, behavior, feeling, or belief. (104:330). Greeley suggested that, like language, man absorbs his religion. (53:241). The influence of parental attitudes and belief systems and the impact of conflicting beliefs is addressed by Scobie. He suggested that additional influence by peers and society will be experienced in the presence of conflict. (114:137). Wilson also ascribed to the socialization concept of assimilation of religious beliefs. He suggested that religious identification frequently is transferred to other dimensions such as race, ethnicity, or political affiliation. (130:113).
Lilly described the complexity of human belief systems. He stated that they usually have several systems that may or may not overlap and be in conflict. (76:19). Allport reported two opposing forms of religious identification. The first, communal, stressed sociocultural factors and satisfied needs of belonging and communal identification. The second form, associational, was designed to meet needs of religious fellowship. Studies were quoted indicating that very large numbers of parishioners engage in religious activities for communal reward. (5:81).

Attitudinal changes in religion may be influenced in three ways, Scobie suggested. These categories were: 1) rational or intellectual persuasion, 2) emotional persuasion, or 3) physiological persuasion (physical force). (114:137). Perceived psychic deprivation may be resolved through religious resolution Glock stated; however, these changes were most likely to be superficial and not effect the real cause of the deprivation. (47:249). Religious attitude change can be quite difficult but can be accomplished.

The literature on spirituality and religiousness indicated great difficulty with definition. It was shown to be multidimensional and highly personal in nature. Rejection by many people of the dogmatic connotations of
"religious" was indicated. Despite the traditional controversy surrounding the compatibility of science and religion, a need to examine change resulting from a death awareness seminar was clearly established. It was noted that the belief systems affected are extremely complex.

**Measurement of Religiosity**

Measurement of the multidimensional aspects of spirituality/religiosity was a difficult technical problem. A number of instruments were examined for possible application in this research, and all were rejected. Wilson expressed the problem encountered when he stated:

> A measurement of religion must also tap ways of being religious that are not tied closely to institutional religion. (130:441).

A five dimensional scaled instrument developed by Faulkner and Dejong has been widely used. The instrument was tested on 362 college students and reported to have high validity. The interrelationships between dimensions was supported by the coefficients. Based on the work of Glock, the five dimensions constructed were ideological, ritualistic, experiential, intellectual, and consequential (47:246). Questions addressed the "will of God," asked for the respondents "view of the Bible," and addressed church attendance. The intellectual scale required knowledge of Christian-specific information.
An earlier publication by Chave provided a survey of the data collection attempted to that time. Again, the study was restricted to those of a Judeo-Christian background but did leave room for eclectics. (20:1).

Lenski later developed an instrument to measure the influence of religion on politics, economics, and family life. This measure, too, was designed for those of Judeo-Christian heritage. Questions asked about belief in Jesus and reading of the Bible. (72:341).

King and Hunt designed and tested a nine dimensional instrument and then later replicated the study on a national basis. The instrument was Christian-oriented and in both tests administered to Protestant groups. (67:60; 160:13).

In a survey approach, Alston attempted to measure and correlate religiosity between Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. Two of the three dimensions examined eliminated that instrument from use in this research, church attendance and respect given religious leaders. (133:165).

The semantic differential technique was applied by Muthen et al in a three-mode factor analysis to investigate the structure of certain types of religious attitudes and differentiating between individuals with regard to differences in those attitudes. The construct was again based on Christian ideology. (177:275).
A lesser known study was also examined and found to be predominantly Judeo-Christian in orientation. Silverman described the use of a Religious Attitude Questionnaire. A review of this fifty item instrument again found it to contain Bible references and Christian-specific concepts of God. (227).

One known attempt has been made at measurement of non-doctrinal religion. This was done to test for the existence of an "invisible religion." Conflicting data were reported on this study based on replication by Nelson, Everett, and Mader. (178:263). The design did not meet the needs of this researcher and was rejected.

The best overview of the measurement of religiosity was found in an appendix of Wilson's book, *Religion in American Society: The Effective Presence*. This appendix synthesized the strengths and weaknesses of many of the existing instruments and detailed the purported dimensions each tests. (130:440).

Review of various instruments available showed that existing instruments tended to have a Judeo-Christian orientation. The researcher desired to use an instrument allowing for a broader connotation of spirituality.
Psychodrama

The goal is to improve
the quality of human life.

Sam Blum
(11:293).

Prior to examination of the dynamics of psychodrama, it is necessary to address briefly the broader scope of group therapy. The encounter movement has expanded rapidly in recent years and has transversed from a purely mental disturbance treatment to an important social function. It has moved from hospitals and clinics into universities and private homes as more and more members of American society became isolated and alienated from family and friends. (11:285).

From a business standpoint, the personal growth movement, based on humanistic psychology, "is off to a resounding start," according to Charny. (19:122). Redefinition of the role of psychotherapy from the one-on-one verbal approach designed for the seriously impaired to a concept of producing more effective functioning has been instrumental in bringing the psychotherapy group into prominence. Johnson stated that the goal of such groups was to move the individual beyond the rigid self-imposed limits of consciousness, and the evidence was conclusive that they accomplish the mission. (61:318).

Evans, quoting Rogers, stated that, because it was a way of eliminating alienation and loneliness, group therapy
such as encounter groups was one of the most significant social inventions of the century. (33:32).

As the movement has grown, the types of groups available have proliferated. Individuals in need of love, support or understanding have participated in supportive groups, analytic therapy groups, reconditioning groups, t-groups, encounter groups, and experiential groups with their myriad of techniques.

While group therapy was credited with many positive attributes, it is not a panacea for the mental and emotional ills of the nation. Caution was urged by several addressing the screening methods employed to eliminate the truly neurotic or psychotic personalities. Welch listed several degrees of danger to neurotics ranging from a) they do not get better to d) they flip out in a psychotic break or suicide. (127:123). Goldman concurred and went on to address the possible physical and emotional damage that can occur to other workshop participants. He also noted that an individual can be prematurely opened and forced to face issues he is not prepared to accept. (49:296).

Another general concern stated by Charny was the lack of permanency of the change that was generated during the psychotherapeutic sessions. The euphoric effect demonstrated at many workshops was addressed, but questions raised as to the sufficiency of the experience to remove deep-seated
blocks and conflict. (19:124). Some suggested that everyone goes back to their old habits while others argue that they do not go back the same way.

Psychodrama, as known in the United States today, was an outgrowth of the work initiated by John L. Moreno during the early part of the twentieth century but had its roots in ancient Greek theatre. It was based on catharsis, a concept introduced by Aristotle. Z. Moreno reported on her husband's work and suggested that a dual cathartic effect was produced, the primary in the actors and secondary in the spectators. It was from the observation of children at play that the concept of psychodrama was adapted. Later, expansion from concentration on one individual to problems of a group led to the development of the sociodrama. (94:353).

In psychodrama, Z. Moreno stated, emphasis was placed on the primordial nature of physical action which was functioning unconsciously below the language level. (94:354). Blatner felt it integrated the experiential and participatory involvement dimensions with the traditional mode of cognitive analysis. (10:1). Frequently, the individual becomes aware of his feelings by spontaneously acting out a psychodramatic scene, many of which are self-directed. However, psychodrama is both interpersonal, as well as intrapersonal, and incorporates behavior training, body training, sociotherapy, and may be presented in either
a direct or indirect format. In the direct, or confessional mode, the patient makes an open declaration of the perceived difficulty; whereas, in the indirect mode, the portrayal was of situations typical of the spectators' circumstances.

The varied applications of therapeutic psychodrama were addressed by Blatner. In a traditional context, it could be applied to emotional problem-solving. Psychodrama provided a multidimensional approach to evaluation of interpersonal relationships which might have been based on unconscious determinants. Another application might have been the facilitation of improved relationships and personal growth. This was accomplished through the establishment of group norms in honesty, self-disclosure, risk-taking, expression of emotion, acceptance, permissiveness, and etc. Psychodrama could also be employed in the area of problem clarification. By concentrating on concrete behavior, the protagonist could be assuaded from employing the cognitive domain defensively and was forced to examine his/her actions. Frequently, it was found that non-verbal communication was occurring at a near subconscious level. Once the incongruities between verbal and non-verbal communication were confronted, it was possible to identify previous hindrances to interpersonal relationships. Additionally, once problems were clearly identified, the protagonist
could have been afforded an opportunity to try out various solutions and determine his/her best course of action. (10:123).

The foundation of psychodrama was based on eclecticism in the choice of educational or psychotherapeutic approaches. This method varied from other forms of psychotherapy, Sacks reported, in that people move freely, time shifts were allowed, surplus realities could be explored, and the individual chose who he/she/wanted to portray. The movement, or acting-out or acting-in, was designed to provide insight. The time shifts referred to flexibility in the temporal dimension to examine past or future events. The context of surplus realities allowed exploration of imagined events such as wishes, fears, or fantasies. The freedom to select an alter ego allowed the protagonist to feel what situations were like to another. (111:142).

The measurement criterion must be successful behavioral change. Moreno reported empirically that he was the first success. Since then, numerous studies have concluded that fundamental changes in behavior can take place through the use of psychodrama. (94:375).

The use of psychodrama in preparation for dealing with death issues was addressed by Abraham. Working in Israel, after the Six Day War in June 1967, he found that death issues were spontaneously raised during psycho-
therapeutic sessions with increased frequency. Abraham stated:

Nowhere in human existence does man remain so isolated and unprepared as when facing the power of the many emotions and experiences which death arouses. (132:85).

He noted that increased warm-up periods were necessary and that people would refuse to participate or fall into deep silence. Fear of the "evil eye" concept was expressed by some. High anxiety was displayed in several ways. These included expressed boredom during periods of high excitement, requests for interruption of the scene, fits of laughter, and failure of some members to return. Abraham suggested that the permanent nearness of death can intensify feelings of solitude and vulnerability and lead to internal withdrawal. (132:91).

The literature on psychodrama has shown it to be an effective method for emotional problem solving. The techniques employed vary but the basic concepts are now widely accepted. A major benefit of psychodrama was the ability to observe issues that are operating at a subconscious level through the physical acting out of events.
Life, Death, and Transition

Should you shield the canyons from the windstorms
You would never see the beauty of their carvings.

Kubler-Ross
(71:155).

Life, Death, and Transition was a five day emotionally intensive workshop led by Kubler-Ross with the assistance of Martha and Jay Barham and other staff members from Shanti Nilaya, a health center near Escondido, California. Up to seventy attendees per session, from all across the United States and some foreign countries, gathered at a relatively secluded workshop site to participate. The expressed purpose in the workshop was to present what had been learned from dying patients during the past twelve years and to allow the participant a forum to share his/her grief, fears, and sorrows in the emotionally safe environment of a stranger peer group. (71:149).

The exploration and release of emotional stress was facilitated by externalization of negativity similar to the Barham method of psychodrama. This method was designed to release repressed emotions which have formed blocks to inter and intrapersonal relationships. Often one could resolve specific behavior crises or remove lingering anxiety. The Barham Method assumes that each individual has the innate wisdom to venture inward and resolve life's problems and complexities. (235:1).
The Barham Method varies from traditional psychodrama in that techniques of confrontation and interruption were not employed. Further, the protagonist always remained himself/herself and was not allowed to shift to auxiliary egos. Thirdly, only real situations were portrayed, and fantasies, dreams, or anticipated events were not acceptable as therapeutic material. (235:2).

During the Life, Death, and Transition workshops, complex staged dramas were not employed. (242). Here the emotional trigger was activated by the spontaneous sharing of tremendously powerful recounting of events that have caused great grief, stress, or anxiety. Frequently, the experience revealed was of personal fear of impending death by a person with a terminal illness, of recounting the loss of a child, or issues of divorce, abortion, sexuality, or proposed suicide. As the workshops progressed, more and more participants became actively and emotionally involved in expressing their pent-up emotions. (242).

The Barham Method of psychodrama maximizes the externalization of emotions. (235:2). To facilitate the release of pain, rage, and impotence, a mattress and rubber hose was provided. The participant was encouraged to physically and vocally ventilate these emotions while beating the mattress with the hose.
As the participant becomes more deeply involved, insight into the cause of the emotion experienced was frequently uncovered. Few observers remained emotionally uninvolved as the moving encounters precipitated their own repressed emotions.

In theory, Kubler-Ross stated, extensive amounts of energy were expended to suppress these negative feelings. The intent of releasing the emotion was to free the energy which could then be used in a positive manner.

