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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Within the past decade the guidance and counseling service in the public schools has experienced phenomenal growth (Sprinthall & Tiedeman, 1966). Among the more noticeable effects of this growth have been increased demands upon counselor-training institutions, a reopening of the question of counselor certification requirements, and more specifically, a renewed interest in and investigation into the counseling process and the counselor's role in that process.

While there has been some degree of agreement upon the requirements for certification of counselors (ASCA, 1963), the theoretical question of the counselor's role has been the focus of much debate within the profession. Having as its antecedent the "Directive-Non-directive" controversy of the late 1940's and the early 1950's, the issue became more clearly defined and points-of-view more crystallized as a result of the Carl Rogers-B.F. Skinner debate of 1955 (Wrenn, 1966). The opening of this dialogue between the client-centered school and proponents of differing schools of therapy was followed by Rogers' introduction of his necessary and sufficient conditions for change in therapy (1957). The impact of this statement has been suggested in one recent review of the research in client-centered therapy (Shlien & Zimring, 1966).
as marking the emergence of a new stage in client-centered research, a shift from the client and from personality theory to the role of the counselor.

The Statement of the Problem

Rogers introduced his position first by raising the question, "Is it possible to state, in terms which are clearly definable and measurable, the psychological conditions which are both necessary and sufficient to bring about constructive personality change?" (1957, p. 95). He proceeded to state his belief that such was possible and presented six conditions which he felt met the criteria of necessity, sufficiency, definition, and measureability (p. 96):

1. Two persons are in psychological contact.

2. The first, whom we shall term the client, is in a state of incongruence, being vulnerable or anxious.

3. The second person, whom we shall term the therapist, is congruent or integrated in the relationship.

4. The therapist experiences unconditional positive regard for the client.

5. The therapist experiences an empathic understanding of the client's internal frame-of-reference and endeavors to communicate this experience to the client.

6. The communication to the client of the therapist's empathic understanding and unconditional positive regard is to a minimal degree achieved.
However, Rogers' efforts notwithstanding, two of the constructs, counselor empathy and unconditional positive regard, have proved to be elusive constructs to define. A review of the research which has been conducted on these constructs (Chapter II) indicates that there have been almost as many definitions proposed as there have been studies. This lack of agreement upon definitions might well lead one to wonder if the studies are measuring the same phenomena and indeed, if these phenomena which are being measured are counselor empathy and unconditional positive regard.

If empathy and unconditional positive regard are communicated to the client by the counselor, as Rogers says they must, then any operational definitions of these constructs should include those behaviors by the counselor which communicate the presence or absence of these conditions to the client. Until counselor behaviors have been identified which permit one to make accurate inferences about the presence or absence of empathy and unconditional positive regard, it is difficult to identify what is being measured in studies of these constructs.

**Purposes of the Study**

The principal purposes of the study are to develop and validate a prescribed set of methodological procedures which permit the study of counselor verbal behavior within the interview. The procedures include the a priori production of counselor verbal response categories, the rating by large numbers of respondents of these and other untrained
counselor verbal responses, and the analysis of data using factor analytic techniques.

Secondly, the study will examine the validity of three predetermined counselor verbal response categories as generated in a previous study of counselor verbal behavior (Zimmer & Anderson, 1968). These response categories are: ability potential response; interrogative prod; and reflection-probe response. By using these counselor response categories in a new counseling setting, their validity as discrete factors may be examined after subsequent analysis.

Specific Objectives:

The study proposes to develop a system of notation which would allow a counselor to identify certain of his own responses concurrent with their emission during a counseling interview and communicate this identification to a person external to the interview without the client's knowledge. Thus, the predetermined trained responses may be marked for identification after subsequent rating and analysis. A second objective is to train counselors to produce predetermined response categories in a counseling interview which meet the criteria established by the operational definitions of these response categories. The essence of the study may be stated in the following questions:

1. Do the factors extracted in the analysis of the data duplicate those extracted by Zimmer and Anderson (1968)?

1 For definitions, refer to section entitled "Definition of Terms."
2. Does the a priori use of the three trained classes of counselor verbal responses which are tagged affect the discreteness of these three factors?
   a. When respondent ratings are subjected to factor analysis, do the three classes of verbal responses cluster as discrete factors?
   b. Does the analysis of the data yield discrete factors for each of the three trained verbal response classes for each of the three counselors?

3. Do empathy and unconditional positive regard yield different factors in the description of the counselor's verbal responses than a non-theory bound dimension?
   a. When respondents rate counselor verbal responses on the "Appropriate Response Scale," does the analysis yield factors replicating those extracted from data on the Accurate Empathy Scale and the Unconditional Positive Regard Scale?
   b. Are the factors yielded in the analysis of the data similar across counselors on the Appropriate Response Scale?

In addition to these questions, the study permits the extrapolation of tentative answers to the following questions:

1. Can Counselor empathy and unconditional positive regard be described by more fundamental underlying verbal behaviors of the counselor?
   a. When respondent ratings of counselor verbal responses are subjected to factor analysis, are the factor structures extracted from empathy ratings similar to those extracted from unconditional positive regard ratings?
Significance of the Problem

The point has been made that the several studies which have been conducted upon counselor empathy and unconditional positive regard have lacked consistency as well as conciseness in defining these constructs. While it is possible to convey the meaning of these constructs to others in terms which are global and impressionistic, problems arise when they become the subject of research. Melvin Marx addresses himself to the significance of this problem by stating:

"...many difficulties in psychology stem from a failure to define constructs unambiguously. The development of simple and more empirically meaningful constructs is an important objective of contemporary psychology." [1963b, p. 44]

Thus, efforts to describe these constructs in terms of counselor behaviors, be they verbal or nonverbal behaviors, would serve to advance the constructs in the direction recommended by Marx.

Descriptive Analysis of Counselor Behavior

Rogers' sixth condition suggests that the extent to which the counselor communicates his conditions of empathic understanding and unconditional positive regard dictates to some extent the effects of these conditions to change in the client. This act of communication is of major significance in this study. Specifically, the study proposes to examine the nature of counselor verbal behavior in terms of the implicit expression of these constructs, as perceived by trained respondents.
Training Facilitative Behavior

No previous studies have been conducted in which counselors have been trained to use specific classes of verbal responses with the expressed purposes of measuring the effect of these responses in terms of empathy and unconditional positive regard. A recent review of the research (Carkhuff, 1966) makes specific reference to this need to investigate the counselor's contribution to facilitative processes, and notes that research in this area has been sparse indeed. A possible issue which might arise is whether or not training of this sort would tend to invalidate the constructs. Since Zimmer and Anderson (1968) did not train the counselor to use specific verbal response classes, it may be assumed that the response factors occurring in their study were not a function of specific training. Should the factors extracted in this study duplicate those of Zimmer and Anderson, it would suggest that overt training did not invalidate the constructs. In fact, the methodology and procedures used in this study might have significant import as a new departure in counselor training.

Generalization of Findings

According to Rogers these necessary and sufficient conditions "apply to any situation in which constructive personality change occurs, whether we are thinking of classical psychoanalysis, or any of its modern off-shoots, or Adlerian psychotherapy, or any other [1967, p. 101]." This position is supported by Truax to the extent that:
"Research deriving from the molar approach of conversation psychotherapy has in recent years accumulated overwhelming evidence suggesting that therapists who provide relatively high levels of accurate empathic understanding, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness (or lack of professional phoniness) causally induce greater self-exploration throughout the process of psychotherapy, and also produce constructive behavioral and personality change in human beings labelled diversely as schizophrenics, college under-achievers, neurotic or emotionally disturbed outpatients, and even juvenile delinquents." [1966b, p. 161]

It would therefore appear that the constructs, counselor empathy and unconditional positive regard have considerable significance which is applicable across various counseling theories. Consequently, any additional knowledge of counselor behaviors which are related to these constructs would also be relevant across counseling theories.

The present study, while still limited by client population and counselor population in its potential for generalization, is none-the-less an expansion of the Zimmer and Anderson study. Its significance rests upon an increase to three client-pairs, a respondent population more than twice the size of that in the Zimmer and Anderson study, and a methodology which permits simultaneous identification and communication by the counselor of his emitted responses.

Potential for Generating Hypotheses for Further Experimentation

Since this is basically a descriptive study, its greatest significance lies in its potential for producing information which can later be transmitted into empirical hypotheses for experimental study. The essential quality of operational constructs is that responses can be related to
stimuli through behavioral observation. This requires the manipulation of independent variables in order to discover the functional relationship. While this activity is beyond the scope of this study, information accruing from this study may suggest independent variables which permit manipulation in future research. For example, it would permit the differential application of these variables and measurement of their effects upon client behavior.

Verification of Previous Research

Using procedures similar to those developed by Zimmer and Anderson (1968) this study seeks to examine the validity of the verbal response factors which they described. Should the findings of this study correspond to those reported by Zimmer and Anderson, it would tend to lend support to the general hypothesis that empathic understanding and unconditional positive regard are global constructs which can be reduced and more explicitly defined in terms of counselor verbal response classes.

Definition of Terms

Ability potential response. The E (counselor) suggests that the S (client) has the ability or potential to engage in some specified future activity which is external to the counseling session, i.e. You could work for a semester; You might take up painting.

Interrogative request for modification (prodding) response. The E asks a question of the S which precludes an affirmative or negative response.
Instead, the S is required to elaborate in his response. Thus, the statement prods the client into verbal activity, i.e. Why did you take the course? How do you intend to finance the trip?

**Reflection-probe (session-centered) response.** The E establishes an "if-then" condition in which the "if" condition is a reflection of a prior statement by the S, and the "then" condition is a projection of the consequence or alternative behavior to the reflection, from the E's frame-of-reference.

**Limitations of the Study**

While certain variables of counselor verbal behavior will be manipulated, the objective is to seek further insight regarding their relationship to empathy and unconditional positive regard. At the same time the study seeks to determine whether or not other untrained counselor verbal behaviors, when viewed within the context of empathy and unconditional positive regard, would approximate the factors identified by Zimmer and Anderson (1968).

In this light, generalizations of the findings of the study are qualified by the selection of factors which the counselors were trained to use, characteristics of the counselor task, and the counseling setting.
Selection of Factors

Zimmer and Anderson (1968) identified eight factors related to counselor empathy which accounted for 73 percent of the total variance of respondent ratings, and eight factors related to unconditional positive regard which accounted for nearly 61 percent of the total variance of respondent ratings. This study involves the use of only three of these factors, two of which were common to both the empathy and unconditional positive regard analyses, and one which occurred only in the empathy analysis. The training of counselors to produce only these three factors permits no statement regarding the efficacy of training counselors to use all the factors described by Zimmer and Anderson.

Characteristics of the Counselor Task.

The counselor's task developed for this study permitted the counselor considerable latitude to incorporate his own counseling style in the counseling session. The most serious infringement upon the counselor's repertoire involved the establishment of certain types of counselor responses which may not have been consistent with his repertoire prior to training, and the requirement that he produce these trained responses at what he deemed appropriate moments, but with the restriction that he distribute the production of trained responses over timed segments within the interview. To this extent the counselor behavior was externally manipulated
through a series of signals which informed him that he had achieved minimal production within a given timed segment.

The counselors underwent a rigorous training procedure in which minimal performance levels of selected counselor responses had been established. However, it is acknowledged that complete standardization of counselor verbal responses is unlikely, and becomes a further limitation.

The Counseling Setting

The counseling session occurred in a specially equipped counseling room which contained the furnishings traditionally found in a counselor's office (i.e. table, two chairs, bookcase, carpet, pictures on walls). Behind and to the left of the client was a window which opened on to the control room. Behind the window was placed a television camera. Clients were told that the session would be video-recorded, and could, upon entering the room, see the window but not the television camera. Technicians in the control room were not visible to the client at any time. Previous studies (Zimmer & Parks, 1967; Zimmer & Anderson, 1968) have followed much the same procedures without suggesting that the conditions presented contamination of the data. However, since the counseling setting did vary from a typical setting to the extent described above, inferences to counseling are limited to the scope of this study.
CHAPTER II

LITERATURE AND RESEARCH DIRECTIVES

Spence (1963) has observed that the psychologist often uses theories as devices to aid him in formulating laws of human behavior. They are used primarily "...in the introduction or postulation of hypothetical constructs which help to bridge the gaps between the experimental variables. (p. 163)." Such gaps exist because the investigator cannot control all of the variables operating in an experiment, nor can he even identify all of the variables. But this activity imposes severe limitations upon research findings. Hypothetical constructs possess a relatively low degree of operational validity in that they contain terms which deny or resist direct observational and empirical measurement. Marx (1963a) suggests that, even with this limitation, the hypothetical construct does have value in the early formulation of psychological theories. However, he emphasizes that "If psychological theories are to be placed on a sound scientific basis, logical constructs of the more distinctly operational type must first supplement and eventually replace those of the hypothetical construct type (1963a, p. 188)."

Stages of Construct Development

It is important to note that hypothetical and operational constructs are not discrete entities. They may be conceptualized (Marx, 1963a;
MacCorquodale & Meehl, 1948) as existing on a continuum (see Figure 1). The continuity is represented by the degree to which the construct has been verified by empirical evidence. For example, Hull invented the term "excitatory potential" to describe certain human behavior which he could not directly observe in his laboratory experimentation, but which he inferred from the results of his experiments. Such a construct, while not operational, would possess a greater degree of empirical reference than would Freud's "ego", and would not be considered a purely hypothetical construct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothetical Constructs</th>
<th>Operational Constructs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree of Direct Empirical Reference</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Figure 1](image_url)

The hypothetical-operational continuum by which constructs may be classified grows out of the methods and approaches used in the study of the constructs. Marx (1963a, pp. 195-196) proposed that logical construct development may be roughly classified into a series of three stages: pre-scientific origins, preliminary scientific formulations, and advanced scientific analysis.

Pre-scientific origins are characterized by common-sense reflections of men in which some refinement in definition of terms occurs but little is done to tighten the relations between the concept and the relatively uncontrolled observations producing it. Preliminary scientific formulations grow out of investigative efforts in which some degree of scientific
rigor is present. However, the nature of the research is such that the investigator often uses "response-inferred" measurements rather than direct observation. As a result, there remains a lack of operational clarity of terms.

Advanced scientific analysis is marked by a systematic examination of the construct leading to empirical evidence which is directly related to the observed behavior. Four activities which are characteristic of this stage are: a) the investigator uses experimental procedures as well as theoretical structures; b) definite hypotheses which are more or less formal are established; c) the investigator makes deliberate efforts to establish hypotheses which permit direct empirical tests; and d) the problem of quantification is more a concern than qualitative distinctions.

Classification of Empathy and Unconditional Positive Regard

Studies which have been conducted on these constructs reflect the ambiguity of the constructs in the definition of terms. Empathy has been variously defined as "the skill with which the therapist is able to know and communicate the client's inner being" (Truax & Carkhuff, 1965a, p. 5); the therapist's "ability to understand the patient in his own terms, whether or not the patient and therapist are of the same sex" (Cartwright & Lerner, 1966, p. 538); the counselor's response to deep as well as surface feelings of the client (Martin, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1966); the degree to which the client feels "understood" by the counselor (Branan, 1967); and, in response to the ambiguity of other efforts, a retreat to the Greek origin "empathemia"
(Astin, 1967) which implies an active appreciation of another's feeling experience.

Looking to the research that has been conducted on unconditional positive regard, one also finds divergent expressions. Positive regard implies a "deep respect" for the client (Martin, et al., 1966) or an absence of threat to the client (Truax & Carkhuff, 1965a); counselor "warmth" (Truax, 1966a); and often, no attempt to define the construct at all.

Terms such as "client feelings", "inner being", "ability to understand", and "appreciation of another's feeling experience", while possessing a common-sense meaning, defy description in terms of observable behaviors. For while they are used interchangeably to define empathy, they give no indication of what is occurring either within or without the person who is communicating the condition.

The same may be said for unconditional positive regard. A "warm acceptance" or "deep respect" falls short of describing what the counselor is doing in the interaction with the client.

Such lack of conciseness in terms of what is occurring, what the counselor is doing to communicate these qualities to the client, leads to very subjective appraisals of these constructs, and, as will be shown later, the injection of systematic biases which cast doubt upon research findings.

**Methodological Considerations in Counseling Research**

In a large majority of the reported studies on empathy and unconditional positive regard, analysis reveals several common methodological
elements:

1. Raw data consist of audio tape-recorded interviews.
2. Segments of the interviews are selected for evaluation.
3. Trained or experienced raters evaluate segments and assign a rating for each segment according to the degree of empathy or unconditional positive regard they consider to be present in the counselor's behavior, or
4. Experienced raters evaluate segments and assign a rating for each segment according to the degree of self-exploration they consider to be present in the client's verbal behavior.
5. Rating scales provide the criteria for the judges' evaluations.

A brief examination of methodological considerations relevant to these procedures will provide a basis for evaluation of the reported research findings.

**Selection of the Interview Segments**

A major consideration in the selection of interview segments which are to be rated is the method by which selection is made. Presumably, the segments are representative of the total interview if inferences are to be made for the total interview. To accomplish this end, segments must be selected randomly so that each segment of the interview has an equal opportunity to be selected. A table of random numbers, selecting numbers from a pool, or some similar method meets this criterion.

Such a distinction is important in light of recent research on the selection of segments from interviews (Kiesler, Mathieu & Klein, 1964; Klein & Mathieu, 1965). They found that 1) the number of samples selected,
2) the length of segments in minutes, 3) the point in the interview from which the samples were taken, and 4) the method of selecting samples (use of table of random numbers versus unsystematic procedures) determined the representativeness of the samples based on longer portions of the therapy hours. In other words, the decisions related to any of the above four points could lead to invalidation of the findings of the study.

**Use of Raters**

Studies involving the use of raters are faced with methodological considerations as well. If the raters are trained, the nature of the training becomes an issue. Specifically, the type of skills being taught, the criterion level to which raters are trained, methods of assessing the raters' attainment of criterion levels, and validity of training in relation to the instrument being used are important considerations. If the raters are considered experienced, the commonality of their past experience is an item of added concern.

Finally, if the raters are skilled practitioners in psychotherapy, their theoretical orientations are a potential source of data contamination. Combs and Soper (1963) allude to this problem as do Stollak, Guerney, & Rathberg (1966, p. 314) in that "...co-workers can achieve reliability because of their common outlook or because of discussion involved in their training procedure, which they may unwittingly attribute to the operational definitions they have used."
Physical Conditions in the Rating Process

Care must also be taken, when using raters, to insure the independence of ratings. If raters conduct their ratings in close physical proximity, effort must be made to prevent consultation among raters which would lead to higher levels of agreement upon ratings than would otherwise occur. Since rater reliability is generally conceded to be a critical issue in this type of study, it is important to demonstrate that the reliability achieved is not a function of rater collaboration.

Studies on Empathy and Unconditional Positive Regard

The majority of the research which has been conducted upon these constructs may be broadly classified into one of five categories:

1. Relationship of counselor empathy and unconditional positive regard to process variables in counseling.

2. Relationship of empathy and unconditional positive regard to counseling outcome.

3. Significance of empathy and unconditional positive regard for alternative theoretical approaches in counseling.

4. Empathy, unconditional positive regard, and counselor training.

5. Behavioral correlates of empathy and unconditional positive regard.

Empathy, Unconditional Positive Regard, and Process Variables

Most of the studies in which the effect of empathy or unconditional positive regard influence the behavior of the client have used as their criterion the degree to which the client participates in self-exploratory
behavior. Berenson, Mitchell, and Moravec (1968) report finding a relationship between the degree of empathy and unconditional positive regard expressed by the counselor and the degree of intra-personal exploration on the part of the client. A second study (Holder, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1967) found that low-functioning clients are more affected by the degree of these counselor behaviors than are high-functioning clients.

Another study found that by experimentally varying the degree of counselor empathy and unconditional positive regard within the interview, the degree of client self-exploration responded differentially (Truax & Carkhuff, 1965a). Carkhuff & Alexik (1967) used a trained client and found that the manipulation of client intra-personal exploration differentially affected the degree of empathy and positive regard expressed by low-functioning counselors but did not significantly affect high-functioning counselors. Low-functioning counselors were identified as undergraduate students in psychology while high-functioning counselors were two trained, experienced counselors.

Piaget, Berenson, and Carkhuff (1967) examined the interaction between high- and moderate functioning therapists and high- and low-functioning clients. The level of therapist functioning was determined by the amount of empathy, unconditional positive regard, genuineness, and concreteness exhibited by the therapists. Client functioning was determined by the level of self-expression exhibited by clients. By pairing high- and moderate-functioning therapists with high- and low-functioning clients, the investigators
sought to determine the effects of different interaction pairs. Results indicated that all clients improved in their levels of self-expression when paired with high-functioning therapists, and all clients tended to decline in level of self-expression when seen by moderate-functioning therapists.

Finally, a study of client self-exploration comparing experienced counselors to best friends of the clients (Martin, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1966) found that counselors induced more self-exploratory behavior on the part of clients than did best friends.

Although these studies seem to suggest a causal relationship between counselor empathy and unconditional positive regard on the one hand, and client self-exploration on the other, they possess severe methodological limitations. Berenson, Mitchell, & Moravec (1968) use interview segments as their source of data, but they tell nothing about how interview segments were selected. In their discussion of the rating procedures, they fail to mention training and theoretical orientation of their raters or their rating procedures. They do explain that the raters were two independent experienced therapists but this does not eliminate the possibility of systematic biases in the analysis of data. Holder, Carkhuff, & Berenson (1967) used random excerpts from interviews but do not describe the system of random selection. The interview excerpts were rated by "experienced raters" but no information was given as to whom they were, the nature of their experience, and their rating procedures. Finally, the investigators failed to indicate the criteria used in assignment of clients to low- and high-functioning groups.
Much the same criticisms can be raised with the other reported studies. In their description of procedures they fail to dismiss methodological concerns with regard to rater orientation, rater training, independence of ratings, and operational control of levels of the independent variable (Truax & Carkhuff, 1965a; Martin, et al., 1966; Piaget, et al., 1967; Carkhuff & Alexik, 1967) and method of selection of interview excerpts for rating (Martin, et al., 1966; Truax & Carkhuff, 1965a).

As a result of these oversights or failure to control systematic error, it becomes difficult to accept the findings reported in these studies as significant.

**Empathy, Unconditional Positive Regard, and Counseling Outcome**

One of the earliest studies (Halkides, 1958) examined variations in levels of these constructs in terms of success in therapy. Halkides took client-counselor interaction units from interviews occurring early and late in therapy from both successful and unsuccessful cases, randomized the samples, and had judges rate the interactions for the degree of empathy and unconditional positive regard present. She reported that judges' ratings on these two criteria differentiated between successful and unsuccessful cases at the .001 level, with higher levels of these constructs associated with the successful therapy cases. Inter-judge correlations were in the .90's for all interaction samples.

Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imber, Battle, Hoehn-Saric, Nash, and Stone (1966) sought to cross-validate previous research which suggested that the
levels of the therapist's accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness were causally related to the degree of patient improvement or deterioration. They selected two three-minute samples from each of three interviews; one sample was taken from the middle of the interview and one from the final one-third of the interview. Undergraduate students were trained to use rating scales for empathy, warmth, and genuineness and then rated the six interview segments. Their results indicated that on overall measures for all patients, therapists providing high therapeutic conditions had 90% patient improvement while those providing lower conditions had 50% improvement.

A variation on these studies (Barrett-Leonard, 1959) used clients' ratings of counselor empathic understanding and positive regard. Clients were given a rating scale which described different degrees of how the counselor might feel toward the client and they were to rate their counselor on these dimensions relating to empathy and positive regard. He found that the more experienced therapists were perceived as having more empathy, higher levels of regard, greater unconditionality of regard, and greater congruence or genuineness than did less experienced therapists. In the more disturbed clients, there was a high correlation between these four measures and the degree of personality change in the clients.

Gross and DeRidder (1966) used a similar strategy but were concerned with the effects of these constructs in short-term therapy. Using the Barrett-Leonard Relationship Inventory, they selected three three-
minute samples from each of sixteen interview tapes. The segments were selected from the 12th, 24th, and 36th minute points of each interview. No rationale was given for the selection of these particular time segments. The raters were two trained, but clinically naive, college students. Results indicated significant mean movement for short-term clients in the direction hypothesized by Rogers (that higher levels of empathy and unconditional positive regard led to greater personality change in a positive direction). However, they reported that individual clients' experienced movement differentially.

A further examination of the relationship between the client's manner of problem expression, depth of personal exploration, and manner of relating to the therapist and the therapist's congruence, empathy, and unconditional positive regard was conducted by van der Veen (1967). Using 15 hospitalized schizophrenic therapy cases, he rated tape-recorded segments of therapy interviews using these criteria. These ratings were compared to pre- and post-therapy changes. He found that patient movement on the above criteria was not related to level of therapist conditions nor to case outcome. Demos (1967) took the 10 highest and 10 lowest rated counselor-trainees in a six-week program and rated 15 client-counselor interactions from terminating interviews by these trainees. These verbal interactions were then rated on three scales, empathy, unconditional positive regard, and congruence, by 10 specialists in secondary school counseling. He found that judges' ratings successfully discriminated between high- and low-rated counselor-trainees on both empathy and unconditional positive
regard at the .01 level.

The methodology reported in these studies relating empathy and unconditional positive regard to outcome in therapy raises serious questions concerning the believability of the results. Those studies using success or lack of success in therapy as a criterion rely either upon the therapist's judgment of success (Halkides, 1958; Barrett-Leonard, 1959) or fail to report the method for determining success (Truax, et al., 1966; Cross and DeRidder, 1966; van der Veen, 1967). In either case, the possibility of therapist or experimenter bias which would influence the direction of the results is quite strong. Demos (1967) did not describe the method for selection of interaction units to be rated, the nature of the judges' specialization, the types of scales used, or the conditions for rating of interview segments. Such omissions in the reporting of research studies, while not uncommon, make critical evaluation of results virtually impossible.

