

the LETTER

Volume 3, Issue 2



THE PACIFIC INSTITUTE®

Fall 2000

The Monterey Project

by Dr. Glenn Terrell, Mark Schlosser, Shane Nelson
Antowaine Richardson and John McNeil

In a move to quantify the results of The Pacific Institute's curricula, a research project has begun with the participation of Monterey County, California employees, under the supervision of Mr. Joe Werner. Since there were only forty participants in the initial study, a relatively small percent of the total Monterey County employees, we consider it an excellent pilot endeavor.

However, we are continuing the study, using more participants, in view of the dramatic improvement in several measures of efficacy of the participants in the pilot study. We shall report the results of our continuing research in a later issue of THE LETTER.

The Monterey Project is particularly important to The Pacific Institute for several reasons:

1) It is the first Pacific Institute project that is being evaluated by one of the world's most distinguished universities, Stanford University. Professor Carl Thoresen, a Stanford colleague of Dr. Al Bandura, and doctoral candidate Sam Standard designed and conducted research measuring the impact of The Pacific Institute's work with employees of Monterey County, California. They developed several instruments, determined their validity and reli-

ability, and administered them before and after the participants experienced our centerpiece program, *Investment in Excellence*®.

The instruments appear in Table 1 below, entitled **Self Efficacy (Personal Confidence), Life Satisfaction, Optimism-Future, Optimism-Dispositional, Trait Anger, and Perceived Stress**. Also included in Table 1 are the mean pre- and post-test scores and the "p" values for the changes from the pre- to the post-test scores for all tests. The "p" value column in Table 1 expresses the likelihood that the gains are due to chance factors alone. For example, the mean Efficacy pre-and post-test scores are 43.908 and 83.892, respectively, a gain of 39.984, and a p value of .001. This indicates that a gain of 39.984 due to chance alone is one in a thousand. Finally, only the Self-Efficacy instrument, (the first one

mentioned above) is included in its entirety in Table 2, at the end of this article. Those who wish to examine any of the other five tests may obtain them by contacting Mark Schlosser at The Pacific Institute's office in Seattle.

2) Another reason for the importance of the Monterey Project, and for continuing the study, lies with Joe Werner. An exceptionally talented officer in Monterey County, Joe is familiar with and strongly supportive of The Pacific Institute's work, and has a vision of extending the program throughout the State of California, and even the nation.

FINDINGS

Now we proceed with more of the major findings of the Monterey Project. In the words of Professor Thoresen, "I think the most impressive (finding) clearly was the huge increase in perceived confidence . . . their self-efficacy

Measure	Mean pre-test	Mean post-test	p
Self Efficacy	43.908	83.892	.001
Life Satisfaction	23.172	25.137	.060
Optimism-Future	71.892	78.785	.005
Optimism-Dispositional	35.000	36.896	.024
Trait Anger	16.703	14.851	.007
Perceived Stress	21.214	17.892	.005

Continued on page 3



Loutice
THE
PACIFIC
INSTITUTE®



1709 HARBOR AVENUE SW
SEATTLE, WA 98126-2049

Phone: (800) 426-3660

Fax: (206) 587-6007

www.loutice.com

Dr. Glenn Terrell, Editor
gterrell@pac-inst.com

Christy A. Watson,
Associate Editor
cwatson@pac-inst.com



The Letter was designed by The Pacific Institute. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of The Pacific Institute®, Inc. Copyright 2000.

A Message from Lou & Diane:

This issue of THE LETTER features the Monterey Project, the brainchild of several of our colleagues and staff members in the Seattle office, including John McNeil, Mark Schlosser and Antowaine Richardson, as well as Shane Nelson, a Project Director in Texas.

The preliminary results are exceedingly encouraging, as you will note in THE LETTER. The evidence, from the analyses of the results thus far, include dramatic improvements in personal confidence and other measures of efficacy on the part of participants in the program, county employees in Monterey County, California.

As mentioned in THE LETTER, we regard the Monterey Project as unique and far-reaching, in view of the fact that Joe Werner, the very effective, visionary manager and leader of the Monterey County employees, wants the program to be extended to all counties in California, and throughout the United States.

Another unique aspect of the Monterey Project lies in the fact that the research design and data analyses were conducted by a faculty member and doctoral candidate at Stanford University, Professor Carl Thoresen and Mr. Sam Standard. Professor Thoresen is a colleague of Professor Albert Bandura, who recommended Dr. Thoresen.

We applaud the excellent work of our Pacific Institute and Stanford University colleagues, and we look forward to subsequent reports from them as they continue the expansion of their work in other counties in California, and elsewhere.

Lou & Diane Tice

P.S. We are pleased to announce the appointment of Christy Watson as Associate Editor of THE LETTER. Christy has been functioning as Associate Editor from the very beginning. In the words of Dr. Glenn Terrell, "Christy has been enormously helpful in the editing and production of THE LETTER. She is a multi-talented colleague with a strong commitment to the work of The Pacific Institute."

Dr. Glenn Terrell earned his B.A. in Political Science from Davidson College, his M.S. in Psychology from Florida State University, and a Ph.D. from the University of Iowa. Dr. Terrell served as Chairman of the Department of Psychology, University of Colorado, Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences and as Dean of Faculties at the University of Illinois in Chicago before an 18-year tenure as President of Washington State University.



continued from page 1

sharply improved . . . they could think, feel and act more effectively.” Examples of specific items include “being able to describe their scotomas, to demonstrate with personal examples how the self-talk cycle works and how to cope with the pain/effort needed to make changes in their lives.”