Continually, the concept of "unfinished business" was addressed. The death and dying research has shown that many people were afraid to die or prolonged life in order that they might complete a task, experience a certain event, or bring closure to a relationship. Freud and Kubler-Ross agreed that patients facing death with no remaining unfinished business are able to approach it with peace and equanimity. By addressing this concept in the workshop, it was hoped that participants would recognize their unfinished business, address the issues, and continue to live life in a fuller and more complete manner.

The therapeutic techniques employed in the Life, Death, and Transition workshop were well grounded in Humanistic Psychology. Maslow stated that for most people a wall existed between the conscious and unconscious mind, and that the role of the psychotherapist was to penetrate
to the deeper levels which are ordinarily repressed. He suggested that it was by removing these blockages that the creative nature of man could be freed. (85:84). He went on to state that as these successively deeper levels were penetrated, the individual frequently had to face things of which he was terribly afraid and learn there was nothing to fear in the first place. (85:90). In his Primal Therapy concept, Janov stated that neurotic tension comes from repressed pain, and from each experience that remains unfelt and not integrated, tension ensues. (59:23). The only way to remove the blocks was to return and feel what was not fully felt and integrated previously. (59:26).

Others also have addressed the need for release of repressed grief. Kavanaugh learned that grief was a psychological process which required various forms of energy to be released. Central to grief therapy, he suggested, was a totally permission-giving atmosphere. (65:198). Maslow stated that if grief and pain were sometimes needed to facilitate personal growth, then automatic protection from them should not be offered as if pain were bad. (84:8).

The concept of unfinished business has been acknowledged by Gestalt therapists such as Blum. Similar techniques are sometimes used by them to assist patients in dealing with
grief, loss, or fear. (11:289).

Along with the emotions of grief and pain, guilt frequently was expressed during the workshops. Maslow talked to that issue and stated that every crime against one's own nature was recorded without exception in the unconscious. This phenomenon yields self-hate and guilt. (84:5). He later stated that real guilt can serve a useful function in directing personal growth. (84:75). Guilt can be experienced in differing degrees, and the ways of alleviating guilt feelings varied, found Robinson and Shaver. It must be remembered that guilt feelings, which were always subjective, extended over a wide range and exceeded the limits of laws and ethics. (106:22). Insight into the cause of guilt and an ability to place the guilt into a reasonable perspective was accomplished by some participants in the workshop. (242).

The need for an emotionally safe environment in which the workshop participants could function has been mentioned. An important dimension of that environment was the establishment of a situation where participants could be sincerely heard. According to Perls, this society is noted for its transmit only mode of communication. He stated that few listen without talking while most people talk without listening. (103:48). Curran also addressed the need for creative listeners and stated that there was
a need by many to have someone genuinely committed to listening. (27:90). Participants in the workshop were really heard.

Major influence on the whole concept of the Third Force on humanistic psychology was the works of Jung. The effects of his work, the nature of which was too broad to single out, have had primary and secondary impact on the concept and design of the Life, Death, and Transition workshop. (242).

Little is written about the Life, Death, and Transition workshop per se. However, the design was shown to be based on sound psychotherapeutic concepts of humanistic psychology. The need to address "unfinished business" so that advances in emotional growth can occur was clearly stated.

**Life After Death Research**

It is surprising to hear a physician respond to the question of whether or not there is life after death with: "Yes, beyond a shadow of a doubt." Holck (154:1).

As previously stated, an integral part of the Life, Death, and Transition workshop was the presentation of research in the area of life after death and near-death experiences. A unique aspect of that presentation was that Kubler-Ross was able to give first-hand accounts of the phenomena. (242).
Kubler-Ross was not the only medical doctor to speak openly on the subject of "near-death" experiences. Moody was largely responsible for the popularization of near death research through his book, *Life After Life*. (91). His findings included numerous reports of continued existence and consciousness while in an out-of-body state were reported by patients who had been clinically dead and later revived. Additional confirmation was reported by Sabom and Kreutziger, cardiologists at the University of Florida. Their findings included reports of the out-of-body experience in two forms, the first, autoscopy, or viewing their body from several feet above, and two, transcendence, the traveling into another dimension. They concluded, "No adequate medical explanation of these findings is presently available." (184:195).

Another cardiologist, Rawlings, has written a book which reported many similar findings to those previously reported. A difference from the findings reported by Kubler-Ross, Moody and others was the description of strongly negative experiences, conceptualized as "hell" by some patients who had survived the life-threatening episodes. Rawlings suggested that the others are accurately reporting what the patients have stated. He felt, however, that the negative experiences were quickly suppressed into the unconscious mind and therefore not related to the investigators. (105:65). Kubler-Ross
regarded these "negative experiences" as real but not reality. Her research indicated that they were projections created by a fearful mind, conditioned throughout life with stories of fire and brimstone. She clearly differentiates between physical energies which were man created and manipulated, and psychic energy which can never be manipulated. (244).

Lilly, another medical doctor, reported a first-hand account of a near death experience triggered by an embolism. He too reported leaving his body, traveling to another dimension, and communicating with spirit guides. (75:22). Jung, after suffering an attack suggestive of cardiac arrest, reported on an out-of-body experience he described as ecstatic. He accounted being in a "contemporaneous state in which the present, past, and future are one." (63:295).

Qualified scientists from related fields have also investigated the out-of-body experience and near death phenomena. Osis and Haraldsson presented research data on over a thousand such cases in their recent book, At the Hour of Death. Their findings confirm the data reported by their medical colleagues. (101). A psychologist, Wambach, has pursued not only the life after death aspects, but through the medium of hypnotic regression explored
the possibilities of previous life. (125). Tart, also a psychologist, has reported on data of the out-of-body experience. (118:285). A respected theologian, Wileferson, has also investigated the near-death experience and reported on it in a popular book and film both titled, *Beyond and Back*. His findings closely parallel what the others have reported. (129). It must be pointed out that not all theologians accepted this material. Ryrie, in his dissenting opinion, stated that he felt the reports were representative of a counterfeit truth due to Satan's influence. (110:19).

The commonalities of recent research findings were reported on by Cooper. (196:18). The concept of separation from the physical body is not new. Preparatory texts such as *The Tibetan Book of the Dead* and *The Egyptian Book of the Dead* have been written in other cultures specifically addressing the topic. (34:18; 15:iv). Some suggest the Bible contains similar references based on symbolic interpretation. (131:177). Holck has reviewed the existing research and concluded that, "These phenomena manifest themselves universally and that they appear to be part of the experience of the human race." (154:1).

More broadly, the near-death experience can be categorized in the penumbra of mysticism. Writers have wrestled with the interrelationship of religion and mys-
ticism for a long time. Underhill suggested that, "No deeply religious man is without a touch of mysticism; and no mystic can be other than religious." (123:70). Leuba stated that mysticism was included within the definition of the term religion. (73:2). More recently, Knowles confirmed the existence of true mysticism but stated concern over translation of the experience into verbal expression by the participants. (68:73).

A Catholic priest and researcher, Greeley, has investigated extensively mysticism and the paranormal. Among his early conclusions were that the paranormal was normal, and people who have paranormal experiences were not kooks. He found that these experiences were normal even in modern society. (52:7). In another book, Greeley and McCready stated that people, perhaps millions, have had mystical experiences, and many report having had them frequently. (51:4). Greeley went on to address the transformation that occurs in a person during a mystical episode and described the experience as extraordinary. (51:41). He also described the relationship between mysticism and Christianity. (51:68).

In a recent study in the measurement of mystical experiences, Thomas and Cooper reported that 34 percent of the subjects reported that they had felt a spiritual force which had lifted them outside of themselves.
In another study, Hay and Morisy confirmed that these experiences were more widespread than previously believed. In July 1979, a study was released in England that had been suppressed for forty years. The majority opinion in the study concluded that there was evidence to support a belief in survival after death.

A respected theologian, Weatherhead, studied the subject of mysticism in depth and reported on the evidence supporting survival of death. His material included both first hand accounts of communication with the dead and substantiated case studies of the same. He went on to address the biblical aspects of mysticism.

Maslow also had studied and reported at great lengths on what he termed "peak experiences." He found that time and space disorientation was a commonly reported factor as was a unity with the world or universe.

It should be noted that several researchers have drawn parallels between mystic experiences and mental illness. Boisen reported on the work of some, including Starbuck, Coe, Pratt, James, and Leuba, all of whom addressed aspects of psychological disorders. He found Coe the most austere when he stated that there is a close relationship between mystical experiences and hysteria.
and delusional insanity. (13:93).

After more recent study, Greeley concludes, "... there is in the current revival of mysticism a sign of the times that no one can afford to ignore." (51:6).

This section was reviewed, not because it was anticipated that participants would report "peak experiences" or "near-death experiences," but rather to cover material presented in the workshop that might impact upon them. The literature on life after death has demonstrated a growing body of credible evidence to support that thesis. It was shown that scientists and theologians have begun seriously to study this field that was previously classified as mysticism.

Summary

This chapter brought into focus from the literature and related research an overview of the areas of primary concern that were used in developing this study. Presented by subheading, the literature revealed:

Death Education

1. There was a scarcity of information addressing measurement of spirituality as it related to death education.

2. Death education has proliferated in the past decade,
3. The need for death education has expanded due to medical advances that prolongate life.

4. Death education courses were taught at all levels from primary through graduate school and in both public and private institutions.

5. The work of Kubler-Ross has strongly influenced the field of thanatology.

6. Death education material was being provided to meet the increased need.

Fear of Death

1. There was considerable literature addressing "fear of death."

2. Most studies indicated that no significant change in fear of death was observed in those who had taken a death education program.

3. A need for additional instruments and research was cited.

Spirituality/Religiousness

1. Definition of religiousness or spirituality was difficult and diverse.

2. There was some resistance to the dogmatic connotation of "religion."

3. "Spirituality" had broader connotations than "religiousness."
4. Religiousness or spirituality was multidimensional and personal in nature.

5. Individuals could validly apply his/her own concept of religious/spiritual when answering the questionnaire.

6. There has been a tradition of controversy over the compatibility of science and religion.

7. Thanatology is an appropriate subject to interface between religion and psychology.

8. Religious belief systems are complex.

Measurement of Religiosity

1. A number of instruments have been developed to measure religiosity.

2. The instruments reviewed were all biased towards a Judeo-Christian background.

Psychodrama

1. Psychodrama has been proven to be an effective method of emotional problem solving.

2. The Barham method of psychodrama allows people to discover and ventilate emotional stress.

3. During the Life, Death, and Transition workshops grief, fear, and sorrow are expressed by the participants.

4. "Unfinished business" has major impact on how people live and needs to be resolved.
Life After Death Research

1. Workshop participants are exposed to "life-after-death" and "near-death" research.

2. Several reputable scientists have reported on near-death experiences.

3. The life-after-death research is related to the historic study of mysticism.

4. Recent research on mysticism indicated it is widespread and warrants further serious research.

5. Some suggested that a relationship existed between mystical experiences and mental disorders.

6. It was concluded that mysticism cannot be ignored.

The summary of the review of literature indicated that there was a need to study the changes in spirituality that occur during death education workshops. Further, it supported the techniques that have been employed in the conduct of the workshop and the study designed to research the subject.
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

This chapter will examine the methodology used to test for changes in spirituality as reported by those who attended Life, Death, and Transition workshops.

A discussion of the procedures and instrument used in the study is presented in this chapter. Areas presented are: 1) the rationale for the study; 2) a description of the population; 3) selection of the sample; 4) workshop design; 5) development and design of the survey instrument; 6) interview procedures; 7) statistical methodology.

A review of literature in the areas of death education, fear of death, spirituality, measurement of religiosity, psychodrama, Life, Death, and Transition workshop, and life after death research indicated that there was a need to determine if significant change occurred in the dimension of spirituality in people who attend a Kubler-Ross Life, Death, and Transition workshop. This became the problem. To determine if significant change occurred, the following steps were taken. First, a self-assessment survey instrument was constructed and tested. This
The instrument was then mailed to a random sample of attendees of eleven workshops. Additionally, a pretest-posttest version of the instrument was used to gather data at two more workshops during their period of attendance. The next step was to conduct a telephone survey of selected recipients of the mailed instrument to verify the responses.

The purpose of collecting the data from the attendees was to test the first hypothesis that there was no significant change in spirituality reported by the people who attended a Life, Death, and Transition workshop during the cited time period. If the first hypothesis was rejected and significant change in spirituality reported, that change would demonstrate no increase longitudinally in correlation with the intervening time period.