Those studies which used interview segments for rating possess an added weakness. In the light of results on interview segment selection reported earlier in this chapter (Kiesler, et al., 1964; Klein & Mathieu, 1965) the representativeness of the selected samples is questionable. Questions may also be raised regarding the methods and conditions for rating. In none of the reported studies do the investigators indicate the training procedures or minimum performance levels for raters. Further, and perhaps more important, the investigators do not indicate the conditions for rating. If, for example, the raters were in physical proximity while rating the interview segments, the possibility of consultation
occurring between them would increase the inter-rater reliability but
would destroy the independence of ratings, thus negating the findings.

A final question may be raised regarding the two studies which
used the Barrett-Leonard Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Leonard, 1959;
Gross & DeRidder, 1966). Mills and Zytowski (1967) report a study in
which ratings from the two forms of this scale were factor-analyzed. They
found one common factor which accounted for more than two-thirds of the
total variance on both scales. This finding casts serious doubts on the val-
ue of the scale as an instrument. Either the scales do not measure four
discrete constructs or else the four constructs may be better explained by
one common factor. In either case, the findings of these studies are, at
best, unclear.

Studies Comparing Alternative Theoretical Approaches

While much of the research has restricted itself to studies within
the framework of a specific counseling theory, usually the client-centered
school, there have been a few studies which have attempted to compare
techniques and outcomes over two or more theoretical approaches. The
results of these studies suggest that empathy and positive regard are rele-
vant across theoretical lines. Fieldler (1950a; 1950b) asked therapists
representing the psychoanalytic, client-centered, and Adlerian schools to
describe their concepts of the ideal therapeutic relationship and found that
experts of the different schools agreed more closely with each other than
they did with non-expert therapists within their respective schools. In a
second study Fieldler reported (1951) that therapists of all three schools agreed upon one essential common factor in the ideal therapeutic relationship, counselor empathy.

Using two client-centered and two psychoanalytic oriented therapists working with matched patients, Cartwright (1966) compared client behaviors using three scales: Rogers' and Rablen's Process Scale, Self-Obervation Scale (developed by the investigator to follow psychoanalytic theory) and Bales Interaction Analysis Scale, a measure free of direct ties to any counseling theory. Cartwright found that there was much more that was similar in the response of matched patients to different treatment than is often credited, and that the range of verbal behaviors available to psychoanalytic and client-centered therapists is not very different, given the goals they are pursuing (1966, p. 527).

Training Counselors to Use Empathy and Positive Regard

Although the knowledge of empathy and positive regard provided through research leaves many questions unresolved, several studies report success in training counselors and lay people to use empathy and positive regard in a helping relationship. Carkhuff and Truax (1965a) report findings of several training endeavors involving both graduate students and lay personnel in which trainees could be brought to function at levels of effective therapy commensurate to those of more experienced therapists in less than 100 hours of training. However, among the questions they leave unanswered in this report are those relating to training criteria, training
procedures, training of evaluators, independence of evaluations, and data on experienced therapists to which the trainees are compared. In a study measuring effects of this training upon counseling Carkhuff & Truax (1965b) report that significant improvement was noted in the mental hospital ward behavior for the treatment group when compared to a control group. The trainees in this study were ward attendants. Their training procedures, while scantily described, involved a sensitivity-type program in which the trainees listened to counseling tapes and rated counselor responses on empathy and positive regard rating scales, and outcome was measured using a self-exploration scale. The study is limited by the same methodological problems of earlier studies, namely, failure to report the characteristics of raters, the rating procedures, procedures for the selection of excerpts to be rated, whether or not the 'significance' was a statistical significance, and information about the control group.

A third study (Berenson, Carkhuff, & Myrus, 1966) using undergraduate college trainees at three levels of training, found that the combination of therapeutic experience and training in research scales proved more effective than did therapeutic experience alone, but that therapeutic experience alone produced warmer and more empathic counselors than did no training at all. Once again, however, so much essential information is omitted in the report of the study that the results lack credibility. The one common characteristic of these studies is a training program which involves experiential and dydactic exposure to rating scales, with the assumption that
this exposure will transfer to and modify counselor behavior. Yet, at no point is the desired counselor behavior spelled out in behavioral terms. There are no reported studies in which counselors are trained to produce operationally defined verbal response categories related to the constructs, empathy and unconditional positive regard.

**Behavioral Correlates of Empathy and Positive Regard.**

If positive personality change is to occur in therapy, the counselor's empathy and positive regard must be communicated to the client (Rogers, 1957; 1961). While it is assumed that this communication does not occur by the counselor's saying "I am empathic" or "I have great regard for you," certain behaviors of the counselor would suggest the presence or absence of these therapeutic conditions. Two recent studies (Zimmer & Parks, 1967; Zimmer & Anderson, 1968) have attempted to describe counselor verbal response classes which are associated with various rated levels of these constructs. They trained respondents to use rating scales measuring these constructs, and then had the respondents rate each counselor response in a video-taped counseling session for level of empathy and positive regard. They found eight factors or verbal classes of counselor behavior which characterized empathy and eight factors which characterized unconditional positive regard. That six of these verbal classes were common to both constructs suggests that empathy and positive regard are not discrete constructs as defined, but may be reduced to more specific descriptions of counselor behavior.
Only one other reported study has attempted to examine specific counselor behaviors within the context of counselor empathy. Pierce and Mosher (1967) experimentally manipulated emission of 14 client-centered verbal statements by counselors with 60 male subjects who had been previously assigned to high- or low-anxiety groups. Two treatments, appropriate counselor verbal behavior (defined as counselor response 3 seconds after the client response) and inappropriate counselor verbal behavior (defined as a counselor response 15 seconds after the client response) were used. After the interview clients rated the level of empathy shown by the counselor using the Barrett-Leonard Perceived Empathy Questionnaire. The investigators reported no significant differences between high- and low-anxiety clients and the two levels of counselor verbal behavior. However, results might be a function of the Barrett-Leonard Questionnaire.

**Further Research Potential**

While different schools of psychotherapy have their own views of what constitutes necessary and sufficient conditions for desired personality change in therapy, Cartwright and Lerner (1963) observed that the percentage of success in therapy is fairly constant across theoretical approaches. They propose that this consistency suggests that one or more common elements might well be more significantly related to improvement than the techniques on which the schools differ (p. 537). Still others have proposed that these therapeutic conditions which cut across therapeutic orientations are, in fact, the counselor's level of empathic understanding and uncondi-
tional positive regard (Rogers, 1957; 1961; Fieldler, 1951; Truax, 1966b). With the exception of two studies (Zimmer & Parks, 1967; Zimmer & Anderson, 1968) the research into these conditions or constructs has treated them as global phenomena.

Not only have they been described as desirable counselor qualities, but also they might also be counselor tools or techniques (Truax, 1966c). Truax attempted to show that empathy and positive regard can be looked upon, from a behavioral stance, as very potent positive reinforcers in therapy. Taking a single long-term successful case in which Carl Rogers was the therapist, Truax selected 'therapist-client-therapist' interaction units from the middle one-third of therapy hours over 85 interviews. Some nine separate classes of patient behavior which might theoretically be expected to be significant for behavioral change were separately rated by five experienced psychotherapists. Additionally, three "reinforcers" were also rated (empathy, non-possessive warmth, and directiveness). He found that the therapist significantly tended to respond selectively with different levels of empathy, warmth, or directiveness to high and low levels of five of the nine classes of patient behavior, and, as a result, four of the five reinforced behaviors showed significant changes in patient behavior in the predicted direction over time in therapy. Truax (1966b) further proposes that "the effective therapist might respond with empathy and warmth 40% of the time to any verbalizations by the patient, but 90% of the time to definite attempts (by the client) at relating" (p. 163).
On the other hand, there are suggestions in the literature that empathy and unconditional positive regard may not be unique conditions but may be masking more molecular functions. High inter-judge correlations reported in the studies mentioned earlier may be a function of elements common to both constructs. Rogers (1961) raises this question as do the more descriptive studies (Zimmer & Parks, 1967; Zimmer & Anderson, 1968).

Therefore, efforts should be made to isolate and define these more molecular components. Their use in therapy, as described by Truax (1966c), would be more meaningful, particularly in experimental studies in which these more definitive behaviors might be manipulated to measure their reinforcement potential. Clearly, efforts to reduce empathy and unconditional positive regard to more molecular components of counselor behavior is a promising avenue for further research.

**Ratings of Empathy and Positive Regard**

The degree to which these constructs are present within a counseling session or counseling segment has been measured mostly through the use of rating scales, although the questionnaire, Q sort, and in one case, judges' global reactions have been used.

**Rating Scales**

The majority of the studies have used 5-point scales as criteria for

In all these scales, the lower part of the scale represents lesser degrees of empathy and positive regard, while the higher levels of the scales represent a high degree of empathy and positive regard. The scales do not represent observable counselor behavior; rather, they call for rater evaluations based upon subjective, but trained, rater judgments. With the exception of two studies (Zimmer & Park, 1967; Zimmer & Anderson, 1968) none of the investigators include the complete scales in the reports of their research.

**Sampling of Taped Excerpts From Interviews**

Most of the reported studies have used only portions of the counseling interviews for purposes of evaluation. The excerpts include single counselor-client interaction units (Halkides, 1958); client-counselor-client interaction units (Truax, 1966c); 3-minute segments (Truax & Carkhuff, 1965a; Gross & DeRidder, 1966; Truax, et al., 1966; Holder, et al., 1967), and 4-minute segments (Martin, et al., 1966; van der Veen, 1967; Carkhuff et al., 1967; Carkhuff & Alexik, 1968). The rationale for selection of excerpt length is not stated in any of the research. In the case of the three-
and four-minute segments, the rating assigned by the judges is a global rating of the degree of empathy and positive regard expressed by the counselor over the several responses emitted by the counselor during the time segment, thereby making it impossible to equate these constructs to specific counselor behaviors.

In contrast, Zimmer & Park (1967) and Zimmer & Anderson (1968) utilized the continuous counselor-client verbal interaction within a single counseling session, with the exception of a few counselor responses which were selected out of the sample, using a table of random numbers. As a consequence, the data analyzed in these two studies was potentially more representative of the population of counselor-client responses within the interview than was data of other reported studies.

**Factor Analysis as a Descriptive Tool**

Factor analysis is a statistical tool which may be employed when one has a multiple set of observations and wishes to determine their relationships. It is commonly used by investigators who seek to determine the inter-relationships of various tests of personality, ability or other categories of psychological testing. In fact, the use of factor analysis with testing has led to the establishment of what is known as the trait-factor theories of personality (Hall & Lindzey, 1957). Factor analysis has also been used in the examination of constructs. Several studies may be identified in which this statistical tool has been employed in the examination of variables in counseling.
Prior Use of Factor Analysis in Counseling Studies

Counseling studies employing factor analysis techniques may be classified into four types: studies of change or outcome in counseling; comparisons of therapist variables across counseling theories; analysis of structural or process variables; and studies of counselor verbal behavior described as empathic or showing positive regard.

Studies of counseling outcome have generally involved pre- and post-therapy scores on multiple tests of personality such as the MMPI and TAT, and have included therapist ratings (Gibson, Snyder, & Ray, 1955; Fiske, Cartwright, & Kirtner, 1964; Cartwright, Kirtner, & Fiske, 1963; Nichols & Beck, 1960). The primary objective of these studies was to determine whether or not such measures had validity as predictors of counseling outcome and the commonality of the various measures used.

It has already been noted that Fieldler, in a series of three studies (1950a; 1950b; 1951), investigated therapists' responses to questions dealing with the desirable conditions for a therapeutic relationship. He factor analyzed responses to a large number of items relating to the therapeutic relationship to determine the commonality or degree to which responses to items were independent of each other.

Three reported studies have used factor analysis to examine process variables in counseling as perceived by clients and/or therapists. Nunally (1955) used a Q-sort in having clients evaluate 15 descriptions of their behavior. These measures were then inter-correlated and subjected to
centroid factor analysis, yielding three common factors present in the fifteen measures. Harway (1959) attempted to derive a measure of therapist empathy by having therapists complete the Edwards Personal Preference Scale as they thought their clients would, then having clients also complete the EPPS; he subjected the two measures to factor analysis, and found relationships that suggested that therapist predictions may be a function of factors other than knowledge of the predictee. Mills & Zytowski (1967) used the Barrett-Leonard Relationship Inventory to examine the components which contribute to the examinee's score. They had 79 female undergraduate college students complete the inventory two times, assessing their relationship with their mothers, and assessing their perception of their mothers' feelings toward them. Through factor analysis, they were able to isolate three components: a general component which accounted for two-thirds of the total variance, a component reflecting a reciprocal relationship between unconditionality and level of regard, and a component which they described as a "relationship distortion."

Two previously described studies (Zimmer & Park, 1967; Zimmer & Anderson, 1968) analyzed respondent ratings of counselor empathy and positive regard, utilizing each counselor response within the interview. Analysis yielded eight verbal factors which could be associated with each construct.
Fact or Analysis as a Reduction Tool

As a reduction tool, factor analysis examines the variance which is common to all the variables under study. Theoretically, if each of the variables is totally unique and contains only error variance and variance attributable to individual differences, the underlying factors will equal the number of variables. On the other hand, if the variables are not orthogonal, factor analysis may be used to identify a lesser number of constituent parts which contribute to the data. In the case of construct studies, the technique is utilized to examine the data for underlying factors which define the construct more explicitly. Fruchter (1954, p. 2) notes the particular appropriateness of this tool for the clinical psychologist in his analysis of classification schemes to determine "...whether these classification systems can be verified with empirical data for specific populations, or whether they overlap to such an extent as to call for a reordering and redefinition of the sets of diagnostic categories."

He cautions, however, that factors are not to be interpreted as eternal truths; "...they merely serve to represent the fundamental underlying sources of variation operating in a given set of scores or other data observed under a specified set of conditions." (1954, p. 4). On the other hand, if one were to continue to extract the same factors in replications of the specified set of conditions, this would provide the kind of empirical reference Marx (1963a) calls for in the movement from hypothetical to operational constructs. It is toward this end that the proposed study is directed.
Summary

While the amount of research on empathy and unconditional positive regard is considerable, the methodological problems inherent in much of the research limit the credibility of the findings. As indicated by Kiesler, Mathieu, and Klein (1964) and again by Klein and Mathieu (1965) the method of selecting interview segments for rating determines their representativeness of the original data. Unless all interview segments are used, or unless a smaller number are selected using standard statistical procedures, i.e. a table of random numbers, there is no assurance that the data represents the original variables. This does appear to be a problem with many of the reported studies (Berenson, Mitchell, & Moravec, 1968; Holder, Carkhuff, & Berenson, 1967; Martin, Berenson, & Carkhuff, 1966; Truax & Carkhuff, 1965a; Halkides, 1958; Truax, et al., 1966; Barrett-Leondard, 1959; Gross & DeRidder, 1966; van der Veen, 1967; Demos, 1967; Carkhuff & Truax, 1965b; Berenson, Carkhuff, & Myrus, 1966).

Since the method of rating interview taped excerpts is equally crucial, efforts should be made to assure the independence of ratings, either by isolating raters or judges from each other, or by some other means which prevents their consultation with one another on ratings. In most of the reported studies (Truax & Carkhuff, 1965a; Martin, et al., 1966; Piaget, et al., 1967; Carkhuff & Alexik, 1967; Halkides, 1958; Truax, et al., 1966; Barrett-Leonard, 1959; Gross & DeRidder, 1966; van der Veen, 1967;
Demos, 1967; Carkhuff & Truax, 1965a; Berenson, et al., 1966; Carkhuff & Truax, 1965b).

Factor analysis has been employed in several studies to attempt to lay open underlying factors which better describe the global constructs, and thereby open the way for experimental studies of the constructs. Since factor analysis represents fundamental underlying sources of variation operating in a given set of data, replication of such studies would be necessary to establish the credibility of the empirical references relating to empathy and unconditional positive regard. The procedures described in Chapter III are directed toward this objective, while at the same time, attempting to control many of the sources of bias common to most of the studies of empathy and unconditional positive regard.
CHAPTER III
EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES

The study to be described is a re-examination of certain aspects of counselor verbal behavior as they relate to counselor empathy, unconditional positive regard, and appropriateness. Three counselors were trained to reproduce three classes of verbal responses in a counseling interview. Then each of the counselors conducted a counseling interview which was video-recorded. Counselor responses were identified numerically on each of the video-tapes and groups of trained raters viewed and rated each identified counselor response, using one of three types of rating scale: Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes (Berenson, Carkhuff, & Southworth); Respect or Positive Regard in Interpersonal Processes (Carkhuff, Southworth, and Berenson); and Counselor Appropriateness of Response (Hackney). The study was conducted during the fall semester, 1968, and the spring semester, 1969.

Experimental Personnel

Facilities and personnel of the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, were used in the conduct of the study. Raters were provided by the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, and the University of Hartford, Hartford, Connecticut.
Interview clients were selected from a pool of volunteer undergraduate male students enrolled in a nearby community college. Seventeen clients were interviewed by the three counselors and their interviews were video-recorded. From this pool of interviews, three were selected which met the minimal counselor performance criteria in the production of trained responses. These criteria included the production of one each of the three trained responses during each of eight six-minute timed segments in the interview, a total of 24 trained responses. Further, 90% of these 24 trained responses had to meet the criteria established in the operational definitions of the responses, as rated by independent judges, for the interview to be included in the study. A complete description of the methods used to establish minimal performance levels is presented later in this chapter.

The volunteer clients were solicited from a population of female students enrolled in an undergraduate class of introductory Educational Psychology at Greenfield Community College. During the first week of October, their teacher asked for volunteers to participate in one hour of counseling at the School of Education, University of Massachusetts. They were told that the purpose of the counseling session was to permit some counselors-in-training to obtain experience using skills they had been learning and to permit examination of the counselors' skills. No financial remuneration or course credit was offered the participants.
It was explained that the interviews would be video-recorded and viewed by other people at a later date. Volunteers signed up for interview appointments and were asked to arrive ten minutes before the scheduled time. Upon arrival each client was given an interview registration form which described the nature of the session and explained again that the session would be video-recorded and viewed by others (see Counselor Questionnaire, Appendix A). Clients were told that their interview would be viewed by others only with their consent and they were asked to sign a release permitting later viewing of the interview if this was agreeable to them. None of the clients objected to the use of the video-recordings. Client characteristics are described in Table 1.

**TABLE 1**

**COMPARISON OF CLIENT CHARACTERISTICS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>College Major</th>
<th>College Class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1, Pamela</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Liberal Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 2, Rebecca</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 3, Lucy</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rationale for using only female undergraduate clients is based upon previous research procedures which are related to this study.
This study seeks to validate specified counselor response classes identified by Zimmer and Anderson (1968) and certain methodological elements employed by Zimmer and Anderson and Zimmer and Parks (1967). Both of these studies utilized male counselor-female client pairs. To vary from this combination might serve to confound the data and negate the possibility of validation.

Counselors

Three male counselors were selected to be used in the study. Their cooperation was voluntary and the only incentive was the opportunity to participate in a study of counselor verbal behavior. The counselors represented varying levels of counseling orientation, training, experience, and age (see Table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Highest Degree</th>
<th>Present Degree Program</th>
<th>Counseling Courses</th>
<th>Years Counseling</th>
<th>Years Teaching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselor 1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M. Ed.</td>
<td>Ed. D.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor 2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ed. D.</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor 3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>B. A.</td>
<td>Ed. D.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Counselor Task

Each counselor was trained to produce three verbal responses which were identified by Zimmer and Anderson (1968). Prior to the training program for counselors, the principal investigator developed operational definitions for each of the three responses which permitted preciseness in the training procedure. The three responses, as operationally defined, are:

Ability potential response. The E (counselor) suggests that the S (client) has the ability or potential to engage in some specified form of activity. More specifically:

1. The ability potential is a statement by the E which is characterized by:
   1.1. a future activity, performance, or endeavor,
   1.2. the S's potential for entering into the prescribed activity.

2. Operationally, the ability potential statement will be defined as follows:
   2.1. a sentence structure containing a subject, action verb (usually but not always in the future tense), and (but not always) an object (either a direct object or an object of the preposition modifying the verb).
   2.2. the subject (stated or implied) will usually be a pronoun, the antecedent of which is the client, i.e. You.
   2.3. the verb prescribes some form of action and will usually be in the future tense. It may or may not contain a
negative, i.e. 'can do that' (can't do that), 'can talk' (can't talk).

2.4. the object, if present in the sentence structure, defines the focal point of the activity, i.e. could talk to the Dean, might try studying.

Examples:

You could work for a semester.

I think you could find a way to meet him.

You probably could do the job quite well.

**Interrogative request for modification (prodding) response.** The E asks a question of the S which precludes an affirmative or negative answer. Instead, the S is required to elaborate in his response. Thus, the statement prods the client into verbal activity. More specifically:

1. the interrogative request for modification (prodding) is a statement by the E which is characterized by:
   1.1. a question directed to the S which
   1.2. demands more than an affirmative or negative response.

2. Operationally, the interrogative request for modification (prodding) may be defined as a sentence containing a subject (stated or implied), a verb (usually including a linking or auxiliary verb) and (but not always) a subordinate clause.

2.1. the subject may be a noun or pronoun, the antecedent of which is usually the S, i.e. You.
2.2. the verb has a unique structure within the sentence. If it contains a linking or auxiliary verb, the linking or auxiliary verb will precede the subject of the sentence, while the action verb follows the subject, i.e. did you, you feel, could you say;

2.3. the subordinate clause, when used, usually follows the verb in the sentence structure.

2.4. the sentence will be introduced by 'why', 'how', 'when', 'what', or 'where'.

Examples:

How did you feel about that?

Why are you crying?

Why do you think (that) he will be angry?

When do you feel this way?

Probing-reflection (session-centered) response. The E establishes an 'if-then' condition in which the 'if' condition is a paraphrase of a prior statement by the S, and the 'then' condition is a projection of the consequence or alternative behavior to the paraphrase, from the E's frame of reference. More specifically:

1. The probing-reflection (session-centered) response is a statement by the experimenter which is characterized by:

1.1. establishment of an 'if-then' condition to a previous response by the client, and

1.2. is emitted in search of verification or rejection by the S.
2. Operationally, the probe-reflection may be defined as a compound or complex sentence connected by a coordinating conjunction (in the case of the compound) or a subordinate conjunction introduction (in the case of the complex).

2.1. The phrase preceding the coordinating conjunction or introduced by the subordinate conjunction establishes the 'if' condition.

2.2. The 'if' condition reflects or paraphrases a statement by the S.

2.3. If the sentence is compound, the phrase preceding the coordinating conjunction is an independent clause, containing a subject (usually the pronoun "you"), verb, and may include a direct object, predicate noun or adjective, or dependent clause.

2.4. If the sentence is complex, the phrase introduced by the subordinate conjunction is a dependent clause, containing a subject (usually the pronoun "you"), verb, and may include a direct object, predicate noun or adjective, or dependent clause. The subordinating conjunction of concession (although, notwithstanding, though, while) which indicates acknowledgment or admission, will normally introduce the dependent clause.

2.5. The independent clause second in order in the sentence (statement), establishes the 'then' condition, in which
the E projects a consequence, alternative, or negation of the established 'if' condition.

2.6. The 'then' condition contains a subject, verb, and may include a direct object, predicate noun or adjective, or dependent clause.

2.7. Compound sentences will be connected by coordinating conjunctions such as but, and, etc. Complex sentences will be connected with a pause (comma) only.

Examples:

Although you make good grades, school really isn't very satisfying.

If you keep putting the job off, you will become more unhappy with yourself.

The training program consisted of two stages. In the introductory stage counselors studied the operational definitions and practiced the production of examples of each response. This was followed by a performance stage in which counselors produced the three verbal responses in a quasi-counseling setting. The quasi-counseling setting was characterized by five-minute interviews with volunteers drawn from the secretarial pool, School of Education, University of Massachusetts. In each five minute segment, the counselor produced only one of the three trained responses. When all three trained responses approximated the operational definitions, the counselor conducted a 30-minute interview with a new client. At this point, a second task was added. Each time the
counselor attempted to produce a trained response, he had to suppress a numbered foot pedal corresponding to that response. The foot pedal activated a signal light in the control room adjoining the counseling room and served to inform the technician that the counselor's intent was to produce a specified training response. For example, if the counselor wished to produce the ability potential response, he might say "You could get a job this summer and earn enough money." As he began this response, he also suppressed foot pedal #1. This activated signal light #1 in the control room thereby tagging this response as an ability potential response.

Thus, the counselor had to predetermine the production of a specific trained response and identify that response to the technician simultaneous to its production. The thirty-minute interviews were video-recorded, permitting a later critique with the counselor of his verbal and visual performance.

Finally, the counselors conducted a forty-eight minute interview in which response production and communication skills were finalized. The performance stage of each counselor's training was continued at this level until he had attained the following performance levels in the quasi-counseling setting:

1. The counselor could produce five successive responses for each of the three response classes which met the criteria established in the operational definitions. This was determined by the principal investigator who compared tagged
trained responses to the definitions.

2. The counselor suppressed the appropriate foot pedal simultaneous to the production of each of the five responses for the three trained response classes.

Training time was a function of the counselor's ability to attain the minimum performance levels. Counselor 1 and Counselor 2 required less than two hours, and Counselor 3 required approximately three and one-half hours in the performance stage of the training program. A further check on the counselor's performance was made in the actual counseling session and will be described in that section of the chapter.

Experimental Facilities

The facilities used in the counselor training and the counseling sessions consisted of two adjoining rooms located in Montague House, School of Education, University of Massachusetts. These rooms were identified as the Counseling Room and the Control Room.

Counseling Room

The counseling room was equipped with a 36"x36" pedestal-type table in which was mounted a high-impedence microphone. The microphone was not visible to counselor or client. Other furniture included two chairs, carpet, bookcase, student desk, and television set which was not used in the experiment. On the wall facing the client was a calendar. On the wall facing the counselor, and behind the client, was a 3"x8" box
containing three signal lights and a 11"x12" window. Beneath the counseling table was a series of three foot pedals in front of the counselor's chair. The foot pedals were not visible to the client.