THE DETAILS

We now continue to report in somewhat greater detail the results of the research now completed, again in the words of Professor Thoresen, (in quotes) along with your editor’s comments (not in quotes). Table 2 is the Efficacy scale itself, the basis of the following comments by Professor Thoresen, expressed in % gained rather than the mean scores. The participants gained in efficacy “from having about 30-35% confidence level to about 60-70% confidence level. That is a very impressive improvement and highly significant as well, ($p < .001$).” As we learned above, there is only one chance in a thousand that a gain of this size could be due to chance factors such as intelligence rather than due to the effectiveness of *Investment in Excellence*[®].

“Since self-efficacy is the centerpiece of *Investment in Excellence*, I think these results are commendable. Of course, as I have mentioned to you, from a scientific point of view, these results cannot be automatically credited to the *Investment in Excellence* training. The reason for this is that other factors, such as those who volunteered to participate may have been more highly motivated to change or they were influenced more by other factors taking place in the training that had nothing to do with the *Investment in Excellence* training. One can say that’s really unlikely, but without a comparison group that was selected from the same pool of participants who did not receive the

training, the issue of what was the major cause or factor accounting for these changes remains unclear.”

As your editor, the test of statistical significance takes into account the fact that the difference between the means in a small sample must be larger than in a large sample to reach the same level of significance. Also, in a pre- and post-test study, the experimental group becomes its own control group. It is also true that both the experimental and control groups must be randomly selected. Often, this is not possible. Strictly speaking, when it is not possible, the extent to which we can generalize the results of our study is more limited. In any event, we do the best we can in the research design to permit us to generalize to the entire population of interest, in this study to county employees in Monterey County, and ultimately to county employees in the entire nation – if Joe Werner’s dream is to be realized. *In any event, your editor believes that there are no differences, between Monterey County employees and county employees anywhere in the United States, that would make a difference in the results of this study. Our continuing study, including other counties, will provide a definite answer to that question.*

MORE RESULTS

We return now to more results of the study. The following findings reported were taken from the results of five tests administered to the participants, but do not appear in Table 1, in their entirety. However, these findings are all related to our interest in the efficacy of Monterey County employees. Again, in the words of Professor Thoresen, “Participants increased in their hope about the future 15%, reduced their perceived stress level 25% and their Trait Anger score by 10%, (changing one’s characteristic way of handling frustrations) compared to being angry at any one moment (State Anger). These changes were all statistically significant, i.e. with a probability level of at

least .05.” Interestingly, in a topic of special interest (to Professor Thoresen), and of possible interest to The Pacific Institute, there was an almost significant increase in Forgiveness of Self, but not of Forgiving Others. I find this to be very important because forgiving of self for mistakes, shortcomings, and inconsistencies is generally more challenging to do than forgiving others. This finding merits more close attention. No changes were found for Burnout, Depression, and Anxiety, in part because the scores were quite low at the beginning of the training.

“Finally, let me turn to some qualitative data gathered from several interviews with some of the participants. Here the picture complements what can be learned from questionnaires. Here are some highlights of themes emerging after the *Investment in Excellence*[®] training. Several mentioned how they felt the training to be transforming in their personal and professional lives. Several also mentioned that they felt more empowered and capable, as well as noting that the specificity of the *Investment in Excellence* training was very important, that skills were actually learned, not just talked about. Others noted how the program was very consistent with their religious beliefs and with Spitzer’s value focus. None reported actually writing and reading their affirmations on a daily basis, but indicated that they tried to use them in less systematic ways. Finally, several compared the *Investment in Excellence* training and rated it far superior to anything they had experienced. The overall ratings of the program were clearly outstanding.”

THE FUTURE

The results of our work in Monterey County are extraordinarily encouraging. More results of this promising research will be reported later.

[See Table 2, pg. 4]

Table 2
Self-Efficacy (Personal Confidence) Scale

Below is a list of situations. Please circle how confident you are that you can actually do what is described in each situation. If you are completely confident, a rating of 100% would be appropriate. If you are absolutely sure you would not be able to do what is stated, a rating of 0% would be appropriate.

Example 1: I can return a shirt or pants to the store for credit and feel comfortable.										
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
Example 2: I can change the oil in my car without problems.										
0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

I can describe what scotomas are in my life.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can describe the elements of possibility thinking, using at least two examples.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can explain the importance of the Reticular Activating System.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can use the Lock-on/Lock-out concept to my advantage at work.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can utilize tension in a positive way to reduce stress.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can describe what the following formula refers to: $I \times V = R$.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can describe in detail how self-talk influences feelings-emotions.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can write an affirmation in the ideal format.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can describe the major elements of the visualization process.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can give an example of the push-push back process.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can notice my self-talk when I'm running late to a meeting and write it down.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can list the step-by-step procedure for goal-setting.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can describe the steps for imprinting.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can list the steps in the assimilation process.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can demonstrate, using a personal example, how the self-talk cycle works in my life.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can use the flick-back/flick-up technique to overcome apprehension at work.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

I can open my Reticular Activating System in a work situation.
0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%