**Population**

The population used in this study was all persons who attended Kubler-Ross Life, Death, and Transition workshops conducted between June 1977 and February 1979. The following workshops were surveyed:

1. January 1979, Escondido, California
2. December 1978, Bahamas
3. October 1978, Kapaau, Hawaii
4. June 1978, Appleton, Wisconsin
5. May 1978, Halifax, Nova Scotia
6. May 1978, Escondido, California
7. April 1978, Sonora, California  
8. February 1978, San Antonio, Texas  
9. January 1978, Escondido, California  
10. October 1977, Black Mountain, North Carolina  
11. October 1977, Santa Barbara, California  
12. September 1977, Three Rivers, California  
13. June 1977, Appleton, Wisconsin

**Sampling Procedures**

Three sampling procedures were used, one for each method of data gathering.

The first method of data gathering was used for the pretest-posttest instrument. The workshops conducted in December 1978 and January 1979 were administered the pretest upon arrival and the posttest immediately prior to departure. An attempt was made to survey every attendee; however, the goal of 100 percent participation was not achieved. Eighty-seven usable questionnaires were retrieved which represented 73 percent of those in attendance.

For the eleven workshops surveyed by mail, a second method of data gathering was employed. Thirty subjects were randomly selected from the mailing list of each workshop. Each selectee received a transmittal letter, a questionnaire, and a self-addressed stamped envelope. The only limitations placed on selection were as follows:
1. United States resident.
2. Only one member per family surveyed.
3. Only one questionnaire per individual. A few names appeared on multiple lists.
4. No known staff members of Shanti Nilaya were selected.

Approximately twenty-five letters were returned marked as not forwardable. These were remailed to another subject from the same workshop. A total of approximately 330 letters should have been received by selectees. Of those, 157 responded to the questionnaire and returned it to the researcher. This represented a return rate of approximately 47 percent without the use of follow-up procedures.

The final procedure for data gathering was to select persons to be contacted for the telephone survey. Twenty were randomly selected and called. In those cases when contact could not be made, another person was randomly selected.

Treatment

The treatment provided each group was the experience of the Life, Death, and Transition workshop as described in the preceding chapter. A curriculum outline of the workshop is included (see Appendix A). The workshops were five days in length and generally conducted in a
cloistered location which facilitated the necessary emotional security. The participants came from widely varied social, religious, and professional backgrounds. Every group contained terminally ill patients representative of all ages except young children.

Attendees generally arrived on a Monday which was designated as "Baloney Day" by Kubler-Ross due to the superficial nature of topics that predominate conversations. Introductory exercises were conducted, and the groups engaged in a symbolic non-verbal communication exercise. During this exercise, each participant drew a picture which was later analyzed using techniques developed by Bach, a Jungian analyst. (242; 71:52).

Tuesday through Thursday, the participants dealt with emotional issues via the medium of psychodrama. Mini-lecture sessions were also employed to meet the need of cognitive learning and presentation of the theoretical base. Sessions were interspersed with meditative and musical therapy. Individual counseling was available on an as needed basis. While formal sessions were conducted from mid-morning until early the next morning, often until 2:00 or 3:00 A.M., allowing for appropriate breaks, the emotional nature of the workshop was omnipresent.

During the later portion of the workshop, life-after-death research material was presented and mystical experiences personally recounted by Kubler-Ross. Therefore,
it was prudent to include a synopsis of her professional training and background (see Appendix B).

Kubler-Ross is a Swiss born psychiatrist who received her medical degree at the University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland in 1957. She has done extensive psychiatric and thanatology work at several major hospitals in the United States and held several positions of great responsibility in the medical community. (240).

Immediately following World War II, she entered Germany and traveled extensively throughout Europe. Lasting impressions were made during the journey which took her to some of the Nazi concentration camps. These impressions were to help shape her later work in death and dying. (69:122). Her background was medical and scientific, not theological. Throughout the experiences that she has now reported, Kubler-Ross has always maintained a high degree of scientific skepticism and required proof on both a physical and cognitive level that these events were real. This position has been maintained despite many attacks on her credibility. (242).

Some of the information provided at the workshops was scientifically controversial and in many cases represented a drastic departure from the participants' context of reality. The material presented included the first-hand recounting of a physical encounter with Mrs. Swartz,
a patient who had died a year earlier, many out-of-body reports provided by people who had been clinically dead for periods up to twelve hours, Kubler-Ross' own "mystical experiences," and finally the physical manifestation of three spirit guides in front of an audience of seventy-five observers in San Diego in September 1976. (179:21; 242; 171:55).

The material was presented in seminar format with Kubler-Ross leading the discussion. Questions and personal accounts of related experiences were provided by the workshop participants. The seminar was presented in a serious manner with frequent referencing of all the physical facts available. Examples of the extent Kubler-Ross has gone to to establish the validity of these experiences included the obtaining and analysis of a handwriting sample from Mrs. Swartz, the physiological monitoring of out-of-body experiences at the Monroe laboratories in Virginia, and the availability of qualified witnesses during the manifestation of the spirit guides. (179:25; 242). Written acknowledgement of meeting with spirit guides was provided by a terminal patient, Louise, just prior to her death. (71:101).

**Survey Instrument Development**

The proposed design required the construction and reliability testing of a two-part instrument that could
measure changes in spirituality. The multidimensional approach was chosen to obtain a comprehensive examination of any change that took place. Borg and Gall stated that attitude scale construction normally encompasses at least ten items. (14:200). The instrument developed established eighteen items for analysis, seven open-ended items, and eleven semantic differential bipolar adjectives.

Development of Open-Ended Questions

The first section of the instrument contained seven open-ended dimensions. As Borg and Gall pointed out, it is often desirable to employ open-ended items. (14:199). The questions utilized were derived from an unused questionnaire developed by Bunny Flarsheim and suggestions provided to Flarsheim by Kubler-Ross in a letter dated August 6, 1976. (243:3). The questions allowed for pretesting and posttesting of attitudes toward death, life, religiousness/spirituality, self, and others, as well as value changes and workshop comments.

Semantic Differential Scale Development

The second section of the instrument employed required the subject to indicate his/her pre and post position on each of eleven bipolar adjective scales. Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum addressed the construction and evaluation of semantic differential at length. They claimed that it is an acceptable technique for attitude data gathering
that has both high validity and reliability. They further addressed the specific use of semantic differential in attitude assessment, studies of personality traits, and numerous other psycho-social contexts. (100:79-80).

Borg and Gall also addressed semantic differential as a viable measure of self-concept. (14:182). It was one of the most frequently used tools for measuring religious belief and behavior. (114:36)

Development of Descriptors

The first step in the construction of the semantic differential segment of the instrument was to identify adjectives connoting the qualities of either high or low spirituality. A list of fifty-five words was generated without regard for the positioning of each descriptor. To insure that the words would be presented in a random order, a pair of dice were employed. The dice were thrown for each word. The number appearing on the dice was counted down from the previous word. This process was continued until the emplacement of all descriptors produced a final list (see Appendix C).

The next step was to establish a jury to test the internal validity of the generated descriptors. The selected jury was comprised of nine Christian clergy all with advanced degrees in theology and six lay persons of widely varied backgrounds and religious orientations.
None of the jurors had been previously exposed to the Life, Death, and Transition workshop. Each was given a mimeographed copy of the instrument and asked to comply with the enclosed instructions (see Appendix C). Those instructions required the juror to apply his/her own definition of spirituality and determine if each of the descriptors connoted attributes of high spirituality, low spirituality, or did not apply to that concept.

The results were tabulated and evaluated by the researcher. As a result of this process, twenty-seven words were immediately eliminated. Elimination was based primarily on lack of consensus of the jury. A few words such as good, bad, and evil were eliminated due to the high degree of emotional loading that would accompany their usage.

At this point, it was noted that a greater number of words connoting attributes of high spirituality remained than words connoting attributes of low spirituality. To provide for balanced responses, a few antonyms were added for the second round of jury panel evaluation.

The random positioning of the words was again accomplished by the roll of the dice. The same procedure described in step one was employed. The only variant was that now two clearly definitive groups were established. The column on the left side of the paper contained eighteen
words connoting attributes of high spirituality while the right column contained fourteen words connoting attributes of low spirituality (see Appendix D).

A jury panel of five was given oral instructions to pair the words which imparted the opposite attributes of spirituality. Each was again instructed to employ their personal definition of spirituality. The procedure used in the pairing required each juror to place the number found along side the words on the left column in the blank beside the word in the right column portraying an opposite meaning in the context of spirituality.

The researcher again tabulated and evaluated the responses of the jury. As a result of a lack of consensus, four words were eliminated entirely. Several other descriptors merged into a single dimension. Those merged were miserly-greedy, charitable-giving, meditative-prayerful, and concerned-caring.

The next step was to establish the order of presentation of the selected bipolar adjectives. The relative sequencing was again accomplished by rolling dice. When sequencing was completed, the matter of polarity was addressed. To insure that subjects read and evaluated each item individually, the researcher decided to randomly reverse the polarity of the presented items. A coin was tossed for each set of bipolar adjectives to determine
if the positive pole, or words attributed to high spirituality, would fall to the right or left of the page. As a result of this procedure, seven pairs had the positive pole presented on the left side of the instrument while four pairs had the positive pole presented on the right side. The seven bipolar pairs with left side positive references were: patient-impatient, forgiving-unforgiving, warm-cold, accepting-judgmental, hopeful-hopeless, meditative/prayerful-non-contemplative, concerned/caring-unconcerned.

A scale from zero to ten was placed between each of the bipolar adjectives to allow the subject to easily identify his/her relative position. For numerical consistency and evaluation purposes, the polarity was realigned by the researcher. The placement of all positive descriptors on the right side of the instrument allowed for a direct correlation between the numerical selection of the subject and positive or negative change. That is a movement to the right was indicative of a positive change while a movement to the left was indicative of a negative change.

Although pre, post, and relative change scores were all recorded, the evaluation of change process was applied only to the relative change scores. Other scores were employed in the reliability testing aspects.
The instrument developed was then designated as the Alexander Spirituality Change Survey (SCS).

Implementing Instructions

The SCS was employed in two separate and distinctive modes. The first involved pre and posttesting of subjects while at the workshop site. To accomplish this, two versions of the instrument were developed with slightly different implementing instructions. The pretest questionnaire contained only three of the open-ended questions. Those questions addressed death, life, and spirituality. The semantic differential segment was the same throughout.

The transmittal and instruction sheet contained a brief explanation of why the requirement for demographic data, anonymity aspects, a statement on subjectivity and voluntariness, and instruction on completing the semantic differential portion (see Appendix E).

The post-workshop questionnaire encompassed all seven open-ended questions as well as the semantic differential portion (see Appendix F). An instruction sheet similar to the pre-workshop questionnaire was employed.

As anonymity was maintained at the workshop, comparison of demographic data served to match the pre and posttest questionnaires. In a few cases, comparative analysis of handwriting had to be employed.
The pre/posttest mode was employed at two workshops, one in the Bahamas during December 1978 and the other at Shanti Nilaya, near Escondido, California, in January 1979. The administration of the instrument was accomplished by assistants of Kubler-Ross and the completed questionnaires mailed to the researcher in Atlanta, Georgia.

The second mode employed was a mailed questionnaire sent to selected subjects of eleven previous workshops. The instrument addressed the seven open-ended areas and the identical semantic differential portion (see Appendix G). To obtain pre and post attitudes toward death, life, and spirituality, the subject was asked to subjectively respond to each of those areas. The supporting rationale for this approach has been covered earlier in this chapter.

To facilitate comparison between written and interview responses, a code was applied to the mailed questionnaires. Each return envelope was annotated indicating the workshop that the subject had attended. Each questionnaire contained a small dot indicating his/her relative position on the address sheet. After analysis, the code was destroyed returning anonymity to the subject.

Attached to each mailed questionnaire was a letter of transmittal. Two letters were drafted, one signed by the researcher (see Appendix H) and the other by Kubler-Ross (see Appendix I). Each workshop was divided into two
groups. One group received the transmittal letter signed by Kubler-Ross, and the second group received the letter signed by the researcher. The purpose of the different letters was to test for a halo effect that might attach to the Kubler-Ross signature.

Both letters stated that Kubler-Ross was interested in the studies. Borg and Gall addressed the importance of the transmittal letter and the need for association of the study with a recognized institution or organization. (14:204). The signature borne by the transmittal letter was then coded into the key punch data sheet.

Other instructions provided in the letter were very similar to those of the pre and posttest instruments. One notable change was that the subject was requested to place two marks on each of the items in the semantic differential portion. This afforded the subject a change to overtly control the amount of change he/she desired to indicate. It is not as likely that subjects participating in the pre/posttesting were able to manipulate the degree of change due to the time interval experienced between sessions.