Control Room

The control room contained audio- and video-monitoring and taping equipment. The following equipment was required: one Ampex Model VR 7000 video-recorder, one Ampex video camera with wide-angle zoom lens, one Shure four-channel audio mixer, one Ampex four-channel audio tape-recorder with microphone, one Sony 8" video monitor, an electronic timer which was calibrated to signal eight six-minute time segments, and a signal light control panel. Above the signal light control panel was a battery of three signal lights which were activated by the counselor foot pedals in the counseling room.

Reception Room

A third room, a secretary's office, was used as a reception room for clients who participated in the study.

Video-recording Procedures

The video camera was mounted in the control room behind the 11"x12" window which opened on the Counseling room. This window was behind and to the left of the client and permitted a frontal view of the counselor. The technician could communicate with the counselor through use of signal lights mounted on the wall of the counseling room. These lights were
controlled by the signal light control panel in the control room. The technician announced the beginning of the counseling session by flashing two of the three control lights.

At the beginning of the interview the video-recorder, audio-recorder, timer, and counselor signal lights were activated. Superimposed on the audio-recording of the interview were three signals indicating production of trained signaled verbal responses by the counselor. Thus the principal investigator was able to identify trained counselor verbal responses but the video-recording contained no indication that the counselor was doing anything different.

The Counseling Interview

The counseling interview, in an effort to simulate typical counseling, was timed for 48 minutes. It consisted of eight six-minute segments. During each six-minute segment the counselor's task was to produce and signal one each of the ability potential response, interrogative prod, and reflection-probe response. At the outset of each six-minute segment the technician activated the three control lights mounted in the counseling room. The three lights represented the three trained responses. As the counselor produced and signaled a trained response, the technician extinguished its corresponding signal light. Within each time segment, the counselor knew which trained responses he still must produce. The signal lights also served to inform the counselor of the beginning of a new time segment. At the conclusion of the 48 minutes, the technician
signaled the counselor by flashing two of the three signal lights. Upon receipt of this signal, the counselor was to say to the client, "Well, I think our hour is about up. Thank you very much for coming today."

Upon hearing this response the technician deactivated the audio- and video-recording equipment. After the session, each client was invited to continue with future counseling interviews if she so desired. None of the clients chose to continue at that time.

**Establishing Counselor Attainment of Performance Levels**

Since there was no guarantee that the counselor's training carried over to the counseling interview, minimum performance levels in the counseling session were established. An arbitrary performance level of 90% agreement between trained counselor response production and the operational definitions was required to permit use of the video-recorded session for rating purposes. Two judges, external to the study, were solicited to examine and rate the accuracy of counselor responses. Both judges were candidates for the Ed. D. in the School of Education, University of Massachusetts. Judge 1 was in a counselor education program and had extensive knowledge of the counseling process. Judge 2 was in a curriculum development program and had no knowledge of the counseling process. Both judges have a high level of research knowledge.

Those counselor responses which were tagged by the counselor as trained responses were typed on separate 3"x5" cards for rating by judges. A fourth category of responses, identified by the principal investigator as
"other-directed" responses, were included in the evaluation process. The rationale for this addition was to counteract the possible effects of word production in the trained responses, since the interrogative-prod is characterized by greater word production than the other two trained responses. As a result, the judges had two classes of low word production responses and two classes of high word production responses.

Judges were given operational definitions for the three trained response classes and for the fourth fictitious response class. They were asked to study the definitions and then attempt to classify each counselor response by sorting the 3"x5" cards into four categories. Cards were randomly ordered, using a table of random numbers, prior to each classification by judges. Each judge conducted his task independently. To preserve independence of judges' evaluations further, neither judge knew the identity of the other judge until after all rating had been completed.

Since such a procedure does not eliminate the possibility of chance agreement between judges, a correction formula recommended by Scott (1955) was used to determine the level of inter-judge reliability corrected for chance agreement. The formula used was:

\[ P_i = \frac{P_o - P_e}{1 - P_e} \]

Where \( P_i \) represented inter-judge reliability; \( P_o \) represented percentage of observed agreement between judges; and \( P_e \) represented a correction term for chance agreement based upon the number of categories used.
The judges' ratings of the trained signaled counselor responses in the three interviews used in the study are reported in Table 3 along with inter-judge reliabilities:

**TABLE 3**

**AGREEMENT BETWEEN COUNSELOR RESPONSES AND JUDGES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RESPONSE VALIDITY</th>
<th>Inter-judge Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Judge 1</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge 2</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judge 3</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As was indicated earlier, seventeen interviews were conducted by the three counselors before three video-recorded interviews were obtained which met minimal counselor trained response criteria.

**Identification of Counselor Responses on Video-Recordings**

The first step in preparing the video-recordings for raters involved preparation of typescripts for each of the three interviews. One hundred and sixty counselor responses were selected from each interview for rating. Of this number, 24 were the trained responses which had been signaled by the counselors during the interview. The remaining 136 responses were selected by using a table of random numbers.
Once the statements to be rated had been selected, a numbering system to identify those responses had to be super-imposed upon the video-recording. This was accomplished by using the facilities of the Educational Media Department, School of Education, University of Massachusetts. By using a Conrac Special Effects Generator, two video sources were combined into one video output which was then video-recorded. One video source was the play-back of the counseling interview. The second source was a series of numbers in repeating cycles from 1 to 10. These numbers were projected upon a screen and a Conrac television camera was used to provide the video signal. The sequence of numbered slides could be advanced at the television control panel and super-imposed upon the video output. Using the interview typescript as a guide, the principal investigator superimposed the appropriate number for each of the selected counselor responses. The video output signal, which contained the interview recording and the numbering sequence, was then transcribed upon a one-inch Sony Video-corder.

**Interview Rating Procedures**

Raters who participated in the study were solicited from classes conducted in the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, and from the School of Education, University of Hartford. These classes represented the Science Education practice-teaching block, Education 009 and Education 039 observation blocks, Principles of Guidance, and the Techniques
of Counseling course of the University of Massachusetts. The University of Hartford raters were enrolled in undergraduate Educational Psychology, Principles of Guidance, Techniques of Counseling, and Administration of Guidance Services courses.

Raters, totaling 482 students, were divided into three groups and each group was assigned a different rating scale for use in viewing the video-recorded interviews. Of these raters, 171 used the Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes scale, 151 used the Respect or Positive Regard in Interpersonal Processes scale, and 160 were assigned the Counselor Appropriateness of Response scale.

Negation of Ordering Effects

To avoid the possibilities of ordering effects in the rating of the interviews, the three groups were sub-divided into smaller groups and the sequence of video-recorded interview viewings was varied for each group. Group 1, using the Empathy scale, was broken into six sub-groups. Group 2 which rated Positive Regard was distributed into five sub-groups, and Group 3, using the Appropriateness scale, was broken into six sub-groups.

This yielded a total of 17 sub-groups of raters. Table 4 describes the distribution of sub-groups and their viewing sequence of video-ratings.

Rater Orientation

Group ratings of the video-recorded interviews began the first week of February and were concluded the first week of April. Prior to the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-group</th>
<th>Viewing Sequence</th>
<th>Interview 1</th>
<th>Interview 2</th>
<th>Interview 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G-1</td>
<td>1 - 2 - 3</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-2</td>
<td>2 - 3 - 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-3</td>
<td>3 - 1 - 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-8</td>
<td>2 - 3 - 1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-12</td>
<td>1 - 2 - 3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-15</td>
<td>3 - 1 - 2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-4</td>
<td>1 - 2 - 3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-5</td>
<td>2 - 3 - 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-9</td>
<td>3 - 1 - 2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-11</td>
<td>1 - 2 - 3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-13</td>
<td>1 - 2 - 3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-6</td>
<td>1 - 2 - 3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-7</td>
<td>2 - 3 - 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-10</td>
<td>3 - 1 - 2</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-14</td>
<td>1 - 2 - 3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-16</td>
<td>2 - 3 - 1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-17</td>
<td>3 - 1 - 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
collection of data the principal investigator met with each sub-group and asked their cooperation in a study of counselor communication in the counseling process. It was explained that all data would be collected on time and that their task would be to view three video-recorded counseling sessions and rate 160 counselor responses which occurred in each interview. Five students in the total population to be sampled indicated that they did not wish to participate in the study. These students were excused from participation. The remainder of the students were asked to make every effort to attend each of the rating sessions.

Raters were not informed of the true nature of the study to prevent systematic bias in their ratings. They were told that at the conclusion of the study they would be informed in greater detail of the nature of the study.

**Rating Scales**

The scales used in the rating of counselor responses were five-point scales with Level 1 being the lowest level and Level 5 the highest level (see Appendix B). Two of the scales, Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes and Respect or Positive Regard in Interpersonal Processes, are "theory-bound" in the sense that they refer to constructs characteristic of several counseling theories (Fidldler, 1950b; 1951; Cartwright & Lerner, 1963). The third scale, Counselor Appropriateness of Response, avoids theoretical implication, thereby permitting comparison of factor structures between theoretical and non-theoretical constructs.
None of the three scales provides explicit examples of counselor statements for any of the five levels. As a result, users have to take general descriptions of the specific levels and interpret these in terms of overt counselor responses.

Rater Training

Rater training involved an introduction to and explanation of the rating scale to be used by each sub-group, and procedures for recording response ratings. A ten-minute video-recorded training tape was produced for each of the three rating scales, thus permitting standardization of training for each of the 17 sub-groups. Sub-groups viewed this training tape immediately prior to rating the interview recordings. The dialogue in each training tape was identical with exception of the section describing the rating scale (see Appendix C). Training did not include actual experience with counseling interviews. While a case may be built for such a training exercise to permit raters to become more familiar with counselor verbal behaviors characteristic of each level of the scale, a stronger case against such training existed as a result of the type of data analysis employed in the study. This position, in which factor analysis is used to analyze raw data, deals with the restriction of variability inherent in the population from which data is collected.

Above and beyond a general understanding of the meaning of the scale to be used, any efforts to standardize rating procedures in the use of the various levels of the scale in question may serve to establish a
"set" for raters which would decrease the amount of variability across ratings. The purpose of this study was not to decrease such variability or restrict it in any way. Rather, the study was concerned with perception of counselor communication with a minimum of contamination of that variability, thereby avoiding possible masking or systematic elimination of common factors inherent in the rating population.

**Rating Procedures**

All rating sessions were conducted in classrooms within the School of Education, University of Massachusetts, and University of Hartford.

**Physical Facilities**

Classrooms were arranged with student desks facing the front of the room. In the front of the room was a 23" video monitor on a 48" portable cart. The monitor was in the direct line of vision of all raters. To the side of the monitor was a portable Sony Video-corder which was used as the play-back unit. No other facilities were required.

**Rating Group Size**

Rating sub-groups varied in size from 18 to 50 (see Table 4). The mean for the 17 sub-groups was 28.3. Only one group (G-1) viewed and rated the three interviews at one sitting. Five groups (G-11; G-14; G-15; G-16; G-17) viewed the first two tapes at one sitting and viewed the third tape one week later. The remainder of the groups viewed one
tape per sitting over a time span of three weeks. As a result, there was an attrition rate within sub-groups which resulted in unequal totals of ratings over the three interviews. Two groups (G-12; G-13) viewed only two of the three interviews because of unforeseen class commitments.

Recording of Ratings

Following the viewing of the training tape, raters were asked if there were any questions about the scale or the method of recording ratings. Each rater had a copy of the rating scale, a pencil, and an Optical Scan Answer Sheet, Form DS 1120-C. They were asked to record the following information in the personal data section of the answer sheet: name, student number, grade, birth date, sex, and form of test. The answer sheet contained spaces for recording ratings for 160 items. Each item permitted rating levels from one to five, corresponding to the levels of the scale used. Once the rating process had begun, raters were not permitted to ask further questions. At the conclusion of the rating period, raters were asked to turn in their answer sheets and other materials and were dismissed.

Rater Orientation Following Study

In accordance with guidelines established by the American Psychological Association (1953) and the American Personnel and Guidance Association (1961) the principal investigator revisited each of the rating sub-groups at the conclusion of the study to describe the full nature of the investigation in which they participated.
Data Tabulation

Raw data from raters consisted of 160 ratings of counselor responses for each of three interviews. These ratings were recorded on a single answer sheet for each interview. A Digitek Optical Scanner was used to read the raw data and punch ratings into IBM data cards. Forty pieces of data were punched into each data card, yielding four data cards per respondent per interview.

Deletion of Items

After data had been collected the decision was made to delete ratings of ten counselor responses across all interviews. These items were from item 151 through item 160. This decision was made because there was much missing data in these final 10 items. The apparent reason for this missing data was that rating of many of the 48-minute interviews occurred in classes of only 50 minutes duration. Consequently, raters were preparing to depart during these final moments of the rating session and missed items to be rated. The elimination of these items included no trained counselor response for Tape 1 and Tape 2 and only one trained counselor response for Tape 3.

Analysis of Data

Raw data were analyzed using FACTAN, a computer program written by ESSO Corporation and modified by Mr. Larry Wightman, School of Education, University of Massachusetts. Computer facilities were provided
by a research grant from the Computing Research Center, University of Massachusetts. A Control Data Corporation 3600 computer was used in the analysis of data. Because the computer memory bank lacked the capacity to analyze each full set of data, two partial analyses were conducted on each data set. This required 18 analyses, one analysis of odd-numbered items and one analysis of even-numbered items, for each interview-rating scale combination. A pure factor analysis was performed on each of the nine sets of data with Verimax rotation set at 0.25 degrees.

**Treatment of Missing Data**

The pacing of counselor responses identified for rating permitted sufficient time for raters to record a rating for all responses. However, there were instances of missing data where raters failed to record a rating for a particular response. The computer program permitted an option whereby the mean rating across raters was supplied for any missing data. This option was used to supply scores when raters failed to record a rating for counselor responses.
CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Respondent ratings for each of the nine rating scale-counseling interview combinations were correlated. Two correlation matrices were obtained for each data set, a correlation of odd-numbered items and a correlation of even-numbered items. The eighteen resulting correlation matrices were subjected to a true factor analysis which was then rotated in an attempt to reduce the variables to the best simple structure. Finally, variables which loaded highly on each of the extracted factors for each analysis were identified and factors were labeled.

Method of Analysis

Variables

The variables identified for analysis were respondent ratings of 150 counselor responses on each of three counseling interviews. Respondent ratings had a numerical value ranging from a low of zero to a high of four for each rated response. Each respondent rating was punched into a set of four IBM cards, with variables 1 to 40 in card one, 41 to 80 in card two, 81 to 120 in card three, and 121 to 150 in card four.

Subjects

Subjects were divided into three rating groups, each group using a different type of rating scale. Table 5 presents the size of the rating
population on each rating scale for each of the three interview times.

TABLE 5
NUMBER AND ASSIGNMENT OF Raters
BY SCALE AND TAPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Empathy Scale</th>
<th>Positive Regard Scale</th>
<th>Appropriateness Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape #1</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape #2</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape #3</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of Factor Analysis

The type of factor analysis performed on the data is known as true factor analysis. The computer program, FACTAN, began by correlating each set of 75 variables, yielding a correlation matrix of dimension 75 by 75. The type of correlation used was a Pearson Product Moment correlation. From this initial correlation matrix, that variance which could be attributed to error and the variance which was unique to individual raters was extracted and discarded. This left a correlation matrix containing only that variance which was common across raters.

A true factor analysis was then performed on the correlation matrix with the communalities placed in the diagonals on successive iterations until communalities converged. The computer was instructed to extract eight factors in each of the analyses, with the exception of two analyses
on Tape #1 on the Empathy Scale. Seven and six factors respectively were extracted in the odd- and even-numbered analyses. The rationale for calling only eight factors in each analysis was based upon the diminishing amount of variance accounted for in successive factors beyond eight. For example, in the analysis of odd-numbered items on Tape #2, Empathy Scale, factors seven and eight accounted only for 2.73 and 2.57 percent of the Varimax Factor Variance, respectively. Secondly, this criterion conformed to that set by Zimmer and Anderson (1968) on which this study was based.

Finally, a procedure known as Varimax rotation was employed to approximate the best simple structure of factors yielded by the factor analyses. Rotation was set at 0.25 degrees.

**Number of Analyses**

The large number of variables and the complexity of the design prevented an over-all factor analysis of the data. The Research Computing Center, University of Massachusetts, has two CDC 3600 computers, each with a memory bank of 24,000 bits. The maximal capacity, by using both memory banks, was exceeded by the 150 variable program. Consequently, the method of analysis was to conduct two partial analyses of 75 variables for each of the nine conditions, a total of 18 factor analyses. The partial analyses amounted to one analysis of odd-numbered items (1-149) and one analysis of even-numbered items (2-150). Table 6 presents an illustration describing the 18 factor analyses which were performed.
TABLE 6
DATA SETS SUBJECTED TO FACTOR ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview</th>
<th>Empathy Scale</th>
<th>Positive Regard Scale</th>
<th>Appropriateness Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape #1</td>
<td>1. Odd-number Items</td>
<td>7. Odd-number Items</td>
<td>13. Odd-number Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Even-number Items</td>
<td>8. Even-number Items</td>
<td>14. Even-number Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape #2</td>
<td>3. Odd-number Items</td>
<td>9. Odd-number Items</td>
<td>15. Odd-number Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Even-number Items</td>
<td>10. Even-number Items</td>
<td>16. Even-number Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape #3</td>
<td>5. Odd-number Items</td>
<td>11. Odd-number Items</td>
<td>17. Odd-number Items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Even-number Items</td>
<td>12. Even-number Items</td>
<td>18. Even-number Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction of Factors

The resulting analyses yielded a Varimax factor matrix for each of the 18 data sets (see Appendix E). The Varimax factor matrix consists of factor loadings for each of the 75 variables for each factor extracted. Factor loadings vary in value from -1.0 to 1.0. They are correlation coefficients in that they show the correlation between a given variable and a given factor (Kerlinger, 1964, p. 654). The method used in the identification of those variables which were highly loaded with each of the extracted
factors was determined by the amount of variance represented in that factor. Generally speaking, only those variables which correlated higher than .5 with a given factor were included. However, as later factors were extracted in each data set, the amount of variance represented by these factors decreased and often there were no variables which loaded as highly as .5. In that event no variables were identified as descriptive of that factor unless the factor loadings of several variables were closely clustered in the range between .4 and .5 or between .3 and .4. No variables with a factor loading below .3 were considered descriptive of the factors.

Factor Variances

For each of the analyses, a table presents the Varimax factor variances, lambda values, and the amount of total variance accounted for by each extracted factor for odd- and even-numbered items. In those instances where more than eight factors were required for the lambda value to approach 1.0, the additional lambda values are presented. This table is followed by a table presenting a partial list of illustrative variables for each factor. Appendix D presents the 150 rated variables for each of the three interview tapes and Appendix F contains a complete listing of factors extracted in each analysis. Appendix E presents the Varimax factor matrices for each of the 18 analyses.

In the analysis of odd-numbered items for Tape #1 on the Empathy Scale, seven factors were extracted which accounted for 72.63 percent of
the total variance. In the analysis of even-numbered items, six factors accounted for 71.16 percent of the total variance. In both analyses, factor extraction was concluded short of eight factors because the value of lambda approached 1.0.

Identification of Descriptive Variables

The two Varimax factor matrices representing the odd- and even-numbered item analyses (Appendix E) for Tape #1 on the Empathy Scale were examined for factor loadings above .5. Those items which loaded higher than .5 on each factor were selected out for further analysis. Only Factor 7 on the odd-numbered analysis had no loadings as high as .5. Once the highly-loaded items had been identified, those responses corresponding to item numbers were printed out, using IBM cards containing those responses. This print-out was accomplished by hand-sorting responses and then printing them on an IBM 402 Accounting Machine. Responses which were trained and tagged by the counselor simultaneous to their production in the interview were identified by asterisks as follows:

* Ability Potential
** Interrogative Prod
*** Reflection-probe.

Descriptive Labeling of Factors

Print-outs of responses for each factor were then examined for grammatical and meaning elements common to all responses within the
### TABLE 7

**FACTOR VARIANCES, LAMBDA VALUES, AND PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE**

**EMPATHY SCALE - TAPE#1**

#### Odd-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.304</td>
<td>29.78</td>
<td>29.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.911</td>
<td>24.42</td>
<td>54.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.515</td>
<td>19.06</td>
<td>73.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.826</td>
<td>13.04</td>
<td>86.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.781</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>94.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.222</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>97.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.117</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Even-numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>12.216</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>28.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.822</td>
<td>27.30</td>
<td>55.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.116</td>
<td>18.74</td>
<td>74.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.754</td>
<td>10.98</td>
<td>85.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.451</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>93.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.942</td>
<td>6.80</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
factor and a descriptive subjective label assigned by the principal investigator. For example, in Table 8, Factor 1 was labeled a Reflection-probe type of response. This label was attached because Items 145, 129, and 95 fit the operational definition of a Reflection-probe response with a minor exception. That exception is that the first, or reflection condition is assumed rather than verbalized. Items 99 and 149 not only fit the definition of a Reflection-probe but are tagged by the counselor as being Reflection-probe responses. Thus, the determination of the subjective label was based upon the grammatical structure similarities, similarities in terms of content, both cognitive and affective, and in some cases, proximity of responses in the counseling interview. Where items were widely distributed throughout the interview, grammatical structure and meaning were the important criteria. If, on the other hand, highly-loaded responses were in close proximity, i.e. items 96, 98, 100, 102, 106, then the topic during that series of responses was examined.

### TABLE 8

**ILLUSTRATIVE VARIABLES**  
**EMPATHY SCALE: COUNSELING TAPE #1**  
**Odd-Numbered Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor 1: Reflection-Probe Response</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.720 145 I don't know if you were wrong. You felt that way, you felt like I'm not going to stay here and be wrong. You, I don't know if your feelings could be wrong.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>***.675 99 And yet you say you have a situation like that, its very easy to think about her and you be somebody other than you'd like to be but right here you think about her, you're still yourself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
But whereas, you're awfully afraid of having friends of the opposite sex.

I see, and so college is different.

I still find it pretty difficult to believe. You keep saying you find it difficult to get along with people like this, and right here you're getting along very well.

**Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli**

Yeah, um-hum.

Um-hum.

Which one?

Um-hum.

Um-hum.

**Factor 3: Interrogation-passive understanding**

Um, whereas in college, what happened?

I see, very good.

How do you feel about your ability to do it?

Um-hum.

So there is a uh ray of light there somewhere.

**Factor 4: Interrogative Prod (social-centered)**

Do you feel that that the necking part of a date is always a part of it, you, you, there's no way to get around it?

What is there about a date?

I see.

How do you feel about people that you know that's middle class people going to college, not this other group you've talked about?
- .527  77  Find it kind of hard to break that habit of saying no, I don't want to go out on a date?

**Factor 5: Ability Potential**

* .634  45  You could have gone back to him five times.

.555  43  Oh, yes, I'll have to agree with you, he was wrong. There was no reason for him to do that.

.498  49  Do you like others to be mad?

.491  47  But you could get mad.

**Factor 6:**

No interpretable factor

**Factor 7**

No interpretable factor

**Even-numbered Items**

**Factor 1: Interrogative Prod (social-centered)**

.771  146  There's another way that you might try handling something, cause when you leave like that automatically what you are doing, you're saying I don't want to talk to you any more, even though I'm sure you do.

* .702  144  Uh, would you be able to handle the situation?

.699  136  There are a lot of girls that don't necessarily go parking or or if they do go parking, they don't go out of their way for trouble. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).

.696  150  But you were out with a guy. I'm a guy.

**.678  142  What are some of the possible reactions he probably would have?**
**Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli**

| .745  | 58  | Um-hum.       |
| .728  | 130 | Um-hum, um-hum. |
| .715  | 86  | Um-hum.       |
| .701  | 70  | Um-hum.       |
| .683  | 80  | Um-hum.       |

**Factor 3: Unstructured Invitation**

| .729  | 14  | And this is your major. |
| *-.651 | 22  | I see, so you can do it. |
| -.644 | 16  | Did you have a good phys. ed. program in your high school? |
| **-.628 | 10  | Well, what do you feel you should do about it? |
| -.592 | 26  | You don't feel good about that. What he's saying is right then. You do want to get away. |

**Factor 4: Reflection-probe**

| .587  | 60  | Yet you must be concerned to some degree just to mention it. |
| .527  | 44  | But why do you feel uncomfortable? He was wrong. |
| .525  | 42  | Um-hum, but you feel uncomfortable and yet he's wrong. |
| ****.469 | 68  | You know, you say you don't know what to talk about on a date, but right here is one person. |

**Factor 5: Interpretation-understanding (of problems with roommate)**

| .565  | 116 | You don't trust the situation very much either. |
| .466  | 120 | I see, so it wasn't a very long time before she started showing her colors then. |
| * .436 | 114 | You can't live with somebody that's that feels this way so strongly about other people. |
And you feel that there's bound to be something more than meets the eye here.

Sounds to me that you feel you made it through high school on personality rather than, you know, sitting down...

Factor 6: Interpretation-understanding (of problems socially)

Um, um.

And it's hard when you don't go out and talk, be outgoing.

There nobody knows of your sister.

Um-hum.

A complete list of all variables which were subjected to rating and analysis on each interview is included in Appendix D. Tables 9 through 24 describe the remaining eight analyses of the study.

TABLE 9

FACTOR VARIANCES, LAMBDA VALUES, AND PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE EMPATHY SCALE - TAPE #2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variances</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.969</td>
<td>27.05</td>
<td>27.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.585</td>
<td>28.44</td>
<td>55.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.512</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>65.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.290</td>
<td>18.74</td>
<td>84.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.365</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>89.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.182</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>94.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.206</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>94.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9 (cont'd)  Even-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.526</td>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>12.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.247</td>
<td>11.82</td>
<td>24.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.126</td>
<td>25.07</td>
<td>49.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>11.63</td>
<td>60.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.350</td>
<td>7.55</td>
<td>68.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.608</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>87.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.447</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>91.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.917</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 10

ILLUSTRATIVE VARIABLES
EMPATHY SCALE: COUNSELING TAPE NUMBER 2

Factor 1: Reflection-Probe

*** .722 139  So, in a big place it could be a little frightening because you don't know all the dimensions, it might be possible to find, uh, like UMass, it might be possible to find another individual, like in this situation, be it a counselor or colleague, you could, could talk with.

.696 137  I thought toward the middle you were more relaxed than you have been for the last, maybe, seven minutes.

.645 127  And yet, talking now, I get the feeling of ambivalence, uh security but a little little anxious, I, is that correct?

.644 141  But not much help about sociology.

.692 125  Yet you can accept the fact that the oppositeness...
Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli

- .767 37  Um-hum.
- .723 33  Um-hum.
- .701 77  Um-hum.
- .699 47  Um-hum.
- .691 15  Um-hum.

Factor 3: Unstructured Invitation

- .729 3  Do you have any questions?
- .632 7  Back to Aurora.
- .564 1  Well, basically this involves you and I just sitting down and chatting for about forty-five minutes. You can talk about anything you'd like.

***-.561 11  So even though you say you feel uncomfortable in a large setting, you didn't feel uncomfortable uh say coming down here today or traveling out to Aurora or doing things of this type.

- .519 19  So you did enjoy Aurora.

Factor 4: Restating and Understanding (passive acceptance)

.588 65  Difficult to concentrate.
.578 43  You have to psych him out a little bit.
.576 51  In social work.
.565 93  Living on campus is a unique experience.
.560 55  Right.

Factor 5: Reflection-probe

*** .577 41  You seem like you'd uh have some hesitancy about a big school, yet now you now you seem to ve very relaxed and happy and this is a big school.
Um-hum. And sociology you think would give you the opportunity to prepare to do something constructive you thought.

Factor 6:

No interpretable factor.

Factor 7:

No interpretable factor.

Factor 8: Ability Potential (learning-related)

* .346  63  And you can get the marks.

.328  79  You learn with social activities as well.

Even-Numbered Items

Factor 1: Interpretation-Understanding (passive acceptance)

.623  92  Have you found that going to college has helped you to be able to do this more so than high school?

.620  86  Involvement leads to security.

.578  90  Then it's better to be with one, two, or three people you know well than than with a lot of people you don't know at all.

.543  94  But there should be some security in living at home.

.512  88  Different people find security in different ways.

Factor 2: Interrogative Prod (rapport-building)

-.770  10  How long have you been in the East?

**-.744  12  Why did you decide on Aurora?

-.597  2  So if we begin now, we'd be through by eleven-thirty.

-.582  6  Um-hum.

-.552  8  The uh the bigger environment's frightening.
Factor 3: Minimal Social Stimuli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.769</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.719</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.709</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.682</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 4: Restating and Understanding (passive acceptance)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.692</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Knowing there was some security in terms of...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.671</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Having a friend made it easier to go to....</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.524</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>You'd rather not try out a big one.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.499</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>And if you're working within a section...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 5: Unstructured Invitation (related to college)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.599</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Parents like the idea of Aurora as well as you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.510</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Your friend's in sociology.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>-0.460</strong></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Yet if you didn't trans-back uh transfer back to Aurora, uh, where would you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-0.458</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>You could find, you could find your place in the social scheme of things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*-0.450</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>And you feel you can succeed and be happy in sociology.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 6: Ability Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* 0.687</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>You can relax though in new situations with uh new people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.677</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>Perhaps knowing the security of Greenfield Community College uh is there and makes it possible to come down here and...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.651</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>So to be helpful then a person should know not only some information about the alternatives that are available to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
make a decision on but should know about the person making the decision.

.633 148 Like Northfield.

.607 146 The small town and the suburb gives more personal...

Factor 7: Interpretation-understanding (cognitive)

.355 4 You know, sometimes it's hard to figure out what to talk about right like that.

.348 44 So it's more important that you know what he wants than you know what you want.

.345 126 You mentioned that you find security as, you know, part of a whole and you mentioned a whole as usually as small a small group and uh yet if you talk about knowing people and knowing them well, as I hear you talking now, it might not be that you'd find security in the same school that he was in.

**.306 40 Yet if you didn't trans-back uh transfer back to Aurora, uh where would you?

Factor 8: Interpretation and clarification

.460 74 And you are learning too when you get the grades in order.

.459 144 Yet big cities don't seem to worry you too much.

.433 80 Like talking to roommates, uh being with...

.419 70 Everybody

**.396 64 What do you feel is your major difficulty of major trouble in college?
TABLE 11  
FACTOR VARIANCES, LAMBDA VALUES, AND PERCENT  
OF TOTAL VARIANCE  
EMPATHY SCALE - TAPE #3

Odd-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variance</th>
<th>Variances Per Cent Cumulative % Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.807</td>
<td>32.76 32.76</td>
<td>35.496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15.092</td>
<td>31.28 64.04</td>
<td>4.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.257</td>
<td>10.90 74.94</td>
<td>2.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.452</td>
<td>7.16 82.09</td>
<td>1.521</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.267</td>
<td>6.77 88.87</td>
<td>1.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.532</td>
<td>5.25 94.11</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.803</td>
<td>3.74 97.85</td>
<td>1.018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.036</td>
<td>2.15 100.00</td>
<td>.909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even-numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variance</th>
<th>Variances Per Cent Cumulative % Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.427</td>
<td>27.87 27.87</td>
<td>35.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.675</td>
<td>13.85 41.72</td>
<td>3.929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15.954</td>
<td>33.11 74.83</td>
<td>3.371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>8.65 83.48</td>
<td>1.547</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.130</td>
<td>2.35 85.83</td>
<td>1.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>2.45 88.28</td>
<td>1.055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.220</td>
<td>2.53 90.81</td>
<td>1.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.427</td>
<td>9.19 100.00</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 12

**ILLUSTRATIVE VARIABLES**  
**EMPATHY SCALE: COUNSELING TAPE NUMBER 3**

#### Odd-Numbered Items

**Factor 1: Minimum Social Stimuli**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.803</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.774</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.747</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>.746</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 2: Reflection-Probe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td><strong>.723</strong></td>
<td>Um-hum, yeah, well you uh you say you uh you have these small talks with yourself, you you're not really worried about it, or you don't seem worried about it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>.700</td>
<td>Well, when you go on these trips, do you talk to yourself?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.694</td>
<td>Um-hum. That's good. You really look for excitement then.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td><strong>.685</strong></td>
<td>Well, you could uh take some uh easy courses to restore your confidence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td><strong>.668</strong></td>
<td>You can uh you can take a trip by airplane as opposed to car where you can travel by some other means, you know, take long trips.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 3: Active Agreement (rapport-building)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Correlation</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>-.659</td>
<td>Yeah, that's right, it's the most enjoyable too, probably.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-.629</td>
<td>One choice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-.546</td>
<td>Yeah, did you learn the language while you were there?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Yeah.

**-.534 1 What's uh, what's the next move, where's the next place?

Factor 4: Interrogative Prod

***-.618 77 You said that uh you uh really enjoyed the uh German class last year, and yet uh you uh say here that you skipped it quite a bit.

-.526 85 Do you find you have to combat this kind of thing uh when people are a bit critical of women in service quite often?

-.512 81 Oh yeah.

**-.499 87 Why uh why was this that you didn't tell them?

Factor 5: Active Agreement (in area of plans for travel)

-.591 61 Where have you planned on going, where is...

-.499 65 Oh great. That's a rather adventuresome spirit.

-.451 59 Yeah.

-.429 67 Um-hum.

Factor 6:

No interpretable factor.

Factor 7:

No interpretable factor.

Factor 8:

No interpretable factor.

Even-Numbered Items

Factor 1: Active Agreement

.771 136 Yeah, you you think out loud?

.723 140 Um-hum.
Yeah.

Yeah.

The challenge?

**Factor 2: Reflection-probe (session-centered)**

- **.684** 78 The second semester.

***-.677** 90 You seem to uh, you know, to have these little white lies or whatever you call them, yet you also see uh the need for a real basic honesty too.

***-.623** 28 Um, you seem to have a real broad interest yet you're saying here that you want to zero in on German.

***-.584** 44 Yeah, you seem to have a real interest in German, yet you uh you attitudes, the way you talk here, it seems to have deteriorated a little bit.

-.563 36 Um-hum. What do you what do you think of this? Your having been in Germany and knowing the value possible of reading the language, speaking the language, the grammar of the language, do you think this is good or bad?

**Factor 3: Minimal Social Stimuli**

.786 46 Um-hum.

.785 32 Um-hum.

.725 24 Um-hum.

.707 22 Um-hum.

.698 42 Oh, I see.

**Factor 4: Assertive Reacting**

.647 62 Oh I see, you just take off.

.593 70 That's a good education, going to all these places.
That's great.

Factor 5: Interrogative Prod

**-.392 122 What other types of adventuresome type things do you do?

-.341 124 Do you go on these walks like you do the uh, you know, traveling places in your car and so on?

Factor 6: Minimal Social Stimuli

.362 82 Um-hum.

.360 86 Um-hum.

* .307 88 Oh, I see. Well, you could always tell them that you've traveled abroad, approach it from that point-of-view.

Factor 7: No interpretable factor.

Factor 8: Ability Potential

.664 10 Well then, you can take your German and go back to Germany and you'll put them back on your kind of course work at Greenfield. You have taken German there.

* .588 4 You could go back and uh learn the language.

.552 16 Um-hum.

.530 18 And you finish up soon.
TABLE 13
FACTOR VARIANCES, LAMBDA VALUES, AND PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE
POSITIVE REGARD SCALE - TAPE #1

Odd-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variance</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.419</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td>23.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.435</td>
<td>15.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.244</td>
<td>25.38</td>
<td>48.71</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.356</td>
<td>32.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.090</td>
<td>15.09</td>
<td>63.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.261</td>
<td>42.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.060</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>76.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.869</td>
<td>51.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.472</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>79.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.681</td>
<td>53.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.145</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>87.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.403</td>
<td>58.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.257</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>95.84</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.234</td>
<td>64.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.678</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>67.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Factor not extracted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.105</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variance</th>
<th>Variances</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.897</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.406</td>
<td>14.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.948</td>
<td>10.07</td>
<td>32.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.298</td>
<td>21.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.981</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>53.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.963</td>
<td>34.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.705</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>57.47</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>37.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.347</td>
<td>13.64</td>
<td>71.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>46.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.624</td>
<td>16.90</td>
<td>88.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.469</td>
<td>56.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.915</td>
<td>7.44</td>
<td>95.44</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>61.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.787</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.167</td>
<td>64.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 14

ILLUSTRATIVE VARIABLES
POSITIVE REGARD SCALE: TAPE #1

Odd-Numbered Items

| Factor 1: Reflection-probe (of problems of personal identification) |
|---------|-----------------------------|
| 0.739  | 99  | And yet you say you have a situation like that, it's very easy to think about her and you be somebody other than you'd like to be but right here you think about her, you're still yourself. |
| 0.686  | 129 | But whereas, you're awfully afraid of having friends of the opposite sex. |
| 0.670  | 91  | Um, uh good, do you feel that you have to be that much more sensitive, more secure to keep people away from so that you can make sure that nobody associates with your sister? |
| 0.668  | 145 | I don't know if you were wrong, you felt that way, you felt like I'm not going to stay here and be wrong, you I don't know if your feelings could be wrong. |
| 0.646  | 93  | You have to have people know that you're you. |

| Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli |
|---------|-----------------------------|
| 0.751  | 121 | Yeah, um-hum. |
| 0.741  | 103 | Um-hum. |
| 0.737  | 35  | Um-hum. |
| 0.729  | 131 | Um-hum. |
| 0.716  | 79  | Um-hum. |

| Factor 3: Ability Potential (relating to others) |
|---------|-----------------------------|
| -0.730 | 49  | Do you like others to be mad? |
| -0.626 | 59  | Um-hum, are you concerned about it? |
Um, so that she may not be getting along very well with her family, this might be something you'd be concerned about.

They were all mad.

You could have gone back to him five times.

Factor 4: Interrogation-passive understanding

How are you doing at this point?

I see, very good.

Um-hum.

Um-hum, you find that's hurting your, the college level.

Factor 5: Minimal Interrogation

No shoes.

Which one?

Is that good?

Factor 6: Interrogative prod (relating to dating)

He might have said that. Let's assume he did say something like that.

And what if if you'd stayed there?

Well, how do you feel about it?

Factor 7: Interrogative Prod:

Do you feel that that the necking part of a date is always a part of it, you you there's no way to get around it?

How do you feel about people that you know that's middle class people going to college, not this other group you've talked about?
.487 77 Find it kind of hard to break that habit of saying, no I don't want to go out on a date?

.462 71 Sounds like, like you were embarrassed to be in a situation like that.

.412 119 I see. When did you first find this thing out (garbled)?

**Factor 8:**

No determinable factor extracted.

**Even-Numbered Items**

**Factor 1: Interpretation and Advising (of social problems)**

.704 128 She's got a problem where she's got friends but they're the wrong sex.

.692 146 There's another way that you might try handling something, cause when you leave like that automatically what you are doing, you're saying I don't want to talk to you any more, even though I'm sure you do.

.638 148 Um-hum, that way maybe, in the future if you run into situations like this, well what should I do, maybe I should think about it ahead of time. Maybe uh there's a way I could have handled things differently without sacrificing how I feel and still come out with some kind of a relationship along these lines.

.624 150 But you were out with a guy. I'm a guy.

.592 94 And it's hard when you don't go out and talk, be outgoing.

**Factor 2: Interrogative prod**

-.469 106 Do you find this is hard to live in the city after you lived in the country?

-.460 122 And you feel that there's bound to be something more than meets the eye here.

-.455 6 Oh, it's just the money aspect then.

*-.441 2 Can you do it financially?
And yet, does this happen with all the other people up there or just you?

Factor 3: Minimal Social Stimuli

| .725 | 80 | Um-hum. |
| .714 | 126 | Yeah.   |
| .709 | 138 | Um-hum. |
| .696 | 58  | Um-hum. |
| .688 | 86  | Um-hum. |

Factor 4:

No determinable factor extracted.

Factor 5: Interrogative prod (rapport building)

| .598 | 14  | And this is your major. |
| .583 | 30  | Do you have any idea what it is that you fear? |
| .561 | 16  | Did you have a good phys. ed. program in your high school? |

**- .515 | 10  | Well, what do you feel you should do about it? |

Factor 6: Unstructured invitation

| .694 | 48  | You like others. |

***- .623 | 68  | You know, you say you don't know what to talk about on a date, but right here is one person. |

*- .564 | 82  | Um, um, you can't do things like that. |

| .559 | 56  | Just you? |

| .538 | 10  | Well, what do you feel you should do about it? |

Factor 7: Interrogative prod (affective)

| .543 | 40  | What is it about y-your feelings to avoid? Why do you choose to avoid rather than to? |
How do you feel? How do you feel right now?

Factor 8: Assertive reacting

There are a lot of girls that don't necessarily go parking or if they do go parking they don't go out of their way for trouble. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).

And you feel that there's bound to be something more than meets the eye here.

You know, it seems that there's always somebody in everyone of our lives that are always going to make us feel uncomfortable.

She might, yeah.
TABLE 15

FACTOR VARIANCES, LAMBDA VALUES, AND PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE

POSITIVE REGARD SCALE: TAPE #2

Odd-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.860</td>
<td>20.310</td>
<td>16.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.920</td>
<td>5.665</td>
<td>32.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.649</td>
<td>2.684</td>
<td>42.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.238</td>
<td>2.045</td>
<td>49.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>1.589</td>
<td>52.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.542</td>
<td>1.526</td>
<td>54.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>1.323</td>
<td>57.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.895</td>
<td>1.236</td>
<td>60.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Factor not extracted</td>
<td>1.143</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Factor not extracted</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10.455</td>
<td>21.424</td>
<td>17.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.295</td>
<td>4.955</td>
<td>32.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.334</td>
<td>2.932</td>
<td>41.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.824</td>
<td>2.189</td>
<td>49.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.685</td>
<td>1.789</td>
<td>53.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.824</td>
<td>1.650</td>
<td>57.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.554</td>
<td>1.485</td>
<td>59.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>1.256</td>
<td>62.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Factor not extracted</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Factor not extracted</td>
<td>1.075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Factor not extracted</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 16**

**ILLUSTRATIVE VARIABLES**

**POSITIVE REGARD SCALE: TAPE #2**

**Odd-Numbered Items**

**Factor 1: Reflection-Probe**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Then you can build, then you feel safe and venture out and doing different things.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.640</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>And this makes it safe to go out and explore a little bit.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.640</td>
<td>149</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>It's difficult to find security by yourself, though.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.638</td>
<td>89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>And just talking with a person, you feel sometimes, it's difficult to get to know them as well as if...</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.634</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Um-hum.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.740</td>
<td>133</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Um-hum.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.739</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Um-hum.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.714</td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Um-hum.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.704</td>
<td>107</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Um-hum.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.700</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 3: Active Interpretation - Passive Understanding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>You had a little reconnaissance on the place before you even went in.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.587</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>So you did enjoy Aurora.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.575</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Before you start majoring.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.563</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Um-hum, and sociology you think would give you the opportunity to prepare to do something constructive you thought.

You have to psych. him out a little bit.

And you found some teachers at Aurora that were helpful.

Factor 4: Interrogative Prod

How would you feel about say attending UMass if that would be the best decision?

You learn with social activities as well.

I was wondering, how would you use sociology if you if you majored in it?

Factor 5:

No interpretable factor.

Factor 6:

No interpretable factor.

Factor 7: Passive understanding-active interpretation.

Does he really? And you'd feel uncomfortable at UMass.

Yeah.

Um-hum.

Um-hum.

But not much help about sociology.

Factor 8:

No interpretable factor.
Factor 1: Ability Potential

Even-Numbered Items

Factor 1: Ability Potential

.680 90 Then its better to be with one, two or three people you know well than with a lot of people you don't know at all.

.680 150 Perhaps knowing the security of Greenfield Community College uh is there and makes it possible to come down here and...

.644 88 Different people find security in different ways.

* .644 138 You can relax though in new situations with uh new people.

Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli

-.808 116 Um-hum.

-.750 76 Um-hum.

-.707 120 Um-hum.

-.706 108 Um-hum.

-.690 56 Um-hum.

Factor 3: Restating and Understanding (passive acceptance)

.589 28 Your friend's in sociology.

.567 26 The lonely crowd concept.

.567 30 You'd rather not try out a big one.

.552 16 Having a friend made it easier to go to...

.540 20 And yet you came back to Greenfield.

Factor 4: Interrogative Prod

.631 78 You learn with social activities too?

.626 80 Like talking to roommates, uh being with...
Have you found that going to college has helped you to be able to do this more so than high school?

Yet if you didn't trans- back uh transfer back to Aurora, uh where would you?

Factor 5: Unstructured Invitation (rapport-building)

You know, sometimes it's hard to figure out what to talk about right like that.

So if we begin now, we'd be through by eleven-thirty.

Factor 6:

No interpretable factor.

Factor 7:

No interpretable factor.

Factor 8: Interrogative Prod

How long have you been in the East?

Have you found that to be true?

You don't think you'd be known at UMass?

So to be helpful then a person should know not only some information about the alternatives that are available to make a decision on but should know about the person making the decision.

Um-hum.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.168</td>
<td>39.63</td>
<td>39.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.425</td>
<td>24.06</td>
<td>63.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.330</td>
<td>9.99</td>
<td>73.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.135</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>83.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.480</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>88.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.628</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>92.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>96.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.553</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Even-numbered Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.697</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>15.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.763</td>
<td>13.59</td>
<td>29.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.619</td>
<td>13.25</td>
<td>42.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.785</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>58.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.506</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>64.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.074</td>
<td>9.61</td>
<td>74.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.625</td>
<td>22.69</td>
<td>96.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.340</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 18

ILLUSTRATIVE VARIABLES
POSITIVE REGARD SCALE: TAPE #3

Odd-Numbered Items

Factor 1: Minimal Social Stimuli

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.775</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.758</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.747</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.724</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.711</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor 2: Reflection-probe

***.773 133 Um-hum, yeah, well you uh you say you uh you have these small talks with yourself, you you're not really worried about it, or you don't seem worried about it.

.687 119 Well you seem to have the, you know, this idea for the braoder concept you know, of honesty, and so on, and yet within that little narrow one you you take uh what mileage you can, is that right?

.672 97 That's uh that's interesting, course indeed there's only one type of person that you you do that to.

* .660 121 Oh, I see. You could, you can see the real value then in uh, you know, even after the fact making sure that they know what you are.

.659 135 What kind of answer are you looking for?

Factor 3: Active Agreement (rapport-building)

.666 3 Yeah, did you learn the language while you were there?

.628 11 What possibility is there in the Air Force?

.572 9 Yeah, that's right, it's the most enjoyable too probably.
** .541 1 What's uh, what's the next move? Where's the next place?

.526 5 One choice.

**Factor 4: Ability Potential**

* .680 29 You could uh, you could always teach German.

.638 33 Yeah, well you can teach it among friends.

.634 15 Um-hum, well you you could work for a few years and then take off again.

* .616 145 Well, you could uh take some uh easy courses to re-store your confidence.

* .465 105 You can uh you can take a trip by airplane as opposed to car where you can travel by some other means, you know, take long trips.

**Factor 5: Active Agreement (in area of plans for travel)**

.608 61 Where have you planned on going, where is...

.465 65 Oh, great. That's a rather adventuresome spirit.

.431 103 Um-hum, how uh how, you know, what's the longest journey you would take in an instance like that?

.409 63 Oh, good.

Factor 6: Unstructured Invitation

-.462 93 Um-hum.

-.326 7 Um-hum.

-.303 31 Do you feel you have the background to say, teach high school? Is this the age you're interested in?

-.301 5 One choice.

**Factor 7: Interrogative Prod**

.455 113 Why do you say that?
** .409  73  How was the outcome?  Did they uh did they let you go?
** .355  87  Why uh why was this that you didn't tell them?
   .347  25  Um-hum.
** .333  47  Well, what uh what have you done uh outside of class
to uh, you know, so you can increase this knowledge of
of German?

**Factor 3:**

No interpretable factor.

**Even-Numbered Items**

**Factor 1: Minimal Social Stimuli**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.671</td>
<td>76  Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.657</td>
<td>46  Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.620</td>
<td>80  Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.602</td>
<td>72  Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.541</td>
<td>64  Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor 2: Unstructured Invitation**

*** .714  146  You you you say you're uh you're uh you have a kind of
bad attitude toward it, yet the way it comes across to
me you seem to really enjoy it by saying that you like
to do fractions and so on.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| .644  | 124  Do you go on these walks like you do the uh, you know,
traveling places in your car and so on? |
| .587  | 120  For the sake of adventure or... |
| .583  | 130  Or or just on the walks or when? |
| .544  | 136  Yeah, you you think out loud? |
Factor 3: Ability Potential

*-.706  54  You could apply for some kind of a scholarship.
*-.638  68  Uh, you could travel around on your vacation.
-.608  78  The second sem- semester.
-.605  50  You could listen to these.
***-.576  28  Um, you seem to have a real broad interest yet you're saying here that you want to zero in on German.

Factor 4: Minimal Social Stimuli

.692  32  Um-hum.
.672  16  Um-hum.
.643  24  Um-hum.
.619  38  Yeah.
.594  8  Um-hum.

Factor 5: Passive Understanding-Active Interpretation

-.524  26  Yeah.
-.434  98  Oh, I see.
-.433  70  That's a good education, going to all these places.
-.425  40  Oh, that's right, you've just had finals, haven't you.

Factor 6: Assertive Reacting

-.666  66  That's great.
-.520  62  Oh I see, you just take off.
-.514  58  Is that what you really want to do down deep, deeply?

Factor 7: Minimal Social Stimuli

-.798  148  Um-hum (garbled).
Yeah.

That's right, that's right.

Um-hum.

Um-hum.

Factor 8: Reflection-probe

*** .319 6 Um-hum, yeah, you uh say you want to learn German, yet you also in the same sentence seem to say you regret having not learned German.

*** .410 90 You see you seem to uh, you know, to have these little white lies or whatever you call them, yet you also see the need for a real basic honesty, too.

TABLE 19

FACTOR VARIANCES, LAMBDA VALUES, AND PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE

APPROPRIATE RESPONSE SCALE - TAPE #1

Odd-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% 0 Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.809</td>
<td>33.98</td>
<td>33.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.466</td>
<td>28.21</td>
<td>62.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.168</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>74.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.090</td>
<td>10.06</td>
<td>84.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>89.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.537</td>
<td>3.378</td>
<td>92.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.377</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>96.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.525</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Even-Numbered Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variance</th>
<th>Variance Per Cent</th>
<th>Variance Cumulative %</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.066</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td>27.83</td>
<td>25.716</td>
<td>18.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.130</td>
<td>27.99</td>
<td>55.82</td>
<td>4.903</td>
<td>36.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.998</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>63.36</td>
<td>2.285</td>
<td>41.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.230</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>71.48</td>
<td>1.683</td>
<td>47.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.742</td>
<td>14.44</td>
<td>85.82</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td>56.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.087</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>91.17</td>
<td>1.369</td>
<td>60.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.697</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>95.44</td>
<td>1.263</td>
<td>63.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.813</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.051</td>
<td>66.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 20**

**ILLUSTRATIVE VARIABLES**

**APPROPRIATE RESPONSE SCALE: TAPE #1**

**Odd-Numbered Items**

**Factor 1: Reflection-probe**

- **.703 145** I don't know if you were wrong, you felt that way, you felt like I'm not going to stay here and be wrong, you, I don't know if your feelings could be wrong.

- **.701 127** Whereas, you feel that your problem is a little different than her problem.

- **.695 129** But whereas, you're awfully afraid of having friends in the opposite sex.
You're firmly committed to tell them to forget it, right?

I wonder if other things can become as easy as this after a while.

Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli

- .811 125 Um-hum.
- .787 13 Um-hum.
- .775 131 Um-hum.
- .763 121 Yeah, um-hum.
- .748 81 Um-hum.

Factor 3: Interrogation-passive understanding

.629 19 How do you feel about your ability to do it?

** .607 23 How are you doing at this point?

.587 25 How is it so different?