A standard demographic data page was generated and utilized with each questionnaire. The data requested included age, sex, race, education, religious orientation, health, recent personal experience with death of a close friend or relative, and attendance at prior workshops.
Numeric Determination from Open-Ended Questions

To convert the responses to open-ended questions to a qualifiable system required that numerical values be assigned to each response. This was accomplished through the painstaking efforts of five qualified jurors. Selection of the jury was based on academic qualifications, experience, and insurance of diversified backgrounds.

The jurors were as follows:

Dr. Rosemary M. Moss - psychology
Dr. Donald W. Smith - psychology
Dr. Fraughton G. Ford - education
Dr. Barbara Weber - humanities
Chaplain Tommy Thompson - theology

A more complete listing of backgrounds and qualifications has been provided (see Appendix J).

The jurors were instructed to evaluate each response and assign a numerical value based on change in spirituality (see Appendix K). This required evaluation of seven items for each of 244 respondents for a total of approximately fifteen hundred separate assessments per juror. As stated, the values ran from 1 indicating a strongly negative change, through 3 indicating a neutral or no change, to 5 indicating a strongly positive change.

After the jurors completed their analysis, the results were compiled by the researcher. Averages accurate to the nearest tenth place were determined and entered on the key punch conversion sheet.
Interview Data

The use of the interview as a research tool was addressed at length by Borg and Gall. The immediate feedback provided the researcher an opportunity to probe beyond the surface questions. (14:211).

To facilitate comparison between interview data and the written responses, the researcher decided to follow generally the same format as provided by the open-ended questions of the SCS. The only significant change was transferring the last item on general workshop comments to the opening issue (see Appendix L). (14:3).

Twenty subjects were randomly selected for participation in the telephone survey. Generally, they were chosen by geographical residency in the Southeastern United States. To preclude a skewed sample from certain workshops, calls were placed to California, Texas, Illinois, and New York, as well as a few other states outside the Southeast.

In ten interviews, the researcher was identified as such. During the remaining interviews, he presented himself as interested in attending one of the workshops. In only one case did a subject challenge the researcher as to how the telephone number was obtained and the relationship of the study to Kubler-Ross.

Written comments were taken by the researcher during the interviews. Later, these were subjectively evaluated
by the researcher to determine the positive and negative aspects recorded.

After completion of all of the interviews, a cross-check was made to determine if the subject had returned a completed SCS instrument. It was found that eight of the twenty subjects had responded. The interview data was then correlated with written data.

The statistical procedures applied to the interview data involved only basic mathematical evaluation. These data were not used as part of the computer analysis. The information ascertained from a comparison of the telephone survey data with the computer analysis data was incorporated into the analysis of data chapter.

Statistical Procedures

The automated data processing was accomplished at the Georgia State University computer center. All programs were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). (97).

The first requirement was to determine the reliability of the newly designed SCS. To test reliability the Coefficient Alpha subroutine was employed. This procedure was selected over the proposed Spearman-Brown split-half coefficient formula. (43:339). The Coefficient Alpha program accurately tests internal reliability of an instru-
ment and is less subject to statistical variance than the Spearman-Brown formula. This is accomplished by evaluation of multiple split-half correlations in the Coefficient Alpha procedure as opposed to a single split-half correlation experienced with Spearman-Brown. (144:310).

The efficacy of using split-halves is addressed by Garrett. He stated that the split-half method is one of the best methods for testing reliability and may be employed when parallel forms of testing are not advisable. He specifically addressed the use of this method in inventories of personality variables. (43:340).

The application of Coefficient Alpha to the test scores of cases one through eighty-seven, those exposed to both pre and posttesting, demonstrated an internal reliability of 0.757. Based on a review of statistical methodology, this level of internal consistency was accepted by the researcher as having a moderately high reliability.

For each of the following procedures, two independent tests were applied. The respondents were divided into two groups and analyzed separately. The basis of subdivision was the instrument administered. Cases 1-87, which received pre and post instruments comprised group A, while cases 88-244, mailed instrument respondents comprised group B.

To ascertain means and standard deviations for each item, the Condescriptive subprogram of the SPSS was employed. (97:185). To test for significant shift in central tendency,
Central Limit Theorem was applied. Determination was made on open-ended questions by using the approximately normal distribution statistic, 
\[ Z = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}} \]
with a level of significance of \( \alpha = .05 \). If \( Z > 1.65 \) then \( H_0 \) was rejected. If \( Z \leq 1.65 \) then \( H_0 \) was not rejected. (86:162).

This means if the statistic derived \( (Z) \) is greater than the alpha \( (\alpha) \) value (1.65 determined by table B, areas under the normal curve corresponding to given values of \( Z_\alpha \), in Minium) then the null hypothesis can be rejected. Rejection of the null hypothesis by this formula infers a positive change.

The same test was applied to the semantic differential portion. In those procedures, it was \[ Z = \frac{\bar{x} - \mu}{\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{n}}} \]. Again the null hypothesis was rejected if \( Z \) was greater than 1.65.

Simply stated, the formula is the statistic \( (Z) \) equals the mean \( (\bar{x}) \) minus the null \((3.0\) as designation of no change\)) divided by the total of the estimated standard deviation \( (\sigma) \) divided by the square root of the number of respondents \( (\sqrt{n})\).

The same test was employed for semantic differential responses except that zero \((0)\) was designated as the null.

The use of Central Limit Theorem was addressed by several researchers. Minium stated that, "Its value for inference about means can hardly be overstated." (90:228).
Kerlinger and Edwards also reported use of this procedure. (66:207; 32:69).

Three scales were identified with the use of semantic differential, evaluation, potency, and activity. Kerlinger, in discussing semantic differential scales, stated that many investigators, especially in the study of attitude, need only one scale. (66:570).

Demographic and questionnaire variables were analyzed with the Frequencies subprogram. This provided the necessary frequency distribution of those variables. (97:194). The application of frequency distribution was valuable in giving precise distribution characteristics of variables. (97:182).

To determine joint frequency distribution, a cross tabulation was conducted comparing each demographic variable with each item on the questionnaire. The SPSS subprogram CROSSTABS was used to accomplish this evaluation. (97:218).

To evaluate more easily the results of the frequency distribution, certain consolidation was made in accordance with the numeric designation assigned on the Likert scale. For the open-ended questions, groups were consolidated as follows:

Values 1.0 - 2.0 = negative change
Values 2.2 - 2.8 = tending toward negative change
Values 3.0 = no change
Values 3.2 - 3.8 = tending toward positive change
Values 4.0 - 5.0 = positive change
Consolidation of the semantic differential items is as follows:

Values -3 - -6 = negative change
Values -1 - -2 = tending toward negative change
Values 0 = no change
Values 1 - 2 = tending toward positive change
Values 3 - 8 = positive change

Each variable was then compared with each item separately in a one-way analysis of variance. Borg and Gall stated that most researchers start with this approach to determine whether one group varies significantly from any other group. (14:308). The required analysis was accomplished through the employment of subprogram ONEWAY which performs a one-way analysis of variance on a maximum of twenty dependent variables. (97:424). The SCHEFFE test was applied to determine the post hoc comparison of f values. Nie et al described this test as stricter than others available in the SPSS as it examines all possible linear combinations of group means. (97:428). This also had an advantage in that the comparison did not have to be planned in advance. (3. 15)

The interaction of a euphoric artifact was tested for through comparison of the direction and degree of change reported on the pre/posttest instrument with the direction and degree of change on the mailed instrument.
If an euphoric artifact were present, the pre/posttest change would indicate a higher degree of positive change.

It was reported that a test would be made to determine whether or not recipients of the mailed questionnaire would respond more favorably to the cover letter signed by Kubler-Ross than one signed by the researcher. This was accomplished by examining the mean for each item of the questionnaire compared by the cover letter. If the respondents were favoring Kubler-Ross, the mean for each item would have been consistently higher.

To test the second hypothesis, that no significant change would occur based on the time interval since attending the workshop, the combined mean score of open-ended items were determined by workshop and compared. If no linear progression were shown from the earliest workshop through the most recent workshop, then the hypothesis could be accepted. If a linear progression were demonstrated, then a similar test would have to be done to semantic differential items. If both sessions produced a linear progression, then the hypothesis would be rejected.

Summary

To determine if change in spirituality occurred in people who attended a Life, Death, and Transition workshop, three methods were employed. Those included the development and use of a pretest-posttest instrument,
a mailed instrument and a telephone survey. Detailed attention was applied to every step of development of the written instrument. Adequate sampling procedures were followed to insure valid size and randomness. The SPSS was used in all computerized data analysis. Those results were compared with an independent telephone survey.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this chapter was to present a statistical analysis of the data and to indicate whether or not the hypotheses could be supported or rejected. The study was designed to answer the following two questions:

1. Did significant change in spirituality occur in persons who attended a Life, Death and Transition workshop?

2. If so, did the amount of change directly correlate with the time intervening since the workshop?

In examining these questions, it was necessary to address the following auxiliary questions:

1. Was the measurement instrument reliable?

2. How accurate was the data?

3. Who attended the workshops?

4. Were demographic variables a factor in the results?

5. Was an euphoric artifact present in the posttest results?

6. Did the respondents bias the results based on the signature on the cover letter?

The analyses of data are presented in tables relative
to the questions raised. To separate data collected by the two differing techniques, pre/posttesting and the mailed questionnaire, the groups were identified as follows. Group A connoted the participants of the two workshops at which pretesting and posttesting were accomplished. Group B connoted the respondents to the mailed questionnaire.

The first hypothesis tested was $H_1$: no significant change in spirituality would be reported by people who attended a Life, Death and Transition workshop during the cited period. The data are shown in three modes. The first presentations illustrated the frequency distribution of responses by numerical value for each item and a compilation of those responses. This illustrated the direction and degree of change for each individual on each item. The second evaluation showed the mean change for each item, while the third method provided an examination of the data when grouped into verbally defined categories. These procedures indicated the movement of the groups.

The first data presented are based on the frequency distribution of responses by Group A to the open-ended items (Table 1). The data on Table 1 were evaluated as follows:

a. Values of 1.0 through 2.0 recorded a negative change.
TABLE 1
Frequency Distribution for Responses to Open-Ended Items, Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Value of Response</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Life</th>
<th>Spirituality</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 3.0 = no change
3.0 < indicates negative change
3.0 > indicates positive change
b. Values of 2.2 through 2.8 showed tendency toward negative change.

c. A value of 3.0 indicated no change.

d. Values of 3.2 through 3.8 identified a tendency toward positive change.

e. Values of 4.0 through 5.0 reflected a positive change.

This table displayed the numerical value assigned by the jury to the response of each participant for each of the seven open-ended items. A numerical value was assigned to workshop comments when the jury felt those comments addressed spirituality. The table demonstrated a predominance of positive responses for every item evaluated. Four hundred and sixty-five of 564 total responses to the seven items reflected values of 3.2 or greater, which indicated a tendency toward positive change. For four items, self, others, values, and workshop, in excess of 50 percent of the responses had a value or 4.0 or greater. Seventy-six or 13.5 percent of the total responses reflected a value of 3.0 or no change.

Of 564 responses recorded on all seven items, twenty-three displayed an assigned value of 1.2 through 2.8, indicating a tendency toward, or negative change on, some portion of the instrument. The item, Life, received the highest number of negative responses with eight.
Two items, Spirituality and Values, produced no negative responses by Group A.

The frequency distribution for responses by Group A to semantic differential items was shown in Table 2. The table reflected the number of responses recorded for each numerical value. Semantic differential items are listed under the positive descriptor of the bipolar pairings. This table also showed the total number of responses recorded.

It was found that more than twice the number of positive responses were elicited than negative ones, 406 as compared to 175. The neutral responses, 298, accounted for nearly 34 percent of the total. The range of responses was from +8 to -6. While one item recorded responses of -6, seven items received responses of +6 or higher.

The Accepting-Judgemental scale reflected the lowest number of negative responses, eleven, and the highest number of positive responses, forty-nine. It also demonstrated the greatest range of responses on this table. The Hopeful-Hopeless scale received the highest number of negative responses. The most neutral responses, thirty-eight, were recorded on the Concerned-Unconcerned scale.

The frequency distribution for responses by Group B
TABLE 2
Frequency Distribution for Responses to
Semantic Differential Items, Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Value of Response</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Forgiving</th>
<th>Warm</th>
<th>Giving</th>
<th>Accepting</th>
<th>Believing</th>
<th>Tolerant</th>
<th>Hopeful</th>
<th>Prayerful</th>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Peaceful</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4,3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>10,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>33,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>18,4</td>
<td>18,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>12,1</td>
<td>12,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>7,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 80 80 80 79 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 80 879

* 0 = no change
0 < indicates negative change
0 > indicates positive change
to open-ended items was illustrated in Table 3. The data was evaluated using the same values as those listed for Table 1. A heavy predominance of tendency toward, and positive change was observed in the values assigned to responses by the jury. Of the total number of responses, thirty-four were less than 3.0, neutral, and 857 were valued greater than that.