.575 29 That's important. You don't agree with the sociology teacher.

.516 21 The teachers felt uh you don't give me any problem I'll pass you on, is this the idea?

Factor 4: Ability Potential

* .639 45 You could have gone back to him five times.

.606 49 Do you like others to be mad?

.554 43 Oh yes, I'll have to agree with you he was wrong. There was no reason for him to do that.

Factor 5:

No interpretable factor.
Factor 6: Unstructured Invitation

.476 109 Yet some people some people are able to do both in college.

.441 113 You wouldn't have done, you think it was overdone.

.369 105 No shoes.

*** .306 123 Um-hum, I see, well you're from a big family too and yet in this situation you act completely different.

Factor 7:

No interpretable factor.

Factor 8: Interrogative Prod (related to interpersonal relations)

.450 85 Um-hum. It seems as if it would be very hard, I I can't.

.400 91 Um, uh good, do you feel that you have to be that much more sensitive, more secure to keep people away from so that you make sure that nobody associates with your sister?

** .363 83 How do you feel about people that you know that's middle class people going to college, not this other group you've talked about?

Even-Numbered Items

Factor 1: Interrogative Prod (social-centered)

.705 146 There's another way that you might try handling something, cause when you leave like that automatically what are you doing, you're saying I don't want to talk to you any more, even though I'm sure you do.

** .701 142 What are some of the possible reactions he probably would have?

* .696 144 Uh, would you be able to handle the situation?
.683 148 Um-hum, that way maybe, in the future if you run into situations like this, well what should I do, maybe I should think about it ahead of time. Maybe uh there's a way I could have handled things differently without sacrificing how I feel and still come out with some kind of a relationship along these lines.

.667 136 There are a lot of girls that don't necessarily go parking or or if they do go parking they don't go out of their way for trouble. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).

Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli

.847 126 Yeah.

.804 86 Um-hum.

.786 80 Um-hum.

.779 138 Um-hum.

.754 90 Um-hum.

Factor 3: Interpretation-understanding

-.645 48 You like others.

***-.494 46 You say you get mad sometimes and yet I don't see you getting mad here.

-.465 52 Some people some people could overlook it. Did some kids?

-.451 4 You're too close.

-.433 54 Yeah I guess I'd have to be. I guess that's true, come to think of it.

Factor 4: Interrogative Prod (cognitive)

-.611 106 Do you find this is hard to live in the city after you lived in the country?

-.482 16 Did you have a good phys. ed. program in your high school?
Um-hum, and what do you do?

Um-hum, does he go out and does he tell you here you do this?

Are there a lot of girls that don't necessarily go parking or or if they do go parking they don't necessarily go out of their way for trouble, yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).

**Factor 5: Interpretation-understanding (of problems related to school)**

*-.642 22 I see, so you can do it.

-.569 20 Sounds to me that you feel you made it through high school more on personality than you know, sitting down.

**-.539 40 What is it about y- your feelings to avoid? Why do you choose to avoid rather than to...

-.526 38 You know, it seems that there's always somebody in every one of our lives that are always going to make us feel uncomfortable.

-.501 42 Um-hum, but you feel uncomfortable and yet he's wrong.

**Factor 6: Ability Potential**

* .485 2 Can you do it financially?

* .436 82 Um, um, you can't do things like that.

.425 30 Do you have any idea what it is that you fear?

**Factor 7: Unstructured Invitation**

.448 6 Oh it's just the money aspect.

.411 26 You don't feel good about that. What he's saying is right then, you do want to get away.

.384 14 And this is your major.
Factor 8: Active Agreement

.444 34 Yeah, so you think a person may have problems it might help to talk about them.

.372 54 Yeah, I guess I'd have to be. I guess that's true, come to think of it.

.357 58 Um-hum.

.331 84 Um-hum.

.311 98 If you could only be yourself on a date without thinking of her.

---

TABLE 21

FACTOR VARIANCES, LAMBDA VALUES, AND PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE

APPROPRIATE RESPONSE SCALE - TAPE #2

Odd-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.547</td>
<td>25.72</td>
<td>25.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14.572</td>
<td>32.46</td>
<td>58.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.326</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>78.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>86.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.342</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>91.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.248</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>94.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.389</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>97.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.252</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Even-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13.560</td>
<td>29.49</td>
<td>55.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.797</td>
<td>14.73</td>
<td>70.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.735</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>76.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.176</td>
<td>9.08</td>
<td>85.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.806</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>86.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.224</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>96.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.518</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE 22**

**ILLUSTRATIVE VARIABLES**

**APPROPRIATE RESPONSE SCALE: TAPE #3**

### Odd-Numbered Items

**Factor 1: Reflection-Probe**

.700  109  You know, somehow as we talk about the small school versus the large school and Greenfield versus Aurora I have the feeling sort of that there were more basic issues that really are involved in the whole thing than what we've been talking about.

.675  127  And yet, talking now, I get the feeling of ambivalence, uh security but a little little anxious. I, is that correct?

.648  59   That might be important then to get information as to what the requirements are for graduate work in social work.
Then you can build, then you feel safe and venture out and do different things.

And this makes it safe to go out and explore a little bit.

Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli

-.790 55 Right.
-.759 53 Um-hum.
-.752 33 Um-hum.
-.732 15 Um-hum.
-.718 133 Um-hum.

Factor 3: Active Interpretation-Passive Understanding

.695 89 It's difficult to find security by yourself, though.

**-.620 85 Why do you think some people need uh this other type of excitement and all that's going on is so important?

.574 27 Um-hum, and sociology you think would give you the opportunity to prepare to do something constructive you thought.

.558 31 And you found some teachers at Aurora that were helpful.

*** .551 41 You seem like you'd uh have some hesitancy about to a big school, yet now you now you seem to be very relaxed and happy and this is a big school.

Factor 4: Unstructured Invitation (rapport-building)

*-.574 9 And you could get to know people at Aurora.
-.517 3 Do you have any questions?
-.504 5 You're a student.

Factor 5: Interrogative Prod

.455 119 How would he feel about uh you going back to Aurora?
How segregated do you feel that he would feel if you were at Aurora, Illinois?

How would you feel about say attending UMass if that would be the best decision?

But not much help about sociology.

Factor 6:
No interpretable factor.

Factor 7:
No interpretable factor.

Factor 8:
No interpretable factor.

Even-numbered Items

Factor 1: Reflection-Probe

But there should be some security in living at home.

Have you found that going to college has helped you to be able to do this more so than high school?

Like talking to roommates, uh being with...

Now you tell me that uh as as I've listened to you you say your interest in sociology is to be with people and learn to help people and yet uh, as you talk here, I get a feeling on the other hand you feel marks are the important outcome of your education.

Yet if you didn't trans- back uh transfer back to Aurora, uh where would you?

Factor 2: Minimal Social Stimuli

Um-hum.

Um-hum.
.742  76  Um-hum.
.714  106  Um-hum.

**Factor 3: Interrogative Prod (rapport-building)**

.742  10  How long have you been in the East?
.707  12  Why did you decide on Aurora?
.633  22  And you feel you can succeed and be happy in sociology.
.630  20  And yet you came back to Greenfield.
.623  18  Knowing there was some security in terms of...

**Factor 4: Unstructured Invitation**

.571  122  Right, you're smiling.
.496  78  You learn with social activities too.
.478  124  Um-hum.

**Factor 5: Passive understanding-active interpretation.**

.646  30  You'd rather not try out a big one.
.586  28  Your friend's in sociology?
.485  140  Why wouldn't a good engineer be an appropriate source of information?
.431  38  And if you're working within a section.
.413  66  It's more interesting being with people than it is to be with the books.

**Factor 6: Unstructured Invitation (rapport-building)**

.602  4  You know sometimes it's hard to figure out what to talk about right like that.
.579  2  So if we begin now, we'd be through by eleven-thirty.
Factor 7: Interpretation-understanding

.543 130 Some knowledge about places.

.482 132 The counselor should provide information.

.440 150 Perhaps knowing the security of Greenfield Community College uh is there and makes it possible to come down here and...

.425 134 So to be helpful then a person should know not only some information about the alternatives that are available to make a decision on but should know about the person making the decision.

.416 128 You have to make a decision and one that sticks.

Factor 8:

No interpretable factor.

TABLE 23

FACTOR VARIANCES, LAMBDA VALUES, AND PERCENT OF TOTAL VARIANCE

APPROPRIATE RESPONSE SCALE - TAPE #3

Odd-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Variances</th>
<th>Lambda</th>
<th>% of Total Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15.449</td>
<td>35.29</td>
<td>35.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.351</td>
<td>25.93</td>
<td>61.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.033</td>
<td>18.35</td>
<td>79.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.035</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>84.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.937</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>88.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.645</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>92.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.831</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>96.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.492</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Even-Numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.859</td>
<td>22.21</td>
<td>35.80</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>45.94</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>29.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.793</td>
<td>28.82</td>
<td>64.63</td>
<td>2.824</td>
<td>45.94</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>29.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.312</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>69.84</td>
<td>1.602</td>
<td>56.50</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>29.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.615</td>
<td>12.65</td>
<td>82.49</td>
<td>1.493</td>
<td>58.64</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>29.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.617</td>
<td>10.40</td>
<td>92.89</td>
<td>1.482</td>
<td>66.03</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>29.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.829</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>97.01</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>68.96</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>29.446</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.325</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>71.09</td>
<td>5.162</td>
<td>25.45</td>
<td>29.446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 24

**ILLUSTRATIVE VARIABLES**

**APPROPRIATE RESPONSE SCALE: TAPE #3**

### Odd-Numbered Items

#### Factor 1: Minimal Social Stimuli

| .852 | 95   | Um-hum.     |
| .706 | 127  | Yeah.       |
| .770 | 125  | Um-hum.     |
| .766 | 89   | Yeah.       |
| .757 | 147  | Um-hum.     |

#### Factor 2: Reflection-Probe

| .724 | 119  | Well you seem to have the, you know, this idea for the broader concept you know, of honesty, and so on, and yet within that little narrow one you you take uh what mileage you can, is that right? |
Do you find you have to combat this kind of thing uh when people are a bit critical of women in service quite often?

Um-hum. That's good. You really look for excitement then.

Well, what uh what have you done uh outside of class to uh, you know, so you can increase this knowledge of of German?

Um-hum, yeah, well you uh you say you uh you have these small talks with yourself, you you're not really worried about it, or you don't seem worried about it.

** Factor 3: Minimal Social Stimuli **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.730</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.697</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.677</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.638</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.623</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Factor 4: **

No interpretable factor.

** Factor 5: **

No interpretable factor.

** Factor 6: Interrogative Prod **

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.398</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yeah, did you learn the language while you were there?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.360</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>That was kind of a uh shock effect, it sounds like, from him, wasn't it. Wasn't he, was he shocked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.347</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Do you feel you have the background to to say, teach high school? Is this the age you're interested in?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Factor 7: **

No interpretable factor.
Factor 8:

No interpretable factor.

**Even-Numbered Items**

_Factor 1: Minimal Social Stimuli_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.674</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.609</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.606</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.581</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.563</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Factor 2: Interrogative Prod_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.677</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>You're just kind of at a point now and waiting for the next door to open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.676</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>That must be very pleasant, isn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.659</strong></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>What sets off one of these, one of these trips like this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>.657</strong></td>
<td>122</td>
<td>What other types of ad- adventuresome type things do you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.649</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>For the sake of adventure or...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Factor 3: Minimal Social Stimuli_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Load</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.793</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.787</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.772</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.749</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Um-hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.729</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Umm.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor 4:
No interpretable factor.

Factor 5: Assertive reacting

.633 102 That's right, that's right.
.608 148 Um-hum (garbled).
.513 96 Yeah, it could work in the reverse way.
.134 Um-hum.
.505 56 Um-hum.

Factor 6: Ability Potential

-.547 20 Um-hum, well you can kind of see the value of it too, I would imagine, having been out.
-.544 36 Um-hum. What do you what do you think of this? Your having been in Germany and knowing the value possibly of reading the language, speaking the language, the grammar of the language, do you think this is good or bad?
**-.517 68 Uh, you could travel around on your vacation.
***-.503 28 Um, you seem to have a a real broad interest yet you're saying here that you want to zero in on German.

Factor 7:
No interpretable factor.

Factor 8: Ability Potential-Understanding

**-.318 88 Oh, I see. Well, you could always tell them that you've traveled abroad, approach it from that point-of-view.
-.317 62 Oh I see, you just take off.
-.302 142 Um-hum.
-.300 34 Maybe you can expand it.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The principal purpose of this study was to develop and validate a prescribed set of methodological procedures which would permit the study of counselor verbal behavior within the interview and to determine if counselor verbalizations could be identified within one of three hypothetical constructs. These constructs included counselor empathy, unconditional positive regard, and a non-theory-bound construct, appropriateness of response. Procedures included the a priori production of counselor verbal response categories, the rating of these and other untrained counselor responses, and the analysis of data using factor analytic techniques.

Second, the study examined the validity of three predetermined counselor verbal response categories as generated in a previous study of counselor verbal behavior related to empathy and unconditional positive regard (Zimmer & Anderson, 1968). In that study, factor analysis of ratings yielded eight factors for empathy and positive regard, six of which were common to both constructs. Three of those factors, ability potential response, interrogative prod, and reflection-probe, were selected for this study, operationally defined, and used as the criteria for the training of the counselor-experimenters.

The following questions dictated the development of methodological procedures in the study:
1. Does the a priori use of the three trained classes of counselor verbal responses which are tagged affect the discreteness of these three factors?
   a. When respondent ratings are subjected to factor analysis, do the three classes of verbal responses load as discrete factors?
   b. Does the analysis of data yield discrete factors for each of the three trained verbal response categories for each of the three counselors?

2. Do the three constructs, empathy, unconditional positive regard and appropriateness, yield similar or different factors in the description of the counselor's verbal responses?
   a. When respondents rate counselor verbal responses on the "Appropriate Response Scale," does the analysis yield factors replicating those extracted from data on the Accurate Empathy Scale and the Unconditional Positive Regard Scale?
   b. Are the factors yielded in the analysis of the data similar for all three counselors or is there a counselor-verbal response interaction?

3. Do the factors extracted in the analysis of the data duplicate those extracted by Zimmer and Anderson (1968)?

A further question may be extrapolated from the data. When respondent ratings of counselor verbal responses are factor analyzed, does the data
permit description of counselor verbal behavior with a smaller number of factors?

METHODOLOGY

Three counselors, each representing a different level of counselor training and experience, were selected to participate in the study. They underwent a training program which involved learning to produce in an interview three operationally defined classes of counselor responses:

1. Ability Potential Response
2. Interrogative Prod Response
3. Reflection-probe Response

Paired with this task of producing trained responses was the a priori identification of each of the trained responses that the counselor emitted during the interview. Counselors tagged the trained responses by suppressing one of three foot pedals located beneath the counseling table and out of the vision of the client. The suppression of foot pedals activated signal lights in an adjoining control room, thereby informing the technician that a specified trained response would be produced at that moment in the interview. Criteria for the satisfactory achievement of these tasks were established both in the training program and in the actual counseling interview.

The counseling interviews lasted 48 minutes each. Within each interview, eight six-minute segments were identified in which the counselor had to produce one each of the three trained responses. The identification of interview segments and control of counselor performance within those
segments was accomplished by a series of three signal lights located above and behind the client but within the counselor's line of vision. As the counselor produced each trained response, the appropriate signal light was extinguished, not to be relighted until the next six-minute segment.

Counseling interviews were video-recorded and a typescript of each interview prepared. One hundred and fifty counselor responses, including the trained tagged responses, were randomly selected from the counselor's total response production and numerically identified on the video-recording of the interview.

Three groups of raters, selected from Education courses at the University of Massachusetts and University of Hartford, were trained to use one of three rating scales:

1. Accurate Empathy in Interpersonal Processes, A Scale for Measurement (Berenson, Carkhuff, and Southworth)
2. Respect or Positive Regard in Interpersonal Processes, A Scale for Measurement (Carkhuff, Southworth, and Berenson)
3. Counselor Appropriateness of Response Scale (Hackney)

Groups viewed in varying orders the three video-recorded interviews and rated the 150 identified counselor responses. Respondent ratings were recorded on Optical Scan answer sheets and later transferred to IBM cards and factor analyzed. Each of the nine counseling interview-rating scale combinations underwent two analyses, an analysis of odd-numbered responses and an analysis of even-numbered responses. This approach was used because limitations of the memory core of the computer, a CDC 3600,
negated total analysis of each data set. The analysis of data was accomplished by using FACTAN, a computer program developed by the ESSO Corporation. Each analysis began with the computation of intercorrelations of variables, yielding a correlation matrix of dimension 75 by 75. From this correlation matrix that variance which could be attributed to error or individual differences was computed and extracted, leaving only that variance common to all the variables. A true factor analysis was performed on the correlation matrix yielding a set of factors. These factors were then rotated, using a Varimax rotation procedure with rotation set at 0.25 degrees. The purpose of the factor rotation was to obtain the best simple structure of factors. The factors may be viewed as component parts of the data which bear a relationship to the construct used in the ratings.

RESULTS

The methodological procedures demonstrated 1) the feasibility of controlling specified counselor verbal responses within an interview, 2) the efficacy of training counselors to produce in an a priori fashion the three response categories identified for study, and 3) subsequent rating of counselor responses. Each of the three counselors produced 24 trained, tagged responses, one each of the three response categories in each of the eight six-minute segments. As viewed by independent judges, 91% of the trained tagged responses in Tape #1 met the operational criteria, 96% met
the criteria in Tape #2, and 100% met the criteria in Tape #3.

**Comparison of Factors**

Counselor responses from each of the three interview video-tapes were rated using three scales: empathy, unconditional positive regard, and appropriateness. Thus, three sets of data for each counselor were generated from the same responses. This permitted comparison of factors across rating scales for each of the three interview tapes. The rationale was that if the responses which loaded highly on a given factor for Tape #1, Empathy Scale, were the identical or essentially the same as those responses which loaded highly for a given factor for Tape #1, Positive Regard Scale, then the two factors might intuitively be considered the same. Thus, all possible comparisons of loaded items in factors for the three rating scales for each interview tape performed. Tables 25, 26, and 27 describe the comparison of factors for odd- and even-numbered item analyses for each of the three counseling interview tapes. As an example, on Table 25, in the odd-numbered analyses for the three scales, highly loaded items on Factor 5, Empathy Scale are essentially the same as the highly loaded items on Factor 3, Positive Regard Scale and Factor 4, Appropriate Response Scale. These factors were all labeled Ability Potential factors. Note that this same factor did not occur in the analyses of even-numbered items. Likewise, highly loaded variables on Factor 4, Empathy odd, were the same as those on Factor 7, Positive Regard odd but no similar factor occurred on Appropriate Response odd. Factor 1 on each of the three even-numbered analyses were the same loaded items.
Discreteness of Trained Counselor Responses

The trained tagged counselor responses which occurred in each of the factors extracted across analyses are indicated in Tables 25, 26, and 27. They are identified by asterisks as follows:

* Ability Potential

** Interrogative Prod

*** Reflection-probe

The number in parentheses following the asterisk(s) indicates the number of tagged trained responses of that category which loaded on that factor.

The trained counselor responses did occur consistently as loaded items in factors on all analyses, although not all of the trained responses occurred as loaded items in discrete factors. In other words, there were factors in which all three response categories loaded. Of the three trained tagged responses emitted in the three interview tapes, the ability potential response and the interrogative prod response loaded highly in their respective labeled factors 14 times each. The reflection-probe response loaded highly on labeled Reflection-probe factors 26 times. The ability potential response loaded on factors other than the Ability Potential Factor 26 times; the interrogative prod response loaded on factors other than the Interrogative Prod Factors 23 times; and the reflection-probe responses loaded on factors other than the Reflection-probe Factors 19 times.
### TABLE 25

**COMPARISON OF FACTORS ACROSS RATING SCALES: TAPE #1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labeled Factor</th>
<th>Empathy Odd</th>
<th>Empathy Even</th>
<th>Positive Regard Odd</th>
<th>Positive Regard Even</th>
<th>Appropriate Response Odd</th>
<th>Appropriate Response Even</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability Potential</td>
<td>Factor 5 *(1)</td>
<td>Factor 4 ** (1)</td>
<td>Factor 1 * (2)</td>
<td>Factor 7 ** (1)</td>
<td>Factor 1 * (1)</td>
<td>Factor 1 * (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative Prod</td>
<td>Factor 1 * (1)</td>
<td>Factor 2 * (1)</td>
<td>Factor 1 * (1)</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 1 ** (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection-probe</td>
<td>Factor 2 * (1)</td>
<td>Factor 3 ** (1)</td>
<td>Factor 2 ** (1)</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3 ** (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Social Stimuli</td>
<td>Factor 3 ** (1)</td>
<td>Factor 4 ** (1)</td>
<td>Factor 4 ** (1)</td>
<td>Factor 3 ** (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- * Trained, tagged ability potential responses
- ** Trained, tagged interrogative prod responses
- *** Trained, tagged reflection-probe responses
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labeled Factor</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Positive Regard</th>
<th>Appropriate Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odd</td>
<td>Even</td>
<td>Odd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative Prod</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection-Probe</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td><em>(1)</em>**(1)****(2)</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Social Stimuli</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restatement-Understanding</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Interp., Passive Undrstd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstructured Invitation</td>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: * Trained tagged ability potential responses  
** Trained tagged interrogative prod responses  
*** Trained tagged reflection-probe responses
### TABLE 27

**COMPARISON OF FACTORS ACROSS RATING SCALES: TAPE #3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Empathy</th>
<th>Positive Regard</th>
<th>Appropriate Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Odd</td>
<td>Even</td>
<td>Odd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability Potential</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interrogative Prod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection-Probe</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>*(2)**(1)</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***(2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>***(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Social Stimuli</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Agreement</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>** (1)</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Agreement</td>
<td>Factor 5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Factor</td>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>**(1)</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***(1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>***(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Factor</td>
<td>Factor 2</td>
<td>*(1)</td>
<td>Factor 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>***(4)</td>
<td></td>
<td>***(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assertive Reacting</td>
<td>Factor 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Factor 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
- * Trained tagged ability potential responses
- ** Trained tagged interrogative prod responses
- *** Trained tagged reflection-probe responses
Discreteness of Trained Responses Across Counselors

Differences existed in the occurrence of trained tagged responses in the extraction of factors across counselors. For Counselor #1 (Tape #1) the ability potential response loaded on Ability Potential factors four times and on factors other than Ability Potential factors eight times and on factors other than Interrogative Prod factors four times; the reflection-probe response loaded on Reflection-probe factors ten times and on factors other than the Reflection-probe factors, it did not occur.

For Counselor #2 (Tape #2) the ability potential response loaded on Ability Potential factors three times and on factors other than Ability Potential factors ten times; the interrogative prod responses loaded on Interrogative Prod factors two times and on factors other than Interrogative Prod factors eight times; the reflection-probe responses loaded on Reflection-probe factors nine times and on factors other than Reflection-probe factors five times.

With respect to Counselor #3 (Tape #3) the ability potential responses loaded on Ability Potential factors seven times and on factors other than Ability Potential seven times; the interrogative prod responses loaded on Interrogative Prod factors three times (on only one analysis) and on factors other than Interrogative Prod ten times; the reflection-probe responses loaded on Reflection-probe factors seven times and on factors other than the Reflection-probe fifteen times.
Comparison of Factors Across Rating Scales

In each of the analyses, identical or closely similar factors occurred across rating scales for each of the three interview tapes (see Tables 25, 26, and 27). That is, Empathy, Unconditional Positive Regard, and Appropriate Response Scales did not measure individually unique components of the interview responses.

Comparison of Factors Across Counselors

Close examination of the data indicated a strong similarity of extracted factors across counselors, although not all identified factors occurred with the same frequency in the analyses by counselors. The most consistent factor, Minimal Social Stimuli, occurred in all six analyses on all three interview tapes. The Reflection-probe factor occurred in five analyses for Counselor #2 (Tape #2), three analyses for Counselor #1 (Tape #1) and three analyses for Counselor #3 (Tape #3). The Interrogative Prod factor occurred in five analyses for Counselor #1, two analyses for Counselor #2 and one analysis for Counselor #3. The Ability Potential factor occurred in three analyses for Counselor #1, two analyses for Counselor #2, and three analyses for Counselor #3.

Comparison of Extracted Factors to Previous Research

Factors extracted in the analyses of data related to the Empathy Scale and the Unconditional Positive Regard Scale duplicated those extracted in the study by Zimmer and Anderson (1968) with few exceptions. The Empathy Scale data yielded five factors duplicating those of Zimmer and
Anderson in the majority of the analyses. Those factors were: Minimal Social Stimuli (identified by Zimmer and Anderson as Minimal Activity) Ability Potential; Interrogative Prod; Reflection-probe (identified by Zimmer and Anderson as Probing-reflection); and Interpretation-Understanding. Two additional factors occurred in three or less analyses: Unstructured Invitation (3) and Restating and Understanding (2).

The Positive Regard Scale data also yielded five factors duplicating those identified by Zimmer and Anderson in the majority of the analyses. Those factors were: Minimal Social Stimuli (identified by Zimmer and Anderson as Minimal Activity); Ability Potential; Interrogative Prod; Unstructured Invitation; and Reflection-probe (identified by Zimmer and Anderson as Probing-reflection). Again, two additional factors occurred in partial analyses: Passive Understanding-Active Interpretation (3) and Assertive Reacting (2).

One factor identified by Zimmer and Anderson for the Empathy Scale (Probing-reflection cognitive or past tense) and one factor for the Positive Regard Scale (Counselor's clarification of simultaneous occurrence of events) did not occur on either of the analyses in this study.

**DISCUSSION OF METHODOLOGY**

The investigation of three counselor response categories within the rubric of three hypothetical constructs relevant to counseling led to the development of two methodological procedures which have implications for
future research. These procedures included the operationalization and training of response categories and the foot pedal signaling system by which the counselor can communicate the a priori intent of his responses to others external to the interview.