Change in attitude toward others elicited the least number of negative responses, one, and the highest number of positive ones, 140. Comments on the workshop demonstrated the widest range, from 1.2 to 5.0. This item also evoked the most negative responses, sixteen, the least neutral responses, six, and the highest number of extremely positive responses with seventy-one valued at 4.6 or greater. On five items, Spirituality, Self, Others, Values and Workshop, the mode is 4.0 or higher.

The frequency distribution for responses by Group B to semantic differential items was presented in Table 4. The evaluation of this table was the same as Table 2.

A predominance of positive responses was disclosed. of a total of 1127 responses, fifty-one were negative, 740 positive, and 336 indicated no change. The range of all responses was from +8 to -4. While two responses were recorded at -4, fifty-five were reported at +6 or greater.

The Peaceful-Turbulent scale posted the most positive
## TABLE 3

Frequency Distribution for Responses to Open-Ended Items, Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Value of Response</th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Life</th>
<th>Spirit</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 3.0 = no change

3.0 indicates negative change

3.0 indicates positive change
TABLE 4

Frequency Distribution for Responses to
Semantic Differential Items, Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Value of Response</th>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>Forgiving</th>
<th>Warm</th>
<th>Giving</th>
<th>Accepting</th>
<th>Believing</th>
<th>Tolerant</th>
<th>Hopeful</th>
<th>Prayerful</th>
<th>Concerned</th>
<th>Peaceful</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>29.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 102 103 103 103 103 102 103 102 102 101 103 1127

* 0 = no change

0 < indicates negative change

0 > indicates positive change
change with seventy-nine of 103 responses greater than 0, and thirty-three of those at +4 or higher. The least negative change was shown on the Tolerant-Prejudiced scale with one response less than zero. This item also posted the highest number of neutral responses, forty-two, and the narrowest range, from +6 to -1. The Forgiving-Unforgiving scale disclosed the most negative responses, nine.

The second mode of data evaluation was an examination of change in central tendency. To accomplish this, the mean change for each of the seven open-ended items was determined. These data are displayed for both Group A and Group B on Table 5.

All items in both Group A and Group B demonstrated a mean greater than 3.0, indicating a positive shift. The average of the means was close to 4.0, which would, by definition, on the assigned numerical scale, indicate positive change for the group.

The strongest change was observed in the item, Workshop, for both groups. Group A recorded a mean shift to 4.233, while Group B posted a mean shift to 4.134. By definition, this indicated a clear shift to some positive change. The least change was exhibited on the item, Life, as responded to by Group A. The value of 3.513 posted for that item was the only score below 3.70. The attitude towards oneself rated high change both at
TABLE 5

Mean Change for Open-Ended Items, Group A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Death</th>
<th>Life</th>
<th>Spirituality</th>
<th>Self</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Workshop</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

* 3.0 = no change

\[ \bar{x} > 3.0 = \text{positive change} \]
the time of the workshop and later as was displayed with values of 3.973 and 3.997 for Group A and Group B respectively. It was noted that, with one exception, all items were rated higher by Group B than Group A. That exception was the previously addressed item concerning workshop comments.

The mean change occurring on semantic differential items was also examined. These data are presented on Table 6. While change in a positive direction, a value greater than 0, for each item was indicated by both groups, a substantial range was disclosed. The mean change varied from a low of .013 recorded by Group A on the Prayerful-Noncontemplative scale to a high of 2.320 exhibited by Group B on the Peaceful scale.

On all eleven scales, Group B demonstrated substantially higher mean change values than Group A. The total mean change values are representative of that variance. The Group A total mean change value was .672, while Group B posted the value at 1.623. The least amount of difference in mean values between groups was .534 evidenced on the Forgiving-Unforgiving scale. The most amount of variance between groups was shown on the Hopeful-Hopeless scale with a difference of 1.499. Variances in excess of 1.000 between groups were noted on four additional items, Patient-Impatient, Warm-Cold, Prayerful-Noncontemplative,
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td>2.320</td>
<td>2.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Praying</td>
<td>1.337</td>
<td>1.498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>1.629</td>
<td>1.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>1.498</td>
<td>1.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>1.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>1.273</td>
<td>1.227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items, group A and B

Mean Change for Semantic Differential

TABLE 6
Group B reported mean change values higher than 1.000 for all eleven items. Three scales, Accepting-Judgemental, Hopeful-Hopeless, and Peaceful-Turbulent, posted change values in excess of 2.000. Group A posted only four items, Forgiving-Unforgiving, Accepting-Judgemental, Believing-Disbelieving, and Peaceful-Turbulent, above the 1.000 level.

The third mode of examination of data was grouping the individual responses into verbally defined categories. Table 7 displayed the data, derived from assembling the frequency distribution of all open-ended responses of both groups, under five headings. These headings were compatible with the instructions given to the jurors when numerical values were assigned. Values of 2.0 or lower indicated change in a negative direction. Values between 2.2 and 2.8 inclusive tended towards negative change. A value of 3.0 was defined as no change. Values from 3.2 through 3.8 demonstrated a tendency toward positive change. Values of 4.0 or greater demonstrated definite positive change.

Both Group A and Group B displayed a clear predominance of positive change with 57.3 percent and 62.6 percent respectively above the 4.0 level. When combined with the responses tending toward positive change, both groups
### TABLE 7

Grouped Frequency Distribution for Open-Ended Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Change 1.0-2.0</th>
<th>Tending Toward Negative Change 2.2-2.8</th>
<th>No Change 3.0</th>
<th>Tending Toward Positive Change 3.2-3.8</th>
<th>Positive Change 4.0-5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>62.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
revealed approximately 82 percent of the responses in the positive categories.

A very low number of responses were exhibited in the negative change area. Group A reported 1.6 percent in that category, while Group B reflected only 1.0 percent. The total responses under the negative headings were 4.1 percent for Group A and 3.2 percent for Group B.

Table 8 illustrated the grouping of the frequency distribution of all semantic differential responses. The verbal categories were designated by the researcher to differentiate between responses that tended to indicate change and those that were clearly indicative of change. The categories were assigned as follows: values of -3 through -6 indicated negative change. Values of -1 or -2 tended to indicate negative change. By definition, a value of 0.0 was indicative of no change. Values of +1 and +2 were considered to be tending toward positive change, while values of +3 through +8 indicated clear positive change.

Group B provided substantially more responses in the positive categories than Group A, 65.6 percent versus 46.3 percent respectively. Group B also experienced much lower response rates in the negative categories than Group A, 4.5 percent versus 19.9 percent respectively. A sizable number of responses fall in the no change cate-
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Negative Change -3 to -6</th>
<th>Tending Toward Negative Change -1 to -2</th>
<th>No Change 0.0</th>
<th>Tending Toward Positive Change 1 - 2</th>
<th>Positive Change 3 - 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group A</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group B</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Responses</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
gory for both groups.

Based on the data presented in Table 1 through Table 8, the first hypothesis, $H_1$, was rejected, and it was determined that significant positive change did occur.

Tested next was the second hypothesis, $H_2$: the degree of reported change will demonstrate no increase longitudinally in correlation with the intervening time period. To investigate that hypothesis, the data were examined in two modes, frequency distribution and shift in central tendency, both compared by workshop.

The frequency distribution of responses to the seven open-ended items displayed by workshop for Group B is on Table 9. The workshops are labeled chronologically as follows:

3. October 1978, Hawaii
4. June 1978, Appleton, Wisconsin
5. May 1978, Nova Scotia
6. May 1978, Escondido, California
7. April 1978, Sonora, California
8. February 1978, San Antonio, Texas
9. January 1978, Escondido, California
10. October 1977, Black Mountain, North Carolina
11. October 1977, Santa Barbara, California
12. September 1977, Three Rivers, California
13. June 1977, Appleton, Wisconsin
TABLE 9
Frequency Distribution of Responses to Open-Ended Items by Workshop, Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numerical Value of Responses</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* 3.0 = no change
\( \bar{x} < 3.0 \) indicates negative change
\( \bar{x} > 3.0 \) indicates positive change
While the preponderance of responses were positive for all workshops, no pattern on ascendancy is observed. On the negative side of the matrix, the least number of responses occurred in workshops (3), (12) and (13), which recorded 0, 1, and 1 negative responses respectively. The highest number of negative responses were disclosed in workshops (5) and (9), each receiving seven.

Another method of testing the second hypothesis was to display the mean change value for each workshop as was accomplished on Table 10. Again no discernable pattern based on temporal factors was observed. The highest mean change values were recorded in workshops (7), (12), and (3) in descending order. The lowest mean change values were recorded in workshops (4), (10), and (11) in ascending order. The workshop with the lowest mean, (4), fell well below the average mean of 3.928.

Based on the data presented in Tables 9 and 10, it was determined that no additional tests were necessary. The lack of emergent patterns made it possible to accept the second hypothesis in its null form.

In addition to testing the stated hypotheses, several additional questions were addressed. The first concerned the reliability of the SCS instrument. As reported in Chapter III, Coefficient Alpha was used to determine the internal reliability of the semantic differ-
TABLE 10

Mean Change Reported by Workshop on Combined Responses for Open-Ended Items, Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Sonora</td>
<td>San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Respondents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean change</td>
<td>3.988</td>
<td>3.550</td>
<td>3.986</td>
<td>3.860</td>
<td>4.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Escondido</td>
<td>Black Mountain</td>
<td>Santa</td>
<td>Three Rivers</td>
<td>Appleton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Respondents</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean change</td>
<td>3.871</td>
<td>3.738</td>
<td>3.807</td>
<td>4.012</td>
<td>3.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of Respondents = 157

Mean change = 3.928
ential items of the instrument. Alpha was determined to be 0.757 and taken by the researcher as demonstrating moderately high reliability.

The question of accuracy of the data was tested using the described Central Limit Theorem procedure. Each item was tested separately; then the totals were tested for both groups. The display of level of significance for change recorded on open-ended items for Group A was evidenced in Table 11. A Z score of 1.65 or greater would have indicated a .05 probability that the change recorded was due to chance. Every item easily surpassed that mark. For Group A open-ended items, it was determined that all items demonstrated a probability of less than .0001.

The Z scores for semantic differential items for Group A were reported in Table 12. One item, the Prayerful-Noncontemplative scale, failed to demonstrate the .05 probability. All other items demonstrated the required probability. Five items, Forgiving-Unforgiving, Giving-Greedy, Accepting-Judgemental, Believing-Disbelieving, and Peaceful-Turbulent, indicated a probability of less than .0001. The Z score of the total also revealed a probability of less than .0001.

Group B open-ended items were tested as shown in Table 13. The Z score again indicated that the probability of the results being due to chance was less than .0001 for every item and the total.
Table 11
Display of Reliability for Open-Ended Items
Based On Central Limit Theorem, Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
<th>( \Delta )</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \sqrt{n} )</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>3.732</td>
<td>.7331</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>3.513</td>
<td>.6213</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td>3.721</td>
<td>.5195</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>12.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3.973</td>
<td>.5610</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>15.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.912</td>
<td>.5222</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>15.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>3.771</td>
<td>.4939</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>8.78</td>
<td>13.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>4.233</td>
<td>.6872</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>8.83</td>
<td>15.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.835</td>
<td>.6506</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>23.75</td>
<td>30.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( Z \geq 1.65 \) indicates .05 reliability

* \( Z \geq 3.70 \) indicates .0001 reliability
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TABLE 12
Display of Reliability for Semantic Differential Items Based On Central Limit Theorem, Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\sqrt{n}$</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>1.947</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>3.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.158</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>4.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>.313</td>
<td>1.703</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>1.650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>.675</td>
<td>1.581</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>3.141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>1.177</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>4.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>1.896</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>5.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>.438</td>
<td>1.742</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>2.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>.638</td>
<td>2.177</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>2.615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayerful</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>1.634</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>0.071**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>1.372</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>1.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td>1.069</td>
<td>2.290</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>8.94</td>
<td>4.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>1.949</td>
<td>879</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>10.182</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $Z \geq 1.65$ indicates .05 reliability

* $Z \geq 3.70$ indicates .0001 reliability

** indicates failed to demonstrate .05 reliability
TABLE 13

Display of Reliability for Open-Ended Items
Based on Central Limit Theorem, Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\sqrt{n}$</th>
<th>$Z$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>3.843</td>
<td>.696</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>15.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>3.844</td>
<td>.651</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>12.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td>3.769</td>
<td>.616</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>12.37</td>
<td>15.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>3.997</td>
<td>.488</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>12.21</td>
<td>24.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.008</td>
<td>.410</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>12.29</td>
<td>30.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>3.913</td>
<td>.593</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>4.134</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>12.04</td>
<td>13.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.928</td>
<td>.649</td>
<td>1049</td>
<td>32.39</td>
<td>46.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $Z \geq 1.65$ indicates .05 reliability

* $Z \geq 3.70$ indicates .0001 reliability
The semantic differential responses for Group B were also tested and were given in Table 14. Again the results proved that the probability of chance was less than .0001.