The study also reaffirmed the value of factor analysis as a reduction tool in the analysis of counselor verbal behavior.

Definition and Training of Responses

The definition of response categories in terms of grammatical structure, time dimension, and meaning permitted a high level of uniformity between counselors in the production of response categories. This, in turn, permitted the examination of the discreteness of the response categories when counselor, client, and interview content variables differ. The procedures used are adaptable to the broader spectrum of counseling research in which counselor verbal behavior is viewed as the independent variable to be controlled.

Foot Pedal Communication System

The particular significance of the study lies in the a prior production of verbal response categories and the communication of this intent to others external to the interview. Previous research has been limited to post hoc evaluations or the external control of emission of counselor verbal behavior. The foot pedal signal system permitted the counselor to identify his intent simultaneous to the production of his responses, thereby overcoming past problems in the interpretation of intent of counselor behavior.
in the interview. The foot pedal communication system has a further significance within the context of prediction of behaviors and in the counselor training process.

The counselor's ability to communicate his intent simultaneous to the emission of stimuli makes possible a movement in the direction of prediction of client behavior by successive approximations. In addition, the process of communicating intent forces counselor-trainees to examine and define more carefully the behaviors they emit in the interview.

**Factor Analysis as a Reduction Tool**

As was the case in the study reported by Zimmer and Anderson (1968) the application of factor analytic techniques did yield factor structures related to the hypothetical constructs under the study. The loading of tagged trained responses on specific factors suggests not only the uniqueness of these response categories, but also the value of factor analysis as a technique for analyzing the variance existing in ratings of these constructs. Thus, the study re-affirms the value of this statistical technique as a descriptive tool in the study of counselor verbal behavior.

**INTERPRETATION AND CONCLUSIONS**

The results of the study suggest that the search for hypothetical correlates of counselor skills, such as empathy and unconditional positive regard, may be both unnecessary and insufficient. The data indicate that an appropriate response dimension, unrelated to empathy and positive
regard, provided essentially the same descriptions of counselor verbal behavior in terms of extracted factors. If this is the case, the "necessary and sufficient" conditions provided by the counselor for client change can be operationalized in the manner suggested by the study. Or, to put it differently, discrete counselor verbalizations occurring in the interview can be isolated and defined. However, the descriptive analysis of counselor verbal behavior does not lead directly to the incorporation of the findings into valid training procedures. An important intermediary step would involve the documentation of client responses that are elicited by counselor verbalizations. This would call for the systematic manipulation of these variables in an empirical setting such as that described by Kennedy and Zimmer (1968).

The generalizability of extracted factors related to the three constructs, i.e. Passive-Understanding-Interpretation, Unstructured Invitation, Active Agreement, Assertive Reacting, held only partially across counselor-client pairs. Counselors #1 and #2 (Tapes #1 and #2) yielded factors which were quite similar. There was much less similarity in the comparison of these two counselors to Counselor #3 (Tape #3) which suggests that Counselor #3 had a different style of verbal behavior in the interview. A possible explanation for this is the fact that Counselor #3 was a non-counselor while Counselor #1 and Counselor #2 both had extensive counselor training.

This pattern is borne out further by the occurrence of the tagged ability potential responses, interrogative prod responses, and reflection-
probe responses in the three interviews. The trained tagged responses
loaded on factors 35 times for Counselor #1, 37 times for Counselor #2,
and 49 times for Counselor #3. A possible explanation for this disparity
was that trained responses, when emitted by Counselor #3, were obviously
more "counselor-like" than the other emitted responses in that interview.
On the other hand, the data indicate a greater frequency of trained tagged
responses loading on their respective factors, i.e. Ability Potential factor,
Interrogative Prod factor, and Reflection-probe factor, for Counselors #1
and #2 than for Counselor #3. This phenomenon might be explained by the
training and experience of Counselors #1 and #2. Possibly, they were able
to discriminate the more appropriate placement of trained responses than
could Counselor #3.

However, none of the tagged trained responses loaded exclusively on
their respective factors. In some cases, more of the tagged responses
loaded on factors other than the corresponding factor than loaded on the
corresponding factor. For example, on Tape #2 (Table 26) three trained
ability potential responses loaded on the Ability Potential factors but 10
ability potential responses loaded on other labeled factors. With the excep-
tion of the reflection-probe trained responses on Tape #1, this was the case
in all the analyses. This suggests, again, that 1) there may be an interac-
tion between the trained responses and the content of the interview at the
time the response is emitted, and 2) there is a need to make discrimina-
tions as to when a given response is appropriate to the context of the on-
going interview.
The data strongly suggest the interaction between trained responses and interview content. A total of 24 extracted factors contained more than one category of trained responses. For example, on Tape #2 (Table 26) seven tagged ability potential responses, five interrogative prod responses, and nine reflection-probe responses loaded on the Reflection-probe factors for all analyses.

This interaction suggests the need for further research into the differential effects of these trained responses as they relate to different response classes emitted by the client. Such study should be directed at the discrimination of conditions (content, time in interview, etc.) at which specified trained responses are more or less appropriate. Cartwright's study (1966) offers one of several possible methodologies by which this type of study could be accomplished.

On the other hand, there is sufficient evidence to indicate that the tagged trained responses do have discrete qualities. Consider the analysis of data for Tape #1 (Table 25). Four ability potential responses loaded on the Ability Potential factor, nine interrogative prod responses loaded on the Interrogative Prod factor, and ten reflection-probe responses loaded on the Reflection-probe factors. On Tape #2 (Table 26), the reflection-probe was the most stable response, occurring nine times on the Reflection-probe factors. Tape #3 (Table 27) indicates two response categories which are relatively stable. The ability potential response loaded seven times on the Ability Potential factors and the reflection-probe responses loaded seven times on the Reflection-probe factors.
The following conclusions may be drawn from the study. The findings replicated those of Zimmer and Anderson (1968). Of the eight factors identified by Zimmer and Anderson on the empathy and positive regard ratings, seven were also identified by this study for empathy and positive regard. Thus, the conclusion drawn by Zimmer and Anderson (pp. 424-425) that "...positive regard and empathy when looked at in terms of multiple factors, are definable and public, rather than indefinable and private" may also be drawn for this study.

Second, the a priori production of these three trained response categories does not negate their respective unique qualities as viewed by large numbers of respondents. Third, there is an apparent interaction between the emission of the trained responses and the content of the interview which should be the subject of further study. Fourth, this study describes components related to empathy and positive regard, but does not suggest the relative value of those components in an interview. This calls for further research in which these variables are systematically manipulated in an empirical setting and their effects measured in terms of client response. Finally, the study demonstrated the efficacy of operationally defining specific counselor responses, training counselors to emit them in an a prior fashion and communicate that intent simultaneous to their production in the interview.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A
COUNSELEE QUESTIONNAIRE

Name __________________________ Age ______ College Major ____________
Home Address ______________________ Telephone ____________________

To what extent have you had experience in counseling?

Never    Rarely    Occasionally    Often    Frequently

You are being asked to participate in a model counseling interview under the direction of the Counselor Training staff of the School of Education, University of Massachusetts. The purpose of the interview is to provide worthwhile opportunities for counselors-in-training to demonstrate their learned skills. The interview will be video-taped and may be viewed at a later date by counselor-trainers or trained lay observers. Should your interview be selected for later viewing, your identity will not be revealed. If these conditions meet with your approval, would you indicate your willingness to participate by signing your name.

________________________________________
Signature

Note: If, after the counseling interview you would like to meet with the counselor for additional interviews, indicate this desire to the counselor and further arrangements can be made.
APPENDIX B
B1

Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes

A Scale for Measurement

Bernard G. Berenson, Robert R. Carkhuff, J. Alfred Southworth

Level 1
The first (or helping) person appears completely unaware or ignorant of even the most conspicuous surface feelings of the other person(s).
Example: The first (or helping) person may be bored or disinterested or simply operating from a preconceived frame of reference which totally excludes that of the other person(s).

In summary, the first (or helping) person does everything but listen, understand, or be sensitive to even the surface feelings of the other person(s).

Level 2
The first (or helping) person responds to the surface feelings of the other person(s) only infrequently. The first (or helping) person continues to ignore the deeper feelings of the other person(s).

Example: The first (or helping) person may respond to some surface feelings but tends to assume feelings which are not there. He may have his own ideas of what may be going on in the other person(s) but these do not appear to correspond with those of the other person(s).

In summary, the first (or helping) person tends to respond to things other than what the other person(s) appear to be expressing or indicating.

Level 3
The first (or helping) person responds with minimal understanding to the surface feelings of the other person(s) but, although making an effort to understand the other person's deeper feelings, misses their import.

Example: The first (or helping) person has some understanding of the surface aspects of the messages of the other person(s) but often misinterprets the deeper feelings.

In summary, the first (or helping) person is responding but not aware of who that other person really is or of what that other person is really like underneath. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4
The first (or helping) person responds with understanding to the surface feelings of the other person(s) and responds with empathic understanding to the deeper feelings.
Example: The first (or helping) person makes some tentative efforts to understand the deeper feelings of the other person(s).

In summary, the first (or helping) person is responding with some degree of empathic understanding of the deeper feelings of the other person(s).

**Level 5**
The first (or helping) person responds with accurate empathic understanding to all of the other person's deeper feelings as well as surface feelings.

Example: The first (or helping) person is "together" with the other person(s) or "tuned in" on the other person's wavelength. The first (or helping) person and the other person(s) might proceed together to explore previously unexplored areas of human living and human relationships.

In summary, the first (or helping) person is responding with full awareness of the other person(s) and a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of his most deep feelings.
Respect or Positive Regard in Interpersonal Processes

A Scale for Measurement

Robert R. Carkhuff, J. Alfred Southworth, and Bernard G. Berenson

Level 1
The first (or helping) person is communicating clear negative regard for
the second person.
Example: The first (or helping) person may be actively offering advice
or telling the second person what would be "best" for him.
In summary, in many ways the first (or helping) person acts in such a
way as to make himself the focus of evaluation and sees himself as
responsible for the second person.

Level 2
The first (or helping) persons responds to the second person in such a
way as to communicate little positive regard.
Example: The first (or helping) person responds mechanically or
passively or ignores the feelings of the second person.
In summary, in many ways the first (or helping) person displays a lack
of concern or interest for the second person.

Level 3
The first (or helping) person communicates a positive caring for the
second person but there is a conditionality to the caring.
Example: The first (or helping) person communicates that certain kinds
of actions on the part of the second person will reward or
hurt the first (or helping) person.
In summary, the first (or helping) person communicates that what the
second person does or does not do, matters to the first person. Level
3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4
The first (or helping) person clearly communicates a very deep interest
and concern for the welfare of the second person.
Example: The first (or helping) person enables the second person to feel
free to be himself and to be valued as an individual except on
occasion in areas of deep personal concern to the first (or
helping) person.
In summary, the facilitator sees himself as responsible to the second
person.
Level 5
The first (or helping) person communicates a very deep respect for the second person's worth as a person and his rights as a free individual. Example: The facilitator cares very deeply for the human potentials of the second person.
In summary, the facilitator is committed to the value of the other person as a human being.
Counselor Appropriateness of Response Scale

A Scale for Measurement

Harold L. Hackney

Level 1
The first (or helping) person appears unaware of his role in the relationship and fails to respond in a helping way to the second person.
Example: The first (or helping) person fails to respond to aspects of the second person's responses; instead, he responds by talking about irrelevant matters.

Level 2
The first (or helping) person responds to the content of the second person's responses but only in the most superficial terms.
Example: The first (or helping) person responds to insignificant or vague aspects of the client's responses in such a way that he frequently confuses or disturbs the second person.

Level 3
The first (or helping) person communicates some degree of involvement in the relationship with the second person by his responses, but frequently responds to aspects of the second person's statements which are value and require the second person to ask for clarification.
Example: The first (or helping) person is able to respond appropriately to some of the second person's statements but often seems to respond in ways that the second person is unable to understand.

Level 4
The first (or helping) person is able to respond to the second person's statements of condition or feeling in such a way as to lead the second person into further discussion, but occasionally responds in ways that are vague to the second person.
Example: The first (or helping) person responds in ways that permit the second person to express himself more deeply and to greater length.

Level 5
The first (or helping) person skillfully responds to the remarks of the second person in ways that lead the second person into deeper self-exploration and self-understanding.
Example: The first (or helping) person's responses to the second person are concise, relevant to the second person's concerns, and lead the second person to greater insight of himself.
APPENDIX C
APPENDIX C

Rater Training Procedures

Rater training procedures were video-recorded for all three groups using each rating scale. The first half of the training procedures was uniform for each group. The second half of the training involved specific directions for use of each rating scale. The following is a typescript of the training directions:

"The study in which you are about to participate involves viewing three video-recorded counseling sessions. Each counseling session lasts 48 minutes. Your responsibility is one of evaluating selected portions of the counselor's responses to the client. In the materials which have been passed out, you will find a rating scale entitled Respect or Positive Regard in Interpersonal Processes, A Scale for Measurement (or Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes, A Scale for Measurement, or Counselor Appropriateness of Response Scale) and an answer sheet. You will be using this scale as your guideline for rating the video-tape. The items which you will be rating will be identified by a number in the upper left portion of the television monitor. There will be a total of 160 counselor responses which have been numbered. This does not include all of the responses made by the counselor, so you will have to watch the TV monitor for each number to appear and listen to the response which occurs simultaneously with the number. Some of the responses are very brief, for example, 'I see' or 'Um-hum,' and you
will have a very short time to record your rating. Other responses are longer and will give you more time to record your rating. In any event, you will frequently have to make a snap judgment on many responses. Responses on the television monitor are numbered from one to ten in repeating cycles. However, the answer sheet is numbered from one to 160. This means that after the first 10 numbered responses, the number "1" will appear again on the screen. You will record your rating for this response in the space number "11" on the answer sheet. Similarly, the third time the number "1" appears, you will record your rating in the space "21", and so forth. Please make every effort to record a rating for each numbered counselor response. As you view the TV monitor, the counselor will be facing you and the client will have her back to you.

Now, take your answer sheet and complete the following information: Print your last name, first name, and middle initial in the squares provided. If your name requires more than the spaces provided, print as much of your name as the spaces permit. Now, using a pencil, color in the appropriate alphabetical spaces in the grid under your name.

Beneath the name grid, complete the following information: Grade: if you are a freshman, color in space three, sophomore, space four, junior, space five, senior, space six, and if a graduate student, color in space seven. Next, record your birth date. Record your sex. Record your student number.
Each time you view and rate a counseling session, you will use a new answer sheet. Please record the same information on each answer sheet that you have just recorded.

EMPATHY SCALE DIRECTIONS

"Now if we could look at the rating scale for a moment. The scale is a five-point scale with Level 1 being the lowest rating and Level 5 being the highest rating. Level 1 indicates an absence of counselor empathy for the client in which the counselor does everything but listen, understand, or be sensitive to even the surface feelings of the client. Now please take a moment to read the description of Level 1 (pause).

Level 2 indicates a slightly higher level of empathy than Level 1 but the counselor still tends to respond to things other than what the client appears to be expressing or indicating. Take a moment to read the description of this level (pause).

Level 3 indicates a minimal level of empathy. Take a moment to read the description of this level (pause).

Level 4 suggests that the counselor is responding with some degree of empathic understanding of the deeper feelings of the client. Take a moment to read the description of this level (pause).

Level 5, the highest level of empathy, suggests that the counselor is responding with full awareness of the other person and a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of his most deep feelings.
As you will note, the levels are subjective, calling for your own impression of the counselor's level of empathic understanding for the client. Therefore, there is no 'right' or 'wrong' answer or rating. Each rating is a reflection of your own feeling state and is, therefore, correct for you. Are there any questions?"

(End of video-tape)

POSITIVE REGARD SCALE DIRECTIONS

"Now if we could look at the rating scale for a moment. The scale is a five-point scale with Level 1 being the lowest rating and Level 5 being the highest rating. Level 1 indicates an absence of positive regard for the client, or a clear negative regard, in which the counselor may be actively offering advice or telling the client what would be 'best' for him. Now please take a moment to read the description of Level 1 (pause).

Level 2 indicates a token amount of positive regard for the client, but the level of positive regard is still minimal. Take a moment to read the description of this level (pause).

Level 3 indicates some positive regard. Take a moment to read the description of this level (pause).

Level 4 suggests that the counselor does express a responsibility to and deep regard for the client. Read the description of this level (pause).
Level 5, the highest level of positive regard, suggests that the counselor's actions communicate to the client his commitment to the client as a unique and important human being. Take a moment to read Level 5 description (pause).

As you will note, the levels are subjective, calling for your own impression of the counselor's level of positive regard for the client. Therefore, there is no 'right' or 'wrong' answer or rating. Each rating is a reflection of your own feeling state and is, therefore, correct for you. Are there any questions?"
(End of video-tape)

COUNSELOR APPROPRIATENESS OF RESPONSE SCALE
DIRECTIONS

"Now if we could look at the rating scale for a moment. The scale is a five-point scale with Level 1 being the lowest rating and Level 5 being the highest rating. Level 1 indicates completely inappropriate responses by the counselor to what the client is saying. Now please take a moment to read the description of Level 1 (pause).

Level 2 indicates a slightly higher level of appropriateness of the counselor's responses but the responses are still most superficial. Take a moment to read the description of this level (pause).

Level 3 indicates some greater degree of appropriateness. Take a moment to read the description of this level (pause).
Level 4 suggests that the counselor does respond in ways that permit the client to express himself more deeply and to greater length. Take a moment to read the description of this level (Pause).

Level 5, the highest level of appropriateness, suggests that the counselor's responses to the client are concise, relevant, and lead the client to greater insight of himself. Take a moment to read Level 5 description (pause).

As you will note, the levels are subjective, calling for your own impression of the counselor's level of appropriateness in responding to the client. Therefore, there is no 'right' or 'wrong' answer or rating. Each rating is a reflection of your own feeling state and is, therefore, correct for you. Are there any questions?"

(End of video-tape)
APPENDIX D
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table D1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counseling Session Number 1</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>Talk about anything you'd like.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>* 2</td>
<td>Can you do it financially?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>You're too close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*** 5</td>
<td>You s- when you say that you want to be very independent, and right here you're independent as hell. I don't. I don't see where you're running from the problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oh it's just the money aspect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>It not being associated with the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>And yet you seem to be able to hold yourself up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Um hum. You find that's hurting your, the college level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** 10</td>
<td>Well, what do you feel you should do about it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Um whereas in college what happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>And this is your major.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I see, very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Did you have a good phys. ed. program in your high school?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>So there is a uh ray of light there somewhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>How do you feel about your ability to do it?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sounds to me that you feel you made it through high school more on personality rather than, you know, sitting down.

The teachers felt uh you don't give me any problem I'll pass you on. This the idea.

I see, so you can do it.

How are you doing at this point?

Well you know its, you may say something like that right there, but right here you seem to be uh.

How is it so different?

You don't feel good about that. What he's saying is right then. You do want to get away.

Um hum.

I'm not speaking very loudly now. How does that affect you?

That's important. You don't agree with the sociology teacher.

Do you have any idea what it is that you fear?

I see, so it's people making fun that you're more or less concerned about.

You feel that there's any difference right now since you're out of high school and versus the time you were in high school. Do you feel more confident now?

Do you think it helped?

Yeah. So you think a person may have problems it might help to talk about them.

Um hum.

He made you feel better about it.
What are you going to be doing next time you have to select courses for next semester?

You know, it seems that there's always somebody in every one of your lives that are always going to make us feel uncomfortable.

I take it you have chosen to avoid him rather than to deal with him?

What is it about your feelings to avoid. Why do you choose to avoid rather than to?

Um hum, and yet are you afraid of being wrong?

Um hum, but you feel uncomfortable and yet he's wrong.

Oh yes, I'll have to agree with you he was wrong. There was no reason for him to do that.

But why do you feel uncomfortable? He was wrong.

You could have gone back to him five times.

You say you get mad sometimes and yet I don't see you getting mad here.

But you could get mad.

You like others.

Do you like others to be mad?

Yeah, do you ever get mad when you're playing those things?

Um hum.

Some people, some people could overlook it. Did some kids?

They were all mad.

Yeah I guess I'd have to be. I guess that's true, come to think of it.

Um hum.
And yet, does this happen with all the other people up there or just you?

I wonder why?

Um hum.

Um hum, are you concerned about it?

Yet you must be concerned to some degree just to mention it.

You could have had dates in high school.

Oh, why's that?

Do you feel that any possible relationship that your sister might have had would affect what you thought about other peoples' feelings toward you?

Sounds to me like she, like you had the impression that you would have been a cheap date, correct me if I'm wrong.

Um hum.

Um hum. Are you having a good time here?

I see.

You know you say you don't know what to talk about on a date, but right here is one person.

What is there about a date?

Um hum.

Sounds like, like you were embarrassed to be in a situation like that.

Oh, what do you mean?

Do you feel that the necking part of a date is always a part of it, you there's no way to get around it?

Oh, I see, this is something you just
Yeah.

And yet, you don't feel good about not going on a date.

Find it kind of hard to break that habit of saying no I don't want to go out on a date.

What about the guys at the college?

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um, um, you can't do things like that.

How do you feel about people that you know that's middle class people going to college, not this other group you've talked about?

Um hum.

Um hum. It seems as if it would be very hard. I I can't quite picture you picking up a guitar and playing it say.

Um hum.

You say you you trust certain kinds of people to speak to and yet you don't know me here.

But if you don't have that guitar, you find it hard to stand up in front of people and talk. You find it very uncomfortable to be with other people in situations that that most other people find comfortable.

I wonder if other things can become as easy as this after a while.

Um hum.

Um uh good, do you feel that you have to be that much more sensitive, more secure to keep people away from so that you make sure that nobody associates with your sister?
Um, um.

You have to have people know that you're you.

And it's hard when you don't go out and talk, be outgoing.

I see and so college is different.

There nobody knows of your sister.

Um hum, you can't be yourself on a date.

If you could only be yourself on a date without thinking of her.

And yet you say you have a situation like that. It's very easy to think about her and you be somebody other than you'd like to be but right here you think about her. You're still yourself.

How do you feel, how do you feel right now?

Is that good?

What is it about talking to your brother?

Um hum.

Um hum. Does he go out and does he tell you here you do this?

No shoes.

Do you find this is hard to live in the city after you lived in the country?

Um hum.

Um hum, first and what?

Yet some people some people are able to do both in college.

Um hum, and what do you do?

Um, so that she may not be getting along very well with her family. This might something you'd be concerned about.
Tell me.

You wouldn't have done, you think it was overdone.

You can't live with somebody that's that feels this way so strongly about other people.

Which one?

You don't trust the situation very much either.

You're afraid she might get to like you very well too.

She might, yeah.

I see. When did you first find this thing out (garbled).

I see, so it wasn't a very long time before she started showing her colors then.

Yeah, um hum.

And you feel that there's bound to be something more than meets the eye here.

Um hum, I see. Well you're from a big family too and yet in this situation you act completely different.

What things are different from what you do that are things that she does?

Um hum.

Yeah.

Whereas, you feel that your problem is a little different than than her problem.

She's got a problem where she's got friends but they're the wrong sex.

But whereas, you're awfully afraid of having friends of the opposite sex.

Um hum, um hum.

Um hum.
Did you feel that way when you came? Maybe that's one thing you might think.

That might be another way you might think. Are those the only two ways you could think?

You think so?

Um hum, well that's probably true, true. But there are a lot of girls that go out on dates very regularly.

There are a lot of girls that don't necessarily go parking or or if they do go parking they don't go out of their way for trouble. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).

You're caught in a bind right here. Can you go out and feel good when you go home.

Um hum.

You're firmly committed to tell them to forget it, right?

Okay, this is a given. You're saying to him, now look it, buster, we're going to be going out together, here are the lines. Here's where we go and here's where we don't go.

And what if if you'd stayed there.

What are some of the possible reactions he probably would have?

He might have said it. Let's assume he did say something like that...

Uh, would you be able to handle the situation?

I don't know if you were wrong, you felt that way, you felt like I'm not going to stay here and be wrong, you, I don't know if your feelings could be wrong.

There's another way that you might might try handling something. Cause when you leave like that automatically what are you doing. You're saying I don't want to talk to you any more, even though I'm sure you do.
Well, how do you feel about it?

Um hum, that way maybe, in the future if you run into situations like this, well what should I do, maybe I should think about it ahead of time. Maybe uh there's a way I could have handled things differently without sacrificing how I feel and still come out with some kind of a relationship along these lines.

I still find it pretty difficult to believe, you keep saying you find it difficult to get along with people like this, and right here you're getting along very well.

But you were out with a guy. I'm a guy.
Well, basically this involves you and I just sitting down and chatting for about forty-five minutes. You can talk about anything you'd like.

So if we begin now, we'd be through by eleven-thirty.

Do you have any questions?

You know sometimes it's hard to figure out what to talk about right like that.

You're a student.

Um hum.

Back to Aurora.

The uh the bigger environment's frightening.

And you could get to know people at Aurora.

How long have you been in the east?

So even though you say you feel uncomfortable in a large setting, you didn't feel uncomfortable uh say coming down here today or traveling out to Aurora or doing things of this type.

Why did you decide on Aurora?

That's important.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Having a friend made it easier to go to.

Um hum.
Knowing there was some security in terms of

So you did enjoy Aurora.

And yet you came back to Greenfield.

Before you start majoring.

* And you feel you can succeed and be happy in sociology.

I was wondering, how would you use sociology if you majored in it?

*** Earlier you said that you'd feel uncomfortable in a big setting with a lot of people and yet now now you say that you enjoy working with people.

Um hum.

The lonely crowd concept.

Um hum. And sociology you think would give you the opportunity to prepare to do something constructive you thought.

Your friend's in sociology?

You had a little reconnaissance on the place before you ever went in.

You'd rather not try out a big one.

And you found some teachers at Aurora that were helpful.

Parents like the idea of Aurora as well as you do.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Steep.

Um hum.

Um hum.
And if you're working within a section.

You feel that you can go back uh or you can go back to Aurora next year.

Yet if you didn't trans- back uh transfer back to Aurora, uh where would you?