Based on Tables 11 through 14, it was determined that the data were accurate within acceptable standards. As an additional method of data verification, a telephone survey of a representative sample of workshop attendees was conducted. The data were presented in Table 15.

Twenty calls were completed to respondents representing attendance at eleven workshops. The respondents tended to be very positive about the workshop and the impact it had on their spirituality. Eighteen had only positive comments on all facets of the workshop. One respondent reported that the workshop had been a positive experience but was not sure of the change in spirituality.

One respondent stated that the workshop had been a negative experience based on spirituality. The person indicated that the life-after-death material was "the work of the Devil." They continued, saying they felt Dr. Kubler-Ross had good intentions but was misguided. They further stated that their own spirituality had intensified positively due to the experience of the workshop. The case was still considered to be negative by the researcher despite the outcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>$\bar{x}$</th>
<th>$\sigma$</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>$\sqrt{n}$</th>
<th>Z</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>1.794</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>10.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>1.534</td>
<td>1.893</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>8.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1.388</td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>8.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>7.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>2.029</td>
<td>1.932</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>10.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing</td>
<td>1.735</td>
<td>2.211</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>7.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>2.137</td>
<td>2.429</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>8.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayerful</td>
<td>1.588</td>
<td>1.931</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>8.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>1.178</td>
<td>1.785</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>10.05</td>
<td>6.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td>2.320</td>
<td>2.369</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10.15</td>
<td>9.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.623</td>
<td>1.941</td>
<td>1127</td>
<td>33.57</td>
<td>27.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $Z \geq 1.65$ indicates $.05$ reliability
* $Z \geq 3.70$ indicates $.0001$ reliability
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Created by:</th>
<th>TABLE 15</th>
<th>Telephone Survey Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calls completed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of workshops represented by respondents</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caller identified as:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested party</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results as evaluated by the researcher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of telephone survey recipients who had mailed surveys</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of those whose responses on both the mailed survey and telephone survey were compatible</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was determined that eight of the telephone survey respondents had also participated in the mailed instrument survey. The verbal responses to the researcher were compatible with their previous written statements in all cases. They tended to be even more positive on the phone than in writing.

All participants responded freely whether or not the caller was identified. Only one respondent inquired of the researcher how their telephone number had been obtained. A selected sample of responses by respondents of the telephone survey is provided. (Appendix N).

To determine the characteristics of the workshop attendees and respondents, extensive demographic data were gathered. Data for Group A were presented in Table 16, and the data for Group B in Table 17.

The mean age of the respondents was in the category thirty-five to forty-four for both groups. The breakdown by age group was approximately comparable for both groups with one exception. Fewer respondents age twenty-four or under responded to the mailed survey that completed the pre/post instruments.

The respondents were predominantly female in both groups. Group A proved to be 92 percent female while Group B reported to be 69.4 percent female.

Both groups were approximately 93 percent white.
TABLE 16

Demographic Data, Group A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 24</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 54</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-high school</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD/Ph.D.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Law</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Administration/Nursing</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Social Work/Counseling</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Doctor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>40.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes within a year</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\leq 24$</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>32.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$&gt;54$</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>69.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>92.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-high school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA/BS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA/MS</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD/Ph.D.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education/Law</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Administration/Nursing</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology/Social Work</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Doctor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clergy</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestant</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eclectic</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>45.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terminal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes within a year</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cover Letter Signed by</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kubler-Ross</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Blacks represented 2.3 percent and 5.7 percent of the racial breakdown for Group A and Group B respectively. Although the evaluation of data provided categorization of demographic data by race, the individual incidence experienced, other than black or white, was too low to demonstrate statistical significance. Therefore, those respondents were placed in the "other" classification.

The education level of both groups was found to be quite high. Approximately 80 percent of both groups indicated that they were college graduates or higher. Group B reflected graduate degrees for more than 57 percent of the respondents.

Professional experience varied widely in both groups. The broad heading of health care profession contributed to a majority of the groups. These categories included (2) Hospital Administration and Nursing, (3) Psychologists, Social Workers and Counselors, and (4) Medical Doctors.

Other categories were (1) Educators, including professors and teachers, and lawyers, (6) Business, including business secretaries and managers, and (7) Other, which included a cross section of waitresses, mechanics, housewives, writers, etc. (8) None was used only when the respondent stated "none."

Seven categories of religion were established. Category (4) Eastern was used to group respondents reporting
to be Buddhist, Taoist, or other forms of Eastern religion. The Eclectic (5) category was used for respondents who stated "my own," or "all" or other general responses indicating a synthesis of religious thought. Again, None (8) was used only for respondents who stated "none."

The largest affiliation was recorded by Protestants followed by Catholics for both groups. A fairly high number, 10.8 percent, of Group B were reflected in the "none" category.

The health status of the respondents was reported to be good or excellent in over 80 percent of both groups.

The affirmative responses to the question addressing the experience of recent death of a relative or close friend was subdivided into two headings. A response of yes, but with a time factor in excess of a year, was placed in one category, while those with a time factor of less than a year were placed in another. A large number of respondents in both groups reported a death experience within a year. Group A reflected 32 percent in that category while Group B posted 28 percent.

For Group B, the signature of the cover letter was also reported. Instruments with the cover letter signed by Kubler-Ross were measured at a higher return rate than those of the researcher, 39.5 percent compared with 31.8 percent. However, 28 percent were returned without the
cover letter so that actual numbers could not be determined.

The data were subjected to analysis of variance based on each of the demographic variables. Except for a few isolated items, no statistically significant trend was indicated for age, sex, race, profession, education, religion, or experience with death.

An analysis based on reported condition of health did evince a significant trend in the mailed responses to the semantic differential items. Table 18 displayed the means for each category and the $f$ probability of occurrence. It was noted that nine of eleven items demonstrated an $f$ probability less than .05, while one other item, Warm-Cold, approached that level. Only Tolerant-Prejudiced exhibited a higher probability of chance.

When the means were examined, it was noted that the most positive change for every item was in the categories of poor health or terminal patients. In nine of eleven items, the terminal patient response produced the highest degree of mean change. Conversely, the respondents indicating excellent health displayed the lowest amount of mean change in nine of eleven items.

Group A did not display the same level of significance between categories of health. Respondents reporting poor health or terminal conditions did indicate the highest degree of mean change in eight of eleven items. However,
### TABLE 18

Analysis of Variance of Semantic Differential Items by Reported Condition of Health, Group B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Terminal</th>
<th>F-Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>1.622</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>0.0273*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>1.087</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>3.286</td>
<td>2.750</td>
<td>0.0151*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>1.489</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.044</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>0.0003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>1.934</td>
<td>1.689</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>0.0104*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing</td>
<td>1.207</td>
<td>1.705</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>6.500</td>
<td>0.0000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>1.500</td>
<td>0.6113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>1.556</td>
<td>2.133</td>
<td>4.143</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>0.0013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayerful</td>
<td>1.322</td>
<td>1.533</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>4.250</td>
<td>0.0270*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0.0058*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td>1.815</td>
<td>2.344</td>
<td>3.857</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>0.0158*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* indicates significance at .05 level
only one item, Patient-Impatient, registered below the .05 level. Extreme caution was used with these data due to the low number of respondents in Group A describing health as poor or terminal.

The open-ended items reflected a similar trend but not at a statistically significant level. Group B showed poor or terminal health respondents posting the highest mean change for five of seven items. One item, Spirituality, revealed a .0070 f probability with terminal patients recording the top mean change. The poor or terminal health respondents of Group A recorded the highest mean change in four of the seven open-ended items. None, however, revealed the .05 level of significance.

To determine the presence of an euphoric artifact, the data displayed on Tables 5, 6, 7, and 8 were re-examined. The responses of Groups A and B were compared for every category on each table.

The data on Table 5 reflected the compatibility of open-ended responses between groups. Group B imparted a slightly higher mean value in six of seven categories. The semantic differential responses disclosed substantially positive change for Group B.

The data on Table 7 shows the responses for both groups to be very similar with a slight positive edge to Group B. The semantic differential items on Table 8
were clearly skewed with Group B demonstrating the higher degree of positive change.

Based on the compatibility of the open-ended responses and the higher degree of positive change for Group B on semantic differential items, it was determined by the researcher that an euphoric artifact did not significantly influence the data of Group A.

To determine if a halo effect had occurred by association of the study with Kubler-Ross, the ANOVA program was run testing the response based on the signature on the cover letter. Additionally, examination of the frequency distribution based on the same factor was conducted. The data for the open-ended responses were on Table 19, while the semantic differential items were on Table 20.

These tables showed the mean responses to be mixed between the researcher and Kubler-Ross. While most mean values were very close, responses to the researcher's signature was found to be higher on fifteen of eighteen items.

Also compared was the number of negative responses recorded on the frequency distribution. It was divulged that negative responses to letters signed by Kubler-Ross were greater in number than to those signed by the researcher. The breakdown was again fifteen of eighteen
**TABLE 19**

Analysis of Mean of Responses and Negative Responses Based On Cover Letter Signature for Open-Ended Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \bar{x} ) Researcher</th>
<th>( \bar{x} ) Kubler-Ross</th>
<th>Negative Responses Researcher</th>
<th>Negative Responses Kubler-Ross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Death</td>
<td>3.838*</td>
<td>3.790</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life</td>
<td>3.804*</td>
<td>3.782</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spirit</td>
<td>3.769*</td>
<td>3.727</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.040*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>4.041*</td>
<td>3.995</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values</td>
<td>3.938*</td>
<td>3.914</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>4.175*</td>
<td>3.993</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = higher mean
### TABLE 20

Analysis of Mean of Responses and Negative Responses Based On Cover Letter signature for Semantic Differential Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \bar{x} ) Researcher</th>
<th>( \bar{x} ) Kubler-Ross</th>
<th>Negative Responses Researcher</th>
<th>Negative Responses Kubler-Ross</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>2.162*</td>
<td>1.411</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>1.939*</td>
<td>1.477</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>1.889*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>1.074*</td>
<td>0.999</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>2.147*</td>
<td>1.922</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing</td>
<td>1.667*</td>
<td>1.478</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>1.206*</td>
<td>.799</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>2.323*</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayerful</td>
<td>1.383</td>
<td>1.727*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>1.382*</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td>2.824*</td>
<td>1.800</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = higher mean
items. The three items on which the researcher received a higher number of negative responses were all different from the three items for which he had exhibited to lower mean.

Based on the data portrayed in Tables 19 and 20, it was determined that a halo effect was not present.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has presented the statistical results from the treatment of data and investigation of the hypotheses of this study. It was demonstrated that significant positive change did occur in persons attending a Life, Death, and Transition workshop; thus, the first hypothesis, $H_1$, was rejected. It was also shown that no direct correlation between time interval of attendance and degree of change existed. The second hypothesis, $H_2$, was accepted.

The following additional questions were also answered:

1. Was the SCS reliable?
2. Were the data accurate?
3. What were the demographics of the respondents?
4. Was an euphoric artifact present in those just finishing the workshop?
5. Was a halo effect demonstrated by respondents to the letter signed by Kubler-Ross?
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter consists of a summary of the study, the conclusions derived from the statistical analyses of the data, examination of the limitations of the study, and recommendations for further research.

Summary

The study was designed to determine on a longitudinal basis whether or not significant changes in spirituality were experienced by persons who attended a Kubler-Ross Life, Death and Transition workshop during the period June 1977 to February 1979.

To accomplish this task, the Spirituality Change Survey was constructed and tested. The SCS demonstrated moderately high reliability and was employed in the study.

The sample population included eighty-seven persons who participated in the pretest/posttest version of the SCS as they attended one of two workshops. Approximately 330 persons who had attended one of eleven designated workshops received the mailed posttest version of the SCS.
Once the instruments had been completed, the open-ended questions were then referred to a panel of five competent jurors to assign numerical values based on change. That data, along with the values of the semantic differential portion, were then subjected to various statistical analyses.

An additional cross check of the results was accomplished through a telephone survey. This entailed interviewing twenty subjects by telephone following the outline of the open-ended items of the SCS.

It was the purpose of the study to answer two primary questions. First, did significant change in spirituality occur in persons who attended the workshops? Secondly, if change did occur, was there any correlation between the intervening time period and the degree of change? In other words, did the effects of the workshop diminish or increase based on time?

Limitations
The following limitations should be considered when interpreting the conclusions of this investigation:
1. The definition of spirituality was based on the subjectivity of each respondent.
2. The jury was comprised of five competent individuals representing differing academic and philosophic
background. Their evaluation of the degree of change in spirituality and the assignment of numerical value was based on individual definition and subjectivity.

3. Comparison of data between Group A and Group B must be viewed with caution as two similar, yet different, instruments were used. The primary difference was that, in responding to the semantic differential items, Group B could consciously adjust the amount of change between the pre and post values. For Group A, that was less likely as the pre position was determined five days prior to the post evaluation. Further, on the open-ended items, Group B respondents were required to subjectively state what their thoughts on the subject of death, life, and spirituality had been prior to the workshop. It was, therefore, difficult to determine if the workshop experience had biased them. Group A, however, only stated their present position.

4. The semantic differential portion seemed to be difficult to understand. Of 157 respondents to the mailed instrument, only 102 consistently and accurately filled in all items. The major defect was that many only listed one position per item, thus making it impossible to determine if change had occurred. A few complaints about reversing polarity were noted.

5. The sample consisted of only a portion of all
work groups tested. For Group B, only written access was available; thus, we were unable to determine whether or not the respondents represented random sample fairly. The written return rate was 47.6 percent of the sample.

6. All telephone interviews were conducted by the researcher who made subjective evaluation of the responses.

7. The time frame was limited to workshops conducted between June 1977 and February 1979.

8. Measures of central tendency of a group could not be used to predict change of an individual.

**Conclusion**

Within the bounds of these limitations and on the basis of analysis of the respondents to the SCS, the following conclusions seem to be warranted:

1. Significant positive change in spirituality did occur in most persons who attended a Kubler-Ross Life, Death, and Transition workshop.

2. There did not appear to be a direct correlation between the time interval since the workshop and the degree of change in spirituality experienced.

3. People generally expressed very positive views about the workshop upon its completion. This did not appear to diminish over time.

4. There was some indication that a relationship existed between condition of one's health and the degree
of change in spirituality experienced. This was supported by the mailed responses to semantic differential items.

5. The SCS demonstrated moderately high internal reliability for the measurement of change in spirituality.

6. The positive change indicated by the data was accurate to within acceptable established limits.

7. Based on comparison between groups, it was determined that an euphoric artifact did not account for the degree of positive change indicated.

8. Based on comparison of data by cover letter, it was determined that a halo effect evinced by association with Kubler-Ross did not occur.

**Recommendations for Further Study**

The following recommendations are suggested for future studies:

1. The SCS would best be used in the pretest/posttest mode. This would allow the monitoring of responses for completeness and preclude loss due to inability to understand written instructions.

2. A post/post instrument could be employed to varify the permanency of change.

3. Jurors could be allowed wider latitude in the assignment of numerical values to open-ended items.

4. The sample could be increased to nearly 100 percent through better control measures in administration.
of pretest and posttest instruments.

5. Follow-up procedures could be employed to increase the return rate of mailed instruments.

6. There is a need to determine the cause of variance in responses between workshops.

7. There is a need to evaluate the degree of change over a longer period of time.

8. Further attempts should be made to define and evaluate spirituality.

9. The relationship between health status and reported change in spirituality should be further investigated.
APPENDIX A

LIFE, DEATH, AND TRANSITION CURRICULUM GUIDE
1. Provider: Elisabeth Kubler-Ross
   Shanti Nilaya, P.O. Box 2396
   Escondido, California 92025

2. Title of Course: LIFE, DEATH, and TRANSITION

3. Type of Offering: Workshop


5. Instructor: Elisabeth Kubler-Ross, assisted by Jay and Martha Barham.

6. Brief Description of Course: Designed to impart to medical personnel, clergy, and others, knowledge of the death and transition process and how these processes affect those involved in transition or death and "significant others" (family, friends) around them and work with unresolved problems in themselves that keep them from working more effectively with individuals and their families undergoing life transitions and the death process. To also impart knowledge of the latest research on "life after life" and "near death" experiences.

7. Objectives of the Course: Upon completion of this course, the student will be able to:
   a. Demonstrate knowledge of the transition and death process.
   b. Demonstrate knowledge of how "significant others" (family, friends) are affected by the person involved in a transitional phase (be it during life or facing death).
   c. Demonstrate knowledge of latest research of "life after life" and "near death" experiences.
   d. Learn to identify and work with internal factors which may keep them from working more effectively with individuals and their families involved in a transition process.
   e. Demonstrate the acquisition of skills through knowledge and personal work done in this course. To more effectively understand and work with individuals and their families involved in a transition process.
   f. General Objective: To learn to improve the quality of life, deplete the fear of death and understand in all its facets, the nature of the transition process.
8. Teaching methods: Didactic teaching, experiential, demonstrations, group participation, music, and meditation.

9. Content (outline form)

I. Stages of grief involved in transition and death.
II. Exposure to individuals with terminal illness.
III. Sharing of participants of repressed feelings (fear, grief, guilt).
IV. Natural emotions and how to utilize them toward more effective living and dealing with the transition process.
V. New research on: Life after Life, and Near Death experiences.

10. Method of Evaluation: Individuals who desire continuing education units will prepare a one-page personal critique of experience.
APPENDIX B

KUBLER-ROSS CURRICULUM VITAE
CURRICULUM VITAE

Name: Elisabeth Kubler-Ross
Date of Birth: July 8, 1926
Place of Birth: Zurich, Switzerland
Citizenships: USA and Switzerland
Colleges and Universities attended: University of Zurich
M.D. - 1957
Zurich, Switzerland

Present Position:
Director, Shanti Nilaya, Escondido, California

Past Positions:

Internship:
Rotating Internship
Community Hospital
Glen Cove, Long Island, New York

Residency:
Research Fellow
Manhattan State Hospital
Research Division
Wards Island, New York, New York
Montefiore Hospital
New York, New York

Fellow in Psychiatry
Psychopathic Hospital
University of Colorado School of Medicine
Denver, Colorado

Instructor in Psychiatry
Colorado General Hospital
University of Colorado School of Medicine
Denver, Colorado

Assistant Professor Psychiatry
Billings Hospital
University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Assistant Director
Psychiatric Consultation and Liaison Service

Assistant Director
Psychiatric Consultation and Liaison Service
Acting Chief Psychiatric Impatient Service July 1965-66

Associate Chief Psychiatric Impatient Service December 1966-67

Chief of Consultation and Liaison Section July 1969-73
LaRabida Children's Hospital and Research Center

Medical Director July 1970-73
Family Service and Mental Health Center
of South Cook County
Chicago Heights, Illinois

Publications:

Books:

ON DEATH AND DYING, MacMillan, 1969
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON DEATH AND DYING, MacMillan, 1974
DEATH - THE FINAL STAGES OF GROWTH, Prentice-Hall, 1975
TO LIVE UNTIL WE SAY GOODBYE, Photographs by Mal Warshaw,
Text by Elisabeth Kubler-Ross, M.D.

In addition she has written:

a) Chapters in more than nine other books.
b) Papers - more than thirty-six articles in professional journals.
c) Book Reviews - more than fifteen.

She has been involved in the production of:

a) Three films.
b) Six audio-tapes.
APPENDIX C

JURY PANEL DESCRIPTOR EVALUATION
Words from the following list are being considered for use in an academic instrument. The instrument is being developed in an attempt to measure changes in spirituality reported by subjects who are exposed to a controlled experience. We ask that each individual apply his/her own definition of spirituality based on their religious concepts.

Your assistance in the following will be greatly appreciated:

1. Evaluate each word based on your concept of spirituality.

2. If you believe the word is descriptive of an attribute associated with a high degree of spirituality, place a (+) on the line to the left of the word.

3. If you believe the word is descriptive of an attribute associated with a low degree of spirituality, place a (-) on the line.

4. If you believe the word is not an attribute of either high or low spirituality, place an (o) on the line.

5. Additional words may be added at the end of the list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(+) High</th>
<th>(-) Low</th>
<th>(o) Neither</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>Greed</td>
<td>Guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambivalent</td>
<td>Miserly</td>
<td>Unfeeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hurting</td>
<td>Sinful</td>
<td>Knowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking</td>
<td>Helping</td>
<td>Damned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Unemotional</td>
<td>Aggressive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>Prejudice</td>
<td>Cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unforgiving</td>
<td>Evil</td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolving</td>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oneness</td>
<td>Hateful</td>
<td>Tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing</td>
<td>Regressing</td>
<td>Peaceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard</td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>Concerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>Friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faithful</td>
<td>Closed</td>
<td>Charitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frustration</td>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>Fearful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saved</td>
<td>Emotional</td>
<td>Prayerful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thoughtless</td>
<td>Disbelieving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living</td>
<td>Meditative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgemental</td>
<td>Aware</td>
<td>Warm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alone</td>
<td></td>
<td>Attends Church</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Religious Affiliation ________________________________

Educational Level  B.A. ____  M.A. ____  Ph.D. ____
APPENDIX D

SPIRITUALITY DESCRIPTOR PAIRING SHEET
1. Caring
2. Accepting
3. Good
4. Helping
5. Forgiving
6. Peaceful
7. Thoughtful
8. Believing
9. Giving
10. Warm
11. Tolerant
12. Loving
13. Charitable
14. Meditative
15. Prayerful
16. Concerned
17. Patient
18. Hopeful

Cold
Hateful
Disbelieving
Hopeless
Hurtful
Miserly
Impatient
Greedy
Judgemental
Turbulent
Thoughtless
Unconcerned
Unforgiving
Prejudiced
Dear Friend:

We are attempting to measure and evaluate the impact that the workshop you are about to experience has. To accomplish this we are asking your assistance by filling out the attached form.

Although we are asking for some personal data, no individual will be identified by name. The data collected will be analyzed and used to evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop. The findings will be published in a dissertation. Upon request, we will be happy to provide you a copy of those results.

As the area we are studying is highly subjective, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. We only ask that you respond as openly and honestly as possible. Of course, completion of the form is strictly on a VOLUNTARY basis, we do hope you will assist us.

INSTRUCTIONS
1. Briefly address the three questions on page 1 of the attached questionnaire.
2. Evaluate the terms listed on page 2 based on your present concept of the words.
3. Place an (X) on each line at the position you feel best describes your present relationship to those words.
EXAMPLE: If you felt you were of average height, you might answer as follows:

TALL 0 ---------------------- X ---------------------10 SHORT
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
A. What does "death" mean to you now?

B. What does "life" mean to you now?

C. Do you consider yourself to be religious/spiritual now?
Please evaluate the following words as they relate to your concept of spirituality. I feel that I am:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impatient</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgive</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unforgiving</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cold</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miserly</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greedy</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgemental</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbelieving</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Believing</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeless</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditative</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncontemplative</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayerful</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unpeaceful</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Age _____ Female/Male _____ Race/Ethnicity _____

Education Non HS Grad _____ HS Grad _____
Some College _____ College Grad _____
MA or equivalent _____ PhD/MD or equivalent _____

Professional Background __________________________

Religious Affiliation/Orientation __________________

Status of Health ________________________________

Have you recently experienced the death of a close relative or friend?

Yes/No _____ If so, when? _____ Months

Have you attended a previous Life and Transition Workshop?

Yes _____ No _____
APPENDIX F

POSTWORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE
Dear Friend:

This is the second part of the questionnaire you were given at the beginning of the workshop. Your cooperation in completing this form will be greatly appreciated.

The format is much the same as the first part. We request you again complete the demographic data sheet as this is critical for matching responses.

Again, the area we are studying is highly subjective; there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. We only ask that you respond as openly and honestly as possible. Of course, completion of the form is strictly on a VOLUNTARY basis. We do hope you will assist us.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. Briefly address the three questions on page 1 of the attached questionnaire.

2. Evaluate the terms listed on page 2 based on your present concept of the words.

3. Place a (0) on each line at the position you feel best describes your present relationship to those words.

EXAMPLE: If you felt you were of average height, you might answer as follows:

TALL 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 SHORT
POSTWORKSHOP QUESTIONNAIRE

A. What does "death" mean to you now?

B. What does "life" mean to you now?

C. Do you consider yourself to be religious/spiritual now? More so? Less so?
D. What changes, if any, have you noticed in your feelings about yourself?