You seem like you'd uh have some hesitancy about to a big school, yet now you now you seem to be very relaxed and happy and this is a big school.

You don't think you'd be known at UMass.

You have to psych him out a little bit.

So it's more important that you know what he wants than you know what you want.

So grades seem more important than anything else in a course.

And you get good grades.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Your French.

Could you tie it, would it tie in with your sociology interests?

In social work.

Have you found that to be true?

Um hum.

Could you see where a foreign language would be important in social work?

Right.

Um hum.
Um hum.

You've got to tie your interests and abilities together.

That might be important then to get information as to what the requirements are for graduate work in social work.

But you would be happy in this type of activity then.

That could be helpful to people.

Now you tell me that us as as I've listened to you, you say your interest in sociology is to be with people and learn to help people and yet uh, as you talk here, I get a feeling on the other hand you feel marks are the important outcome of your education.

And you can get the marks.

What do you feel is your major difficulty or major trouble in college?

Difficult to concentrate.

It's more interesting being with people than it is to be with the books.

Well, this interest in people, then you probably have many friends on the college campus.

They?

Uh, college students, people of the community.

Everybody.

And marks.

And so the system built this type of orientation.

Um hum.

And you are learning too when you get the grades in order.
The two don't necessarily have to go together though.

Um hum.

Um hum.

You learn with social activities too.

You learn with social activities as well.

Like talking to roommates, uh being with

This can be exciting.

Yet in a small college.

And yet a moment ago as I remember it, you said that people tend to go to large colleges maybe because of the excitement there and yet now I get the feeling that you're saying there is excitement in the small college as well.

You can be happy and satisfied in relatively simple social activities.

Why do you think some people need uh this other type of excitement and all that's going on is so important?

Involvement leads to security.

And your security is a friend at the college that you go to or security is a roommate that you can go to the snack bar.

Different people find security in different ways.

It's difficult to find security by yourself though.

Then it's better to be with one, two or three people you know well than than with a lot of people you don't know at all.

You can feel more comfortable and uh.

Have you found that going to college has helped you to be able to do this more so than high school?
Living on campus is a unique experience.

But there should be some security in living at home.

But different.

Could it be there's a conflict between independence on the one hand and security on the other?

Um hum.

Um hum.

Then you can build, then you feel safe and venture out and doing different things.

So now the decision is what beyond the sophomore year.

How would you feel about say attending UMass if that would be the best decision?

You could find, you could find your place in the social scheme of things.

Why don't you think you'd feel as much a part of the college?

Um hum.

Well, uh I was thinking as you said that, uh you like people, and you like to know a lot about people and lot of different people and yet now you now you now what you're saying is that uh if there are too many people you seem to be insecure.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

You know, somehow as we talk about the small school versus the large school and Greenfield versus Aurora I have the feeling sort of that there were more basic issues that really are involved in the whole thing than what we've been talking about.
110 Does your husband go to school too?
111 Does he really? And you'd feel uncomfortable at UMass.
112 You're blushing.
113 Um hum.
114 Um hum.
115 How segregated do you feel that he would feel if you were at Aurora, Illinois?
116 Um hum.
117 Yeah.
118 That might have been good.
119 How would he feel about uh you going back to Aurora?
120 Um hum.
121 He'd go along with it.
122 Right. You're smiling.
** 123 Why do you think that was funny?
124 Um hum.
* 125 Yet you can accept the fact that the oppositeness.
*** 126 You mentioned that you find security as, you know, part of a whole and you mentioned a whole as usually as small a small group and uh yet if you talk about knowing people and knowing them well, as I hear you talking now, it might not be that you'd find security in the same school that he was in.
127 And yet, talking now, I get the feeling of ambivalence, uh security but a little little anxious. Is that correct?
128 You have to make a decision and one that sticks.
129 Um hum.

130 Some knowledge about places.

131 You didn't experience that type of a counselor.

132 The counselor should provide information.

133 Um hum.

134 So to be helpful then a person should know not only some information about the alternatives that are available to make a decision on but should know about the person making the decision.

135 And just talking with a person, you feel sometimes, it's difficult to get to know them as well as if

136 Like you feel kind of nervous in in this office.

137 I thought toward the middle you were more relaxed than you have been for the last, maybe, seven minutes.

* 138 You can relax though in new situations with uh new people.

*** 139 So, in a big place it could be a little frightening because you don't know all the dimensions, it might be possible to find, uh, like UMass. It might be possible to find another individual, like in this situation, be it a counselor or colleague, you could, could talk with.

** 140 Why wouldn't a good engineer be an appropriate source of information?

141 But not much help about sociology.

142 Um hum.

143 Smith College, I guess, has one, University of Connecticut has one, Hartford, I guess, there are, you know, there are many available, so location, too, might have something to do with it.

144 Yet big cities don't seem to worry you too much.
It'd be kind of

The small town and the suburb gives more personal

interaction.

Like Northfield.

And this makes it safe to go out and explore a little bit.

Perhaps knowing the security of Greenfield Community
College uh is there and makes it possible to come down here and
Table D3
Counseling Session Number 3

** 1  What's uh, what's the next move, where's the next place?
2  Um hum.
3  Yeah, did you learn the language while you were there?
* 4  You could go back and uh learn the language.
5  One choice.
*** 6  Uh hum, yeah, you uh say you want to learn German, yet you also in the same sentence seem to say you regret having not learned German.
7  Um hum.
8  Um hum.
9  Yeah, that's right, it's the most enjoyable too probably.
10  Well then, you can take your German and go back to Germany and you'll put them back on your kind of course work at Greenfield, You have taken German there.
11  What possibility is there in the Air Force?
12  What about just going over there yourself?
13  Yeah.
14  Umm.
15  Um hum, well you you could work for a few years and then take off again.
16  Um hum.
17  Um hum.
18  And you finish up soon.
19 Yeah.
20 Um hum, well you can kind of see the value of it too, I would imagine having been out.
21 Um hum.
22 Um hum.
** 23 What uh what's your degree in, what subject?
24 Um hum.
25 Um hum.
26 Yeah.
27 Um hum.
*** 28 Um, you seem to have a a real broad interest yet you're saying here that you want to zero in on German.
* 29 You could uh, you could always teach German.
30 Um hum, you would prefer uh older.
31 Do you feel you have the background to to say, teach high school? Is this the age you're interested in?
32 Um hum.
33 Yeah, well you can teach it among friends.
34 Maybe you can expand it.
35 Um hum.
36 Um hum. What do you what do you think of this? You're having been in Germany and knowing the value possibly of reading the language, speaking the language, the grammar of the language, do you think this is good or bad?
37 Suffer, you say?
38 Yeah.
Um hum.

Oh that's right, you've just had finals, haven't you.

That might be a reason, huh.

Oh, I see.

Oh, really?

*** Yeah, you seem to have a real interest in German yet, you uh your attitudes, the way you talk here, it seems to have deteriorated a little bit.

Um hum.

Um hum.

** Well, what uh what have you done uh outside of class to uh, you know so you can increase this knowledge of of German?

Oh.

Um hum.

You could listen to these.

Um hum.

Yeah.

Yeah.

* You could apply for some kind of a scholarship.

Yeah.

Um hum.

That would be a problem.

Is that what you really want to do down deep, deeply?

Yeah.

Um hum.
Where have you planned on going, where is
Oh I see, you just take off.
Oh, good.
Um hum.
Oh, great. That's a rather adventuresome spirit.
That's great.
Um hum.

* Uh, you could travel around on your vacation.
Um hum.
That's a good education, going to all these places.
Um hum.
Yeah.

** What was the outcome? Did they ud did they let you go?
Um hum. Well they seem fairly understanding, anyway.
Um hum.
Yeah.

*** You said that us you us really enjoyed the uh German Class last year, and yet uh you us say here that you skipped it quite a bit.
The second semester.
Um hum.
Um hum.
Oh yeah.
Um hum.
Yeah.
Um hum.

Do you find you have to combat this kind of thing uh when people are a bit critical of women in service quite often?

Um hum.

Why uh why was this that you didn't tell them?

Oh, I see, well, you could always tell them that you've traveled abroad, approach it from that point-of-view.

Yeah.

You seem to uh, you know, to have these little white lies or whatever you call them, yet you also see uh the need for a real basic honesty too.

Um hum.

I bet it shocked him, didn't it?

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Yeah, it could work in the reverse way.

That's us that's that's interesting. Course indeed there's only one type of person that you do that to.

Oh, I see.

That was kind of a uh shock effect, it sounds like, from him, wasn't it. Wasn't he, was he shocked?

You're just kind of at a point now and waiting for the next door to open.

Um hum.

That's right, that's right.
Um hum. How uh how, you know, what's the longest journey you would take in an instance like that?

** 104 What sets off one of these, one of these trips like this?

* 105 You can uh you can take a trip by airplane as opposed to care when you can travel by some other means, you know, take long trips.

106 Um hum.

107 Um hum.

108 Um hum.

109 Um hum.

110 Um hum.

*** 111 You know, you say that you like to travel on a on a moment's notice yet you just said you want to be there on a certain schedule.

112 Um hum, what kind of mood you're in, too.

113 Why do you say that?

114 Um hum.

115 Oh, really?

116 Experiments.

117 Um hum. That's good. You really look for excitement then.

118 The challenge?

119 Well you seem to have the, you know, this idea for the broader concept you know, of honesty, and so on, and yet within that little narrow one you you take uh what mileage you can, is that right?

120 For the sake of adventure or
* 121 Oh, I see. You could, you can see the real value then in uh, you know even after the fact making sure that they know what you are.

** 122 What other types of adventuresome type things do you do?
123 Um hum.
124 Do you go on these walks like you do the uh, you know, traveling places in your car and so on?
125 Um hum.
126 That must be very pleasant, isn't it?
127 Yeah.
128 I'll bet. I'll bet. (laugh)
129 Well, when you go on these trips, do you talk to yourself?
130 Or or just on the walks or when?
131 Oh, you don't, do you?
132 Um hum.

*** 133 Um hum, yeah, well you uh you say you uh you have these small talks with yourself, you you're not really worried about it, or you don't seem worried about it.
134 Um hum.
135 What kind of answer are you looking for?
136 Yeah, you you think out loud?
137 Oh, did you?
138 Yeah.
139 Um hum.
140 Um hum.
141 Um hum. Why do you say you have a mental block towards it?
142 Um hum.

143 And what is that?

144 Yeah.

* 145 Well, you could uh take some uh easy courses to restore your confidence.

*** 146 Yous yous you say you're you're uh you're uh you have a kind of bad attitude toward it, yet the way it comes across to me you seem to really enjoy it by this saying that you like to do fractions and so on.

147 Um hum.

148 Um hum (garbled).

149 Um hum

150 Yeah.
APPENDIX E
Table El

Varimax Factor Matrix

Empathy Scale: Tape #1
Odd-numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Varimax Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item 1</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 2</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 3</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 4</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 5</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 6</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 7</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 8</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 9</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 10</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 11</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 12</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 13</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 14</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 15</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 16</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 17</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 18</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 19</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 20</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 21</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 22</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 23</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 24</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 25</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 26</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 27</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 28</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 29</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 30</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 31</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 32</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 33</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 34</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 35</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 36</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 37</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 38</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 39</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 40</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 41</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 42</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 43</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 44</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 45</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 46</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 47</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 48</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 49</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 50</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 51</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 52</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 53</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 54</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 55</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 56</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 57</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 58</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 59</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 60</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 61</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 62</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 63</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 64</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 65</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 66</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 67</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 68</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 69</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 70</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 71</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 72</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 73</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 74</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 75</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 76</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 77</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 78</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 79</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 80</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 81</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 82</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 83</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 84</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 85</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 86</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 87</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 88</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 89</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 90</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 91</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 92</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 93</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 94</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 95</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 96</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 97</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 98</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 99</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item 100</td>
<td>0.2340 0.2340 0.2340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E2

Varimax Factor Matrix
Empathy Scale: Tape #1
Even-numbered Items
Table E3

Varimax Factor Matrix
Empathy Scale: Tape #2
Odd-numbered Items
Table E4
Varimax Factor Matrix
Empathy Scale: Tape #2
Even-numbered Items
Table E5

Varimax Factor Matrix
Empathy Scale: Tape #3
Odd-numbered Items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matrix</th>
<th>Tape #3</th>
<th>Even-numbered Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4597</td>
<td>0.2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.3260</td>
<td>0.2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4393</td>
<td>0.2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.3260</td>
<td>0.2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4393</td>
<td>0.2200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.3260</td>
<td>0.2120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table E7

Varimax Factor Matrix
Positive Regard Scale: Tape #1
Odd-numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The table contains the factor loadings for each item on the Positive Regard Scale using odd-numbered items on Tape #1.
Table E8
Varimax Factor Matrix
Positive Regard Scale: Tape #1
Even-numbered Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor Score</th>
<th>Factor Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>-0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>-0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-0.24</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Factor scores are rounded to two decimal places.

Scale: Each item is scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RECOVERY</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.189 0</td>
<td>0.112 7</td>
<td>0.214 3</td>
<td>0.194 3</td>
<td>0.117 6</td>
<td>-0.074 0</td>
<td>-0.109 5</td>
<td>-0.307 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.121 9</td>
<td>0.071 2</td>
<td>0.117 9</td>
<td>0.118 7</td>
<td>0.337 4</td>
<td>0.053 8</td>
<td>0.057 4</td>
<td>0.114 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.054 9</td>
<td>0.039 9</td>
<td>0.031 9</td>
<td>0.158 1</td>
<td>0.081 3</td>
<td>0.026 8</td>
<td>0.053 7</td>
<td>0.154 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.024 7</td>
<td>0.013 2</td>
<td>0.024 7</td>
<td>0.124 6</td>
<td>0.049 9</td>
<td>0.046 2</td>
<td>0.030 6</td>
<td>0.044 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.124 8</td>
<td>0.091 6</td>
<td>0.376 8</td>
<td>0.048 2</td>
<td>0.151 9</td>
<td>0.048 5</td>
<td>0.072 8</td>
<td>0.212 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.209 8</td>
<td>0.091 5</td>
<td>0.345 1</td>
<td>0.136 3</td>
<td>0.132 4</td>
<td>0.283 3</td>
<td>0.083 1</td>
<td>0.308 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.092 4</td>
<td>0.173 3</td>
<td>0.543 2</td>
<td>0.021 8</td>
<td>0.124 8</td>
<td>0.010 3</td>
<td>0.033 2</td>
<td>0.189 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.105 4</td>
<td>0.567 5</td>
<td>0.372 4</td>
<td>0.172 6</td>
<td>0.161 5</td>
<td>0.061 5</td>
<td>0.353 4</td>
<td>0.310 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.014 2</td>
<td>0.340 3</td>
<td>0.297 2</td>
<td>0.278 3</td>
<td>0.288 1</td>
<td>0.077 2</td>
<td>0.034 0</td>
<td>0.001 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.053 4</td>
<td>0.225 7</td>
<td>0.815 4</td>
<td>0.027 8</td>
<td>0.130 5</td>
<td>0.057 2</td>
<td>0.017 0</td>
<td>0.151 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.531 2</td>
<td>0.227 0</td>
<td>0.634 2</td>
<td>0.048 1</td>
<td>0.029 1</td>
<td>0.102 5</td>
<td>0.013 8</td>
<td>0.069 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.146 4</td>
<td>0.035 3</td>
<td>0.180 4</td>
<td>0.926 3</td>
<td>0.033 1</td>
<td>0.084 0</td>
<td>0.009 4</td>
<td>0.048 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.009 4</td>
<td>0.037 0</td>
<td>0.160 9</td>
<td>0.070 2</td>
<td>0.035 9</td>
<td>0.051 4</td>
<td>0.271 0</td>
<td>0.229 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.256 2</td>
<td>0.101 6</td>
<td>0.331 9</td>
<td>0.102 6</td>
<td>0.079 5</td>
<td>0.135 1</td>
<td>0.075 1</td>
<td>0.040 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.307 2</td>
<td>0.257 1</td>
<td>0.782 2</td>
<td>0.198 7</td>
<td>0.137 8</td>
<td>0.261 8</td>
<td>0.123 5</td>
<td>0.152 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.298 2</td>
<td>0.257 1</td>
<td>0.782 2</td>
<td>0.198 7</td>
<td>0.137 8</td>
<td>0.261 8</td>
<td>0.123 5</td>
<td>0.152 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.059 3</td>
<td>0.359 5</td>
<td>0.307 0</td>
<td>0.187 2</td>
<td>0.124 8</td>
<td>0.092 1</td>
<td>0.028 6</td>
<td>0.140 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.297 2</td>
<td>0.070 3</td>
<td>0.319 2</td>
<td>0.136 0</td>
<td>0.070 4</td>
<td>0.100 9</td>
<td>0.004 5</td>
<td>0.014 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.509 2</td>
<td>0.377 7</td>
<td>0.149 6</td>
<td>0.305 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.285 2</td>
<td>0.062 5</td>
<td>0.097 0</td>
<td>0.036 0</td>
<td>0.099 2</td>
<td>0.027 1</td>
<td>0.127 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1396</td>
<td>-0.0058</td>
<td>0.1376</td>
<td>0.1474</td>
<td>-0.0549</td>
<td>-0.0139</td>
<td>0.2101</td>
<td>-0.0496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.0760</td>
<td>0.0398</td>
<td>0.2874</td>
<td>0.1339</td>
<td>-0.0969</td>
<td>-0.0836</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
<td>0.0979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0334</td>
<td>-0.3080</td>
<td>0.0468</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>0.1332</td>
<td>-0.0314</td>
<td>0.0027</td>
<td>0.0039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-0.1589</td>
<td>0.1300</td>
<td>0.3426</td>
<td>0.1073</td>
<td>0.0476</td>
<td>0.0372</td>
<td>0.0470</td>
<td>0.0050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1199</td>
<td>0.0066</td>
<td>0.1817</td>
<td>0.2031</td>
<td>-0.0954</td>
<td>0.0406</td>
<td>0.2096</td>
<td>0.0074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0687</td>
<td>0.1504</td>
<td>0.4123</td>
<td>0.1323</td>
<td>0.2762</td>
<td>0.2332</td>
<td>0.0034</td>
<td>0.2546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-0.0038</td>
<td>0.0621</td>
<td>0.2840</td>
<td>0.3395</td>
<td>0.3973</td>
<td>0.1325</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>0.2076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1245</td>
<td>0.0095</td>
<td>0.5228</td>
<td>0.3595</td>
<td>0.0928</td>
<td>0.3058</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>0.0874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1055</td>
<td>0.0205</td>
<td>0.5045</td>
<td>0.0748</td>
<td>0.3039</td>
<td>0.0051</td>
<td>0.0504</td>
<td>0.1039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.2827</td>
<td>-0.2829</td>
<td>0.5032</td>
<td>0.1750</td>
<td>0.1874</td>
<td>0.3709</td>
<td>0.0841</td>
<td>0.0031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1641</td>
<td>0.0792</td>
<td>0.0425</td>
<td>0.1781</td>
<td>0.3459</td>
<td>0.1124</td>
<td>0.0163</td>
<td>0.0040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.3514</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
<td>0.1055</td>
<td>0.0320</td>
<td>0.0928</td>
<td>0.2832</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
<td>0.0379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1835</td>
<td>-0.2544</td>
<td>0.5735</td>
<td>0.0711</td>
<td>0.0074</td>
<td>0.1717</td>
<td>0.0077</td>
<td>0.0315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.0787</td>
<td>-0.2146</td>
<td>0.5997</td>
<td>0.2837</td>
<td>0.0547</td>
<td>0.1985</td>
<td>0.0075</td>
<td>0.0138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0767</td>
<td>-0.2825</td>
<td>0.5976</td>
<td>0.1359</td>
<td>0.0136</td>
<td>0.2010</td>
<td>0.1118</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.3760</td>
<td>-0.2260</td>
<td>0.5936</td>
<td>0.2120</td>
<td>0.1857</td>
<td>0.1054</td>
<td>0.0294</td>
<td>-0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.0209</td>
<td>-0.5632</td>
<td>0.2642</td>
<td>0.0060</td>
<td>0.1840</td>
<td>0.1992</td>
<td>0.0070</td>
<td>0.0209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.2075</td>
<td>-0.6410</td>
<td>0.1705</td>
<td>0.0782</td>
<td>0.0223</td>
<td>0.0545</td>
<td>0.0044</td>
<td>0.0159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.1920</td>
<td>-0.2958</td>
<td>0.2271</td>
<td>0.2824</td>
<td>0.0526</td>
<td>0.1025</td>
<td>0.0067</td>
<td>0.0143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.1040</td>
<td>-0.1050</td>
<td>0.0650</td>
<td>0.0507</td>
<td>0.0037</td>
<td>0.1157</td>
<td>0.1040</td>
<td>0.1245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.3530</td>
<td>0.2857</td>
<td>0.3624</td>
<td>0.3526</td>
<td>0.0989</td>
<td>0.0579</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>0.2864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.6369</td>
<td>0.0782</td>
<td>0.3768</td>
<td>0.1992</td>
<td>0.1989</td>
<td>0.1524</td>
<td>0.0007</td>
<td>0.1290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.2045</td>
<td>0.0640</td>
<td>0.2374</td>
<td>0.2011</td>
<td>0.1172</td>
<td>0.0287</td>
<td>0.0997</td>
<td>0.1059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.1342</td>
<td>-0.0950</td>
<td>0.1408</td>
<td>0.0443</td>
<td>0.0035</td>
<td>0.0123</td>
<td>0.0987</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.3876</td>
<td>0.0438</td>
<td>0.3062</td>
<td>0.3305</td>
<td>0.1791</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
<td>0.0987</td>
<td>0.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.0294</td>
<td>0.0090</td>
<td>0.0164</td>
<td>0.0440</td>
<td>0.0455</td>
<td>0.2163</td>
<td>0.2133</td>
<td>0.0701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.3757</td>
<td>-0.3238</td>
<td>0.1079</td>
<td>0.1679</td>
<td>0.0659</td>
<td>0.0370</td>
<td>0.1152</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.2079</td>
<td>-0.2574</td>
<td>0.1679</td>
<td>0.1496</td>
<td>0.0049</td>
<td>0.2082</td>
<td>0.0497</td>
<td>0.3918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.3790</td>
<td>-0.3055</td>
<td>0.3974</td>
<td>0.1440</td>
<td>0.0455</td>
<td>0.2366</td>
<td>0.2133</td>
<td>0.0701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.5766</td>
<td>0.0132</td>
<td>0.2064</td>
<td>0.2064</td>
<td>0.0022</td>
<td>0.2495</td>
<td>0.0492</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.6391</td>
<td>0.0145</td>
<td>0.0802</td>
<td>0.1173</td>
<td>0.0086</td>
<td>0.0366</td>
<td>0.0036</td>
<td>0.0020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.5790</td>
<td>-0.1630</td>
<td>0.1989</td>
<td>0.1292</td>
<td>-0.0040</td>
<td>0.0294</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.4441</td>
<td>-0.0162</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>0.3651</td>
<td>-0.0076</td>
<td>0.0758</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.3496</td>
<td>0.0019</td>
<td>-0.0572</td>
<td>0.1360</td>
<td>0.0548</td>
<td>0.3651</td>
<td>-0.0076</td>
<td>0.0758</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.1396</td>
<td>-0.2863</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>0.0478</td>
<td>0.3156</td>
<td>0.1338</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
<td>0.0379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.4299</td>
<td>-0.1555</td>
<td>0.1841</td>
<td>0.0280</td>
<td>0.0296</td>
<td>0.1926</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.0765</td>
<td>-0.3928</td>
<td>0.1809</td>
<td>0.0390</td>
<td>0.0056</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.3939</td>
<td>-0.2529</td>
<td>0.2973</td>
<td>0.0398</td>
<td>0.0092</td>
<td>0.0054</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.4446</td>
<td>-0.0043</td>
<td>0.3107</td>
<td>0.1492</td>
<td>-0.0937</td>
<td>0.3726</td>
<td>-0.0961</td>
<td>0.1836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.3075</td>
<td>-0.2100</td>
<td>0.1418</td>
<td>0.3130</td>
<td>-0.2285</td>
<td>0.1357</td>
<td>-0.3198</td>
<td>0.0448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Positive Regard Scale: Tape #3</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>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.27940 0.05840 0.48127 -0.15097 0.15496 -0.02822 0.02694 0.03657</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.24349 0.17027 0.44067 0.01078 0.04904 -0.10376 0.05948 -0.07766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.34229 0.25610 0.26816 0.09952 -0.30518 -0.12576 -0.12375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.36903 0.07209 0.38164 0.34095 0.24343 -0.32670 0.04944 0.00293</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.21955 0.18723 0.52721 0.22048 -0.06072 0.01319 0.01534 0.02501</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.15445 0.17050 0.62291 0.12158 -0.02792 0.20664 0.05900 0.12571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.50501 0.00129 0.27044 0.31684 0.02693 -0.29518 0.02361 0.10024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.25985 0.14090 0.07254 0.34190 0.01978 -0.00722 -0.00421 -0.01439</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.00784 0.56254 0.33220 0.19405 -0.03644 0.00523 -0.00014 -0.26970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.11984 0.00115 0.37095 0.38741 0.00095 0.06627 0.00419 0.25741</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.39095 0.00210 0.14503 0.20503 0.11663 0.09889 0.21023 0.10720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.37046 0.24048 0.04680 0.16538 0.02177 0.02676 0.21114 0.05652</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.04440 0.27293 0.24703 0.19432 0.06355 0.04955 0.36764 0.17669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.25462 0.17985 0.16686 0.27519 0.03092 0.13716 0.16123 0.21941</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.13252 0.13194 0.16764 0.34029 0.15912 0.08265 -0.09330 -0.18766</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.12091 0.00471 0.50507 0.19277 -0.02127 -0.10213 0.15550 0.14644</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.26088 0.10484 0.29286 0.22743 0.08286 -0.00014 -0.04560 0.14270</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.22151 0.28388 0.42758 0.31795 0.07175 0.09398 0.18845 0.00445</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.19725 0.14495 0.65949 0.04449 0.39890 0.15193 0.00934 -0.00394</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.57081 0.10104 0.03131 0.09430 0.01110 0.16327 0.12074 0.03908</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.12749 0.00347 0.02978 0.07854 -0.03334 0.00467 0.00046 0.00720</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.13111 0.52136 0.16372 0.19467 0.37214 0.15494 0.19926 0.13443</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.09429 0.00845 0.32187 0.20382 0.29066 -0.14267 0.09927 0.04784</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.22645 0.14671 0.10529 0.32495 -0.03938 0.00496 0.00026 0.00093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.27371 0.17526 0.01081 0.09181 0.16157 0.01596 0.00520 0.10154</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.15745 0.03327 0.72021 0.11343 0.12915 -0.10354 0.10325 -0.15845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.04635 0.19466 0.24147 0.07084 0.21393 0.27191 0.29711 0.10071</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.30333 0.15971 0.29613 0.12445 0.20378 0.15322 0.15377 -0.00831</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.31948 0.32730 0.17118 0.60133 0.01642 0.02691 -0.30518</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.02133 0.14924 0.15402 0.12800 0.01518 0.00311 0.19015 0.40324</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.02745 0.04564 0.15042 0.06512 0.01071 0.04646 0.00093 0.00195</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.34935 0.22546 0.27211 0.03692 0.13466 -0.10374 -0.13717 -0.01583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.07191 0.10052 0.07456 0.10779 0.21055 -0.08001 0.05964 0.11173</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.05031 0.23850 0.26573 0.03148 0.27420 -0.00671 0.18242 0.04239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.27943 0.20994 0.23964 0.10088 0.15046 0.04165 0.04948 0.03449</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### VariMAX Factor Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Row/Col</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</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>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.13429</td>
<td>0.09505</td>
<td>0.06671</td>
<td>0.54864</td>
<td>0.03818</td>
<td>-0.03382</td>
<td>-0.08744</td>
<td>0.11730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.01520</td>
<td>0.25648</td>
<td>0.12305</td>
<td>0.45490</td>
<td>0.16851</td>
<td>-0.02246</td>
<td>0.00449</td>
<td>0.12227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-0.14940</td>
<td>0.00464</td>
<td>-0.61004</td>
<td>0.74549</td>
<td>0.03527</td>
<td>-0.16620</td>
<td>-0.00808</td>
<td>0.30101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.12833</td>
<td>0.07045</td>
<td>0.04616</td>
<td>0.59445</td>
<td>0.04253</td>
<td>-0.09488</td>
<td>-0.02109</td>
<td>0.00568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.02066</td>
<td>0.00401</td>
<td>0.04170</td>
<td>0.33204</td>
<td>0.01832</td>
<td>-0.00201</td>
<td>0.00904</td>
<td>0.13956</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.03366</td>
<td>0.11370</td>
<td>0.13185</td>
<td>0.21983</td>
<td>0.06186</td>
<td>0.27405</td>
<td>0.08985</td>
<td>0.32093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.02552</td>
<td>0.04506</td>
<td>0.21504</td>
<td>0.54808</td>
<td>0.10878</td>
<td>0.00669</td>
<td>0.37088</td>
<td>0.11826</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.24991</td>
<td>-0.04356</td>
<td>0.05944</td>
<td>0.67929</td>
<td>0.07276</td>
<td>-0.11158</td>
<td>-0.23844</td>
<td>0.07162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.21142</td>
<td>-0.00282</td>
<td>0.03101</td>
<td>0.40386</td>
<td>0.31887</td>
<td>-0.10213</td>
<td>-0.13432</td>
<td>0.00958</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-0.04650</td>
<td>-0.10371</td>
<td>0.17569</td>
<td>0.22091</td>
<td>0.05149</td>
<td>0.26308</td>
<td>0.00472</td>
<td>0.07041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.37394</td>
<td>0.07272</td>
<td>0.12194</td>
<td>0.44825</td>
<td>0.08513</td>
<td>0.10049</td>
<td>0.27074</td>
<td>0.03689</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.39305</td>
<td>0.09149</td>
<td>-0.19277</td>
<td>0.84068</td>
<td>0.07633</td>
<td>0.16143</td>
<td>0.30506</td>
<td>-0.12131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.00002</td>
<td>0.04480</td>
<td>0.29288</td>
<td>0.31878</td>
<td>0.52497</td>
<td>0.24568</td>
<td>0.06468</td>
<td>0.04998</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.10430</td>
<td>0.03597</td>
<td>0.57653</td>
<td>0.00046</td>
<td>0.08932</td>
<td>0.21170</td>
<td>0.07905</td>
<td>0.17850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.00459</td>
<td>0.12975</td>
<td>0.53250</td>
<td>0.09705</td>
<td>0.05326</td>
<td>0.00791</td>
<td>0.11707</td>
<td>-0.06474</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.24876</td>
<td>0.07270</td>
<td>0.01101</td>
<td>0.08977</td>
<td>0.07810</td>
<td>-0.12411</td>
<td>-0.02040</td>
<td>-0.12175</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.00174</td>
<td>0.25965</td>
<td>0.21272</td>
<td>0.02973</td>
<td>0.05576</td>
<td>0.21518</td>
<td>0.13884</td>
<td>-0.08742</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.17760</td>
<td>0.37014</td>
<td>0.22531</td>
<td>0.07051</td>
<td>0.04933</td>
<td>0.49797</td>
<td>0.08884</td>
<td>0.01097</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.36967</td>
<td>0.10123</td>
<td>0.15094</td>
<td>0.03187</td>
<td>0.07182</td>
<td>-0.18426</td>
<td>-0.16706</td>
<td>-0.37965</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.25667</td>
<td>0.09429</td>
<td>0.25750</td>
<td>0.01777</td>
<td>0.02959</td>
<td>0.20779</td>
<td>0.19092</td>
<td>0.04899</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.24910</td>
<td>0.14215</td>
<td>0.70714</td>
<td>0.17821</td>
<td>0.15990</td>
<td>-0.19977</td>
<td>0.00147</td>
<td>0.14347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.05750</td>
<td>0.14845</td>
<td>0.49714</td>
<td>0.32740</td>
<td>0.19252</td>
<td>0.29495</td>
<td>0.00786</td>
<td>0.07712</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.65573</td>
<td>0.02577</td>
<td>0.22059</td>
<td>0.22336</td>
<td>0.05287</td>
<td>0.20461</td>
<td>0.08133</td>
<td>0.03429</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.21164</td>
<td>0.11859</td>
<td>0.13585</td>
<td>0.23649</td>
<td>0.03860</td>
<td>0.32657</td>
<td>0.22853</td>
<td>0.33737</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.17594</td>
<td>0.13293</td>
<td>0.40978</td>
<td>0.23774</td>
<td>0.11764</td>
<td>0.02467</td>
<td>0.04894</td>
<td>0.02723</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.14789</td>
<td>0.22628</td>
<td>0.12306</td>
<td>0.32618</td>
<td>0.19762</td>
<td>0.26462</td>
<td>-0.02399</td>
<td>0.03141</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.05851</td>
<td>0.09540</td>
<td>0.70602</td>
<td>0.00866</td>
<td>0.17247</td>
<td>-0.03045</td>
<td>-0.04433</td>
<td>0.00041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.25233</td>
<td>0.23311</td>
<td>0.09182</td>
<td>0.33246</td>
<td>0.08435</td>
<td>0.32507</td>
<td>0.37665</td>
<td>0.02010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.08537</td>
<td>0.25147</td>
<td>0.25715</td>
<td>0.19037</td>
<td>0.02004</td>
<td>0.51430</td>
<td>0.10047</td>
<td>-0.00937</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.32499</td>
<td>0.08010</td>
<td>0.07952</td>
<td>0.07052</td>
<td>0.20126</td>
<td>-0.57034</td>
<td>0.21123</td>
<td>-0.04503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.29210</td>
<td>0.03707</td>
<td>0.27454</td>
<td>0.03240</td>
<td>0.20000</td>
<td>0.57034</td>
<td>0.21123</td>
<td>-0.04503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.03511</td>
<td>0.13114</td>
<td>0.07159</td>
<td>0.26534</td>
<td>0.11202</td>
<td>0.66667</td>
<td>0.37057</td>
<td>0.45064</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.30564</td>
<td>0.01954</td>
<td>0.36315</td>
<td>0.03469</td>
<td>0.03172</td>
<td>0.01266</td>
<td>0.19563</td>
<td>0.04135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.26731</td>
<td>0.02577</td>
<td>0.27551</td>
<td>0.17601</td>
<td>0.04378</td>
<td>0.34468</td>
<td>0.17453</td>
<td>0.04338</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.00257</td>
<td>0.13197</td>
<td>0.19764</td>
<td>0.08893</td>
<td>0.10941</td>
<td>0.17280</td>
<td>0.07292</td>
<td>0.00091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.03762</td>
<td>0.04318</td>
<td>0.18666</td>
<td>0.00278</td>
<td>0.33004</td>
<td>0.10825</td>
<td>0.22360</td>
<td>0.00041</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table represents the factor matrix obtained through the VariMAX rotation technique, with positive regard scale indicated by highlighted values. Even-numbered items are marked for specific analysis or comparison.
Table E13