E. What changes, if any, have you noticed in your attitude towards others?

F. What changes, if any, have resulted in your values?

G. Comments on the workshop.
Please evaluate the following words as they relate to your concept of spirituality. I feel that I am:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Score 0</th>
<th>Score 1</th>
<th>Score 2</th>
<th>Score 3</th>
<th>Score 4</th>
<th>Score 5</th>
<th>Score 6</th>
<th>Score 7</th>
<th>Score 8</th>
<th>Score 9</th>
<th>Score 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Impatient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unforgiving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cold</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miserly Greedy</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Giving Charitable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Judgemental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disbelieving</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Believing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Tolerant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Hopeless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditative</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Noncontemplative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayerful</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Unconcerned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6</td>
<td>7 8 9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Peaceful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Age _____ Female/Male _____ Race/Ethnicity _____

Education Non HS Grad _____ HS Grad _____

Some College _____ College Grad _____

MA or equivalent _____ PhD/MD or equivalent _____

Professional Background ________________________________

Religious Affiliation/Orientation ________________________

Status of Health _________________________________

Have you recently experienced the death of a close relative or friend?

Yes/No _____ If so, when? _____ Months

Have you attended a previous Life and Transition Workshop?

Yes _____ No _____
APPENDIX G

POSTWORKSHOP MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE
POSTWORKSHOP MAILED QUESTIONNAIRE

A. What did "death" mean to you before the workshop?

B. What does "death" mean to you now?

C. What did "life" mean to you before the workshop?

D. What does "life" mean to you now?

E. Did you consider yourself to be religious/spiritual before the workshop?
F. Are you religious/spiritual now? More so? Less so?

G. What changes, if any, have you noticed in your feelings about yourself?

H. What changes, if any, have you noticed in your attitude towards others?

I. What changes, if any, have resulted in your values?

J. Comments on the workshop.
Please evaluate the following words as they relate to your concept of spirituality. I feel that I am:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trait</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patient</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Impatient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forgiving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Unforgiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Cold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miserly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Giving Charitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greedy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Judgemental</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Believing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbelieving</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Tolerant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hopeful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Hopeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meditative</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Noncontemplative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayerful</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Unconcerned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concerned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10 Peaceful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turbulent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMOGRAPHIC DATA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age _____</td>
<td>Female/Male _____</td>
<td>Race/Ethnicity _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Non HS Grad _____</td>
<td>HS Grad _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College _____</td>
<td>College Grad _____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA or equivalent _____</td>
<td>PhD/MD or equivalent _____</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Background _______________________________________

Religious Affiliation/Orientation _______________________________

Status of Health _____________________________________________

Have you recently experienced the death of a close relative or friend?

Yes/No _____ | If so, when? _____ Months

Have you attended a previous Life and Transition Workshop?

Yes _____  No _____

Date of attendance at workshop ________________________________
APPENDIX H

RESEARCHER'S COVER LETTER
Dear Friend:

Dr. Elisabeth Kubler-Ross has given me the addresses of some 700 of her "life, Death, and Transition" workshop participants. We hope to put together a meaningful study about changes which occurred during and after her five day workshops and would appreciate it if you would participate. After the dissertation is finished, Elisabeth will receive all questionnaires, unless indicated differently by you. Please be as open and honest as possible. We would be happy to let you know the outcome.

INSTRUCTIONS

1. The area we are studying is highly subjective and there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Please be as open and honest as possible.

2. Please briefly address the questions on the attached sheets. Then, evaluate the terms listed on page 4 based on your concepts of those words as they relate to spirituality.

3. Please place an (X) on each line at a position that best describes your relationship to those words prior to the workshop.

EXAMPLE: If you were of average height, you might answer as follows:

```
SHORT 0 . . . . X . . . . 10 TALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
```

4. Then, place an (O) on each line at a position that best describes your present relationship to those words.

EXAMPLE: If your height had increased two inches, you might answer as follows:

```
SHORT 0 . . . . X . . . . 10 TALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
```

EXAMPLE: If there had been no change, it would reflect as follows:

```
SHORT 0 . . . . O . . . . 10 TALL
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
```
5. Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

Again, thank you for your cooperation.

Cordially,

John Alexander
Ph.D. Candidate

P.S. Please complete the "Demographic Data" sheet as it is very important. You will retain your anonymity.
APPENDIX I

KUBLER-ROSS'S COVER LETTER
Dear Friend:

We are attempting to put together a meaningful study about changes that occur in people during and after attendance at the Life, Death, and Transition workshop which you previously attended. To accomplish this, John Alexander, a Ph.D. candidate, has put together the attached form. I would greatly appreciate it if you would take a few minutes to fill out the questionnaire. Although some background data is gathered, you will remain anonymous. I will receive the completed forms upon completion of the analysis. If you desire, an abstract will be made available to you upon request. I thank you for your cooperation.

Love,

Elisabeth Kubler-Ross

INSTRUCTIONS

1. The area we are studying is highly subjective and there are no "right" or "wrong" answers. Please be as open and honest as possible.

2. Please briefly address the questions on the attached sheets. Then, evaluate the terms listed on page 4 based on your concepts of those words as they relate to spirituality.

3. Please place an (X) on each line at a position that best describes your relationship to those words prior to the workshop.

EXAMPLE: If you were of average height, you might answer as follows:

SHORT 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

4. Then, place an (0) on each line at a position that best describes your present relationship to those words.

EXAMPLE: If your height had increased two inches, you might answer as follows:

SHORT 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
EXAMPLE: If there had been no change, it would reflect as follows:

SHORT 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 TALL

5. Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope provided.

P.S. Please complete the "Demographic Data" sheet as it is very important. You will retain your anonymity.
APPENDIX J
JURY PANEL
Jury Panel

Rosemary M. Moss, Ph.D.
Doctorate of Clinical Psychology - Georgia State University
M.A. in Psychology - Georgia State University
B.A. in Drama - University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill

Licensed in applied psychology, state of Georgia

Clinical interests: neuropsychodiagnostic, psychosomatic medicine and psychology, thanatology, and psychotherapy.

Donald Walter Smith, Ph.D.
Doctorate of Clinical Psychology - Georgia State University
M.A. in Psychology - Georgia State University
B.A. in Art History

Licensed in applied psychology, state of Georgia

Clinical interests: personality theory, information processing, psychology of art and aesthetics, and psychotherapy.

Fraughton G. Ford, Ed.D.
Doctorate in Education - Peabody College
M.A. in Educational Administration - University of South Carolina
B.A. in Sociology - Wofford College

Currently adjunct instructor at St. Leo College, sociology and psychology and DeKalb Community College, psychology.

Barbara Weber, Ph.D.
Doctorate of Humanities - Florida State University
Post-Doctorate work in psychology - Georgia State University and Emory University

Tommy Thompson, Th.M.
Master of Theology - Golden Gate Baptist Seminary
M.S. in Education - Long Island University
B.D. in Theology (Master's level) - Southwestern Seminary
B.A. in Speech and Psychology - Furman University

Presently a Protestant chaplain on active duty with the United States Army.
APPENDIX K

JURY PANEL INSTRUCTIONS
JURY PANEL INSTRUCTIONS

1. You are to review the returned questionnaires and determine whether or not a change in spirituality has been recorded by the respondent. This should be accomplished by evaluating the pre and post workshop answers and subjectively determining the amount of change, if any, that has taken place.

2. A numerical rating will be assigned as follows:
   1 - Strongly negative change
   2 - Slightly negative change
   3 - No change
   4 - Slightly positive change
   5 - Strongly positive change
   N/A - Does not apply

Increased spirituality will be designated as positive change. Decreased spirituality will be designated as negative change.

3. The following areas should be evaluated:
   a. Pre/Post concepts of "death"
   b. Pre/Post concepts of "life"
   c. Pre/Post concepts of personal spirituality
   d. Changes in feelings toward self
   e. Changes in attitudes toward others
   f. Changes in values
   g. Workshop comments, if applicable
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVALUATION SHEET</th>
<th>JUROR'S NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>DEATH</th>
<th>LIFE</th>
<th>SPIRIT</th>
<th>SELF</th>
<th>OTHERS</th>
<th>VALUES</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX L

INTERVIEW GUIDE
Interview Guide

1. What are your comments/observations concerning the workshop?

2. What does death mean to you now? How has the concept changed?

3. What does life mean to you now? How has the concept changed?

4. Do you consider yourself to be religious/spiritual now? More so? Less so?

5. Have your feelings about yourself changed? If so, how?
6. What changes, if any, have you noticed in your attitude toward others?

7. What changes, if any, have resulted in your values?
APPENDIX M

SAMPLE OF RESPONSES TO OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS
SAMPLE OF RESPONSES OF OPEN-ENDED QUESTIONS

Sample Positive Responses: (4.0-5.0)

Death
Pre - end, termination, sorrow, emptiness.
Post - peaceful, absence of fear.
Pre - fear, the end, terrifying, pain
Post - moving on, it's o.k.

Life
Pre - existence within a physical case.
Post - living each day to the fullest, sharing and
giving to one's fellow man.
Pre - a very painful traumatic experience.
Post - becoming one with the universe.

Spirituality
It is the most important thing in my day.
Experientially I know God's presence.

Self
Self-doubt, self-pain, self-hate are weights that have
been taken off.
I love myself more.

Others
More accepting, less judgemental.
I can forgive wrongs easier.

Values
I definitely feel closer to God and my friends.
Major changes are taking place, achievement orientation
replaced by recognition of growth.
I value life more.

Workshop
Provided me with an affirmation of an inner meaning to
my life.
The loving energy that is God was with us.

Sample of Responses Tending Towards Positive: (3.2-3.8)

Death
Pre - Death was the great unknown.
Post - Change rather than the end.
Pre - An escape from life.
Post - Part of a continuum, a transition.
Life
Pre - A gift from God
Post - Expanded to provide exchange with others.
Pre - Essentially a "physical life."
Post - More like "spiritual existence/flow of energy."

Spirituality
Pre - I went to church.
Post - I feel more inner contact now.
Pre - Not religious.
Post - Not in an organized religion, but have a spiritual awareness of forces.

Self
More accepting of my faults.
I'm moving forward.

Others
We are only human.
People are not always what they seem.

Values
I am more open and sure of my value system.
I have broadened but my Christian values remain.
Perhaps greater awareness and acceptance.

Workshop
It was an opportunity to get more awareness.
It was an important and positive event.

Sample of Responses Tending Towards Negative: (2.2 - 2.8)

Death
Pre - Fear.
Post - Sadness.

Life
Pre - To enjoy all the experiences of life.
Post - to be free of my hangups and do what I want.
Pre - Growing, loving, learning, joy.
Post - Lots of hard work.

Spirituality
Pre - I have been on a search eleven years.
Post - About the same, not as idealistic.

Self
I don't feel quite as good about myself as I did.
Others
At times I am more impatient with other people than I use to be.

Values
More interest in financial security.

Workshop
Too much psychodrama.
Workshop was too emotional.

Sample of Negative Responses: (1.0-2.0)

Death
Pre - A stepping stone to happiness.
Post - Rejection.

Life
Pre - Life means birth, energy, God, love.
Post - Life means pain and suffering.

Spirituality
Pre - Not spiritual
Post - Less so.

Self
I've gone back to self doubt, insecurity and a feeling of worthlessness.
Less sure of my purpose, some guilt about my behavior.

Others
Inability to contact others.

Values
No negative response recorded.

Workshop
I am angry and disappointed I didn't get my feelings dealt with. I have managed without God's direction and will continue to do so . . . it means more aloneness.

I had a sense of tragedy.
APPENDIX N

SAMPLE OF RESPONSES TO TELEPHONE SURVEY
SAMPLE OF RESPONSES TO TELEPHONE SURVEY

Sample Positive Reaction:

A deepening experience - it was confirmation of what I've heard before.

I know the connection between mind and spirit.

It extended my own limits to accept people as they are.

Spiritually I'm more intensified - being drawn more toward involvement with others.

I found God at the workshop - I had given up on religion despite a strict upbringing (a terminal patient, male, twenty years old).

My beliefs were reinforced tremendously. It allowed me to help my mother die - I was literally able to talk her through death.

It was the biggest revelation of my life - like a metamorphosis.

It helped me reach a spiritual side of myself.

Am more spiritual, but not toward organized religion.

My belief in the goodness of people was reaffirmed - people do care.

Made me better equipped to share belief (Catholic priest).

Sample Mixed Reaction:

The workshop is super - the key is acceptance by others. I don't believe the stuff about guides.

Sample Negative Reaction:

The spirits working with Kubler-Ross are not good. She has good intentions but is leading people astray. I'm not sorry I went. The awareness of strong adverse forces strengthened my own belief.
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