Varimax Factor Matrix
Appropriate Response Scale: Tape #1
Odd-numbered Items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2094</td>
<td>0.0713</td>
<td>0.1768</td>
<td>0.0812</td>
<td>0.2527</td>
<td>0.0604</td>
<td>0.1887</td>
<td>0.0422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2516</td>
<td>0.1021</td>
<td>0.1501</td>
<td>0.0916</td>
<td>0.2336</td>
<td>0.0553</td>
<td>0.1795</td>
<td>0.0459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2033</td>
<td>0.0637</td>
<td>0.1675</td>
<td>0.0783</td>
<td>0.2224</td>
<td>0.0536</td>
<td>0.1837</td>
<td>0.0428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2020</td>
<td>0.0621</td>
<td>0.1659</td>
<td>0.0774</td>
<td>0.2213</td>
<td>0.0528</td>
<td>0.1826</td>
<td>0.0418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1745</td>
<td>0.0533</td>
<td>0.1470</td>
<td>0.0665</td>
<td>0.1968</td>
<td>0.0458</td>
<td>0.1696</td>
<td>0.0394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1706</td>
<td>0.0512</td>
<td>0.1436</td>
<td>0.0637</td>
<td>0.1926</td>
<td>0.0430</td>
<td>0.1665</td>
<td>0.0375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table E14

Varimax Factor Matrix

Appropriate Response Scale: Tape #1

Even-numbered Items
Table E15

Varimax Factor Matrix
Appropriate Response Scale: Tape #2
Odd-numbered Items
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate Response Scale: Tape #2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Even-numbered Items</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Varimax Factor Matrix</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0383</td>
<td>0.1237</td>
<td>0.1930</td>
<td>0.1112</td>
<td>0.1096</td>
<td>0.0137</td>
<td>0.0194</td>
<td>0.0071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.2284</td>
<td>0.1929</td>
<td>0.2132</td>
<td>0.1289</td>
<td>0.1630</td>
<td>0.0820</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td>0.2352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3486</td>
<td>0.3179</td>
<td>0.3464</td>
<td>0.2789</td>
<td>0.3150</td>
<td>0.1910</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
<td>0.2249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.4494</td>
<td>0.3957</td>
<td>0.4273</td>
<td>0.3618</td>
<td>0.4177</td>
<td>0.2689</td>
<td>0.0594</td>
<td>0.3789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.4230</td>
<td>0.3572</td>
<td>0.4021</td>
<td>0.3336</td>
<td>0.4110</td>
<td>0.2560</td>
<td>0.0579</td>
<td>0.3592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.2931</td>
<td>0.2450</td>
<td>0.2659</td>
<td>0.2160</td>
<td>0.2722</td>
<td>0.1650</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td>0.2304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2421</td>
<td>0.1813</td>
<td>0.2010</td>
<td>0.1519</td>
<td>0.2052</td>
<td>0.1360</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>0.1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2042</td>
<td>0.1421</td>
<td>0.1618</td>
<td>0.1219</td>
<td>0.1644</td>
<td>0.1054</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
<td>0.1757</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.2225</td>
<td>0.1811</td>
<td>0.2010</td>
<td>0.1519</td>
<td>0.2052</td>
<td>0.1360</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>0.1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1935</td>
<td>0.1520</td>
<td>0.1718</td>
<td>0.1327</td>
<td>0.1760</td>
<td>0.1170</td>
<td>0.0258</td>
<td>0.1863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.2042</td>
<td>0.1421</td>
<td>0.1618</td>
<td>0.1219</td>
<td>0.1644</td>
<td>0.1054</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
<td>0.1757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2421</td>
<td>0.1813</td>
<td>0.2010</td>
<td>0.1519</td>
<td>0.2052</td>
<td>0.1360</td>
<td>0.0269</td>
<td>0.1953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.2931</td>
<td>0.2450</td>
<td>0.2659</td>
<td>0.2160</td>
<td>0.2722</td>
<td>0.1650</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
<td>0.2304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.3486</td>
<td>0.3179</td>
<td>0.3464</td>
<td>0.2789</td>
<td>0.3150</td>
<td>0.1910</td>
<td>0.0403</td>
<td>0.2249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.4494</td>
<td>0.3957</td>
<td>0.4273</td>
<td>0.3618</td>
<td>0.4177</td>
<td>0.2689</td>
<td>0.0594</td>
<td>0.3789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.4230</td>
<td>0.3572</td>
<td>0.4021</td>
<td>0.3336</td>
<td>0.4110</td>
<td>0.2560</td>
<td>0.0579</td>
<td>0.3592</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Varimax Factor Matrix

**Odd-numbered Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriate Response Scale: Tape #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Varimax Factor Matrix

**Appropriate Response Scale: Tape 3**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1</td>
<td>0.1567</td>
<td>0.3546</td>
<td>0.2632</td>
<td>0.1187</td>
<td>0.1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 2</td>
<td>0.2469</td>
<td>0.3276</td>
<td>0.1213</td>
<td>0.2104</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 3</td>
<td>0.1786</td>
<td>0.2592</td>
<td>0.3027</td>
<td>0.1046</td>
<td>0.2912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Even-numbered Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1</td>
<td>0.1684</td>
<td>0.3597</td>
<td>0.2632</td>
<td>0.1187</td>
<td>0.1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 2</td>
<td>0.2469</td>
<td>0.3276</td>
<td>0.1213</td>
<td>0.2104</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 3</td>
<td>0.1786</td>
<td>0.2592</td>
<td>0.3027</td>
<td>0.1046</td>
<td>0.2912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Odd-numbered Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tape 1</td>
<td>0.1684</td>
<td>0.3597</td>
<td>0.2632</td>
<td>0.1187</td>
<td>0.1646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 2</td>
<td>0.2469</td>
<td>0.3276</td>
<td>0.1213</td>
<td>0.2104</td>
<td>0.0192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tape 3</td>
<td>0.1786</td>
<td>0.2592</td>
<td>0.3027</td>
<td>0.1046</td>
<td>0.2912</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F
Table F
Listing of Loaded Variables by Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F 1</td>
<td>Counseling Session Number 1 - Empathic Understanding Scale</td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 2</td>
<td>Counseling Session Number 2 - Empathic Understanding Scale</td>
<td>221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 3</td>
<td>Counseling Session Number 3 - Empathic Understanding Scale</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 4</td>
<td>Counseling Session Number 1 - Positive Regard Scale</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 5</td>
<td>Counseling Session Number 2 - Positive Regard Scale</td>
<td>248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 6</td>
<td>Counseling Session Number 3 - Positive Regard Scale</td>
<td>256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 7</td>
<td>Counseling Session Number 1 - Appropriate Response Scale</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 8</td>
<td>Counseling Session Number 2 - Appropriate Response Scale</td>
<td>275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F 9</td>
<td>Counseling Session Number 3 - Appropriate Response Scale</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table F1

**Counseling Session Number 1 -- Empathy Scale**

Odd numbered items (1-140)

**Factor Number 1
Reflection - Probe Response**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Item Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>145</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>I don't know if you were wrong. You felt that way. You felt like I'm not going to stay here and be wrong. You, I don't know if your feelings could be wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>.674***</td>
<td>And yet you say you have a situation like that, it's very easy to think about her and you be somebody other than you'd like to be but right here you think about her. You're still yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129</td>
<td>.665</td>
<td>But whereas, you're awfully afraid of having friends of the opposite sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>.629</td>
<td>I see and so college is different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>149</td>
<td>.615***</td>
<td>I still find it pretty difficult to believe, you keep saying you find it difficult to get along with people like this, and right here you're getting along very well.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>He might have said it. Let's assume he did say something like that...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>117</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>You're afraid she might get to like you very well too.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>You have to have people know that you're you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>Um hum, you can't be yourself on a date.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>Well, how do you feel about it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>.582</td>
<td>Um uh good. Do you feel that you have to be that much more sensitive, more secure to keep people away from so that you make sure that nobody associates with your sister?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>.581</td>
<td>I wonder if other things can become as easy as this after a while.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Um, so that she may not be getting along very well with her family. This might something you'd be concerned about.

And what if you'd stayed there.

You say you you trust certain kinds of people to speak to and yet you don't know me here.

Um hum, well that's probably true, true. But there are a lot of girls that go out on dates very regularly.

You're firmly committed to tell them to forget it, right?

Sounds like, like you were embarrassed to be in a situation like that.

Yet some people are able to do both in college.

That might be another way you might think. Are those the only two ways you could think?

I take it you have chosen to avoid him rather than to deal with him.

Um hum, I see, well you're from a big family too and yet in this situation you act completely different.

I see, when did you first find this thing out (garbled).

Do you feel that any possible relationship that your sister might have had would affect what you thought about other people's feelings toward you?

You're caught in a bind right here. Can you go out and feel good when you go home.

Whereas, you feel that your problem is a little different than her problem.

Is that good?
### Factor Number 2
**Minimal Social Stimuli**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.729</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>Yeah, um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.722</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.703</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>Which one?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.680</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.668</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.656</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.649</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.648</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.646</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>No shoes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.617</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.583</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.565</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.539</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>I wonder why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.514</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor Number 3
**Interrogation - Passive Understanding**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.674</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Um whereas in college what happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.671</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>I see, very good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.668</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>How do you feel about your ability to do it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.616</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.600</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>So there is a uh ray of light there somewhere.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It not being associated with the family.

The teachers felt uh you don't give me any problem I'll pass you on. Is this the idea.

Um hum. You find that's hurting your, the college level.

How are you doing at this point?

Um hum.

How is it so different?

What are you going to be doing next time you have to select courses for next semester?

Factor Number 4
Interrogative Prod

Do you feel that that the necking part of a date is always a part of it, you you there's no way to get around it?

What is there about a date?

I see.

How do you feel about people that you know that's middle class people going to college, not this other group you've talked about?

Find it kind of hard to break that habit of saying no I don't want to go out on a date.

Yeah.

Um hum. Are you concerned about it?

Factor Number 5
Ability Potential

You could have gone back to him five times.
Oh yes, I'll have to agree with you he was wrong. There was no reason for him to do that.

Do you like others to be mad?

But you could get mad.

They were all mad.

Um hum, and yet are you afraid of being wrong?

Factor Number 6
No interpretable factor

Factor Number 7
No interpretable factor
Even numbered items (2-150)

Factor Number 1
Interrogative Prod

.771 146 There's another way that you might might try handling something. Cause when you leave like that automatically what are you doing, you're saying I don't want to talk to you any more, even though I'm sure you do.

.702 * 144 Uh, would you be able to handle the situation?

.699 136 There are a lot of girls that don't necessarily go parking or if they do go parking they don't go out of their way for trouble. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).

.696 150 But you were out with a guy. I'm a guy.

.678 ** 142 What are some of the possible reactions he probably would have?

.675 148 Um hum. That way maybe, in the future if you run into situations like this, well what should I do, maybe I should think about it ahead of time. Maybe uh there's a way I could have handled things differently without sacrificing how I feel and still come out with some kind of a relationship along these lines.

.596 132 Did you feel that way when you came? Maybe that's one thing you might

.591 134 You think so?

.579 108 Um hum, first and what?

.575 ** 124 What things are different from what you do that are things that she does?

.548 140 Okay, this is a given. You're saying to him, now lookit, buster, we're going to be going out together, here are the lines, here's where we go and here's where we don't go.

.536 * 114 You can't live with somebody that that feels this way so strongly about other people.
.534 ** 40  What is it about your feelings to avoid.  Why do you choose to avoid rather than to?

.533  44  But why do you feel uncomfortable?  He was wrong.

.521  120  I see, so it wasn't a very long time before she started showing her colors then.

.515  50  Yeah, do you ever get mad when you're playing those things?

---

Factor Number 2
Minimal Social Stimuli

.745  58  Um hum.

.728  130  Um hum.

.715  86  Um hum.

.701  70  Um hum.

.683  80  Um hum.

.662  126  Yeah.

.626  90  Um hum.

.623  74  Oh, I see, this is something you just

.623  84  Um hum.

.581  138  Um hum.

.556  110  Um hum, and what do you do?

.550**  62  Oh, why's that?

.540  66  Um hum.  Are you having a good time here?

.530  12  Um hum.

.522 *  82  Um, um, you can't do things like that.
Oh, what do you mean?

What about the guys at the college?

She might, yeah.

Factor Number 3
Unstructure Invitation

And this is your major.

I see, so you can do it.

Did you have a good phys. ed. program in your high school?

Well, what do you feel you should do about it?

You don't feel good about that. What he's saying is right then. You do want to get away.

Very good.

Well you know it's, you may say something like that right there, but right here you seem to be uh.

And yet you seem to be able to hold yourself up.

Um hum.

Sounds to me that you feel you made it through high school more on personality rather than you know, sitting down.

Factor Number 4
Reflection - Probe

Yet you must be concerned to some degree just to mention it.

But why do you feel uncomfortable? He was wrong.
Um hum, but you feel uncomfortable and yet he's wrong.

You know you say you don't know what to talk about on a date, but right here is one person.

And yet, you don't feel good about not going on a date.

What about the guys at the college?

Factor Number 5
Interpretation - Understanding

I see, so it wasn't a very long time before she started showing her colors then.

You can't live with somebody that's that feels this way so strongly about other people.

And you feel that there's bound to be something more than meets the eye here.

Sounds to me that you feel you made it through high school more on personality rather than you know, sitting down.

You don't trust the situation very much either.

Factor Number 6
Interpretation - Understanding

Um, um.

And it's hard when you don't go out and talk, be outgoing.

There nobody knows of your sister.

Um hum.
Counseling Session Number 2 -- Empathic Understanding Scale

Odd numbered items (1-149)

Factor Number 1
Reflection - Probe

.722*** 139 So, in a big place it could be a little frightening because you don't know all the dimensions. It might be possible to find, uh, like UMass, it might be possible to find another individual, like in this situation, be it a counselor or colleague, you could, could talk with.

.696 137 I thought toward the middle you were more relaxed than you have been for the last, maybe, seven minutes.

.654 127 And yet, talking now, I get the feeling of ambivalence, uh security but a little little anxious. I is that correct?

.644 141 But not much help about sociology.

.629 * 125 Yet you can accept the fact that the oppositeness.

.625 145 It'd be kind of

.613 109 You know, somehow as we talk about the small school versus the large school and Greenfield versus Aurora I have the the feeling sort of that there were more basic issues that really are involved in the whole thing than what we've been talking about.

.609 135 And just talking with a person, you feel sometimes, it's difficult to get to know them as well as if

.596 143 Smith College, I guess, has one, University of Connecti- cut has one, Hartford, I guess, there are, you know, there are many available, so location, too, might have something to do with it.

.589*** 105 Well, uh I was thinking as you said that, uh you like people, and you like to know a lot about people and lot of different people and yet now you now you now what you're saying is that uh if there are too many people you seem to be insecure.
Why do you think that was funny?

Interaction.

How would you feel about say attending UMass if that would be the best decision?

And this makes it safe to go out and explore a little bit.

How segregated do you feel that he would feel if you were at Aurora, Illinois?

He'd go along with it.

And your security is a friend at the college that you go to or security is a roommate that you can go to the snack bar.

It's difficult to find security by yourself though.

Um hum.

Factor Number 2
Minimal Social Stimuli

- .767 37 Um hum.
- .723 33 Um hum.
- .701 77 Um hum.
- .699 47 Um hum.
- .691 15 Um hum.
- .674 53 Um hum.
- .674 57 Um hum.
- .672 117 Yeah.
- .653 133 Um hum.
- .643 107 Um hum.
Um hum.
Steep.
Um hum.
Um hum.
Um hum.
Um hum.
He'd go along with it.
Before you start majoring.

Factor Number 3
Unstructured Invitation

Do you have any questions?
Back to Aurora.
Well, basically this involves you and I just sitting down and chatting for about forty-five minutes. You can talk about anything you'd like.
So even though you say you feel uncomfortable in a large setting, you didn't feel uncomfortable uh say coming down here today or traveling out to Aurora or doing things of this type.
So you did enjoy Aurora.

Factor Number 4
Restating and Understanding

Difficult to concentrate.
You have to psych him out a little bit.
In social work.

Living on campus is a unique experience.

Right.

You had a little reconnaissance on the place before you ever went in.

Then you can build, then you feel safe and venture out and doing different things.

That's important.

That might be important then to get information as to what the requirements are for graduate work in social work.

And your security is a friend at the college that you go to or security is a roommate that you can go to the snack bar.

**Factor Number 5**

**Reflection - Probe**

You seem like you'd uh have some hesitancy about to a big school, yet now you now you seem to be very relaxed and happy and this is a big school.

Um hum. And sociology you think would give you the opportunity to prepare to do something constructive you thought.

**Factor Number 6**

No interpretable factor

**Factor Number 7**

No interpretable factor
Factor Number 8  
Ability Potential

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Potential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.346</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.528</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even Numbered items (2-150)

Factor Number 1
Interpretation - Understanding

.623 92 Have you found that going to college has helped you to be able to do this more so than high school?

.620 86 Involvement leads to security.

.578 90 Then it's better to be with one, two or three people you know well than than with a lot of people you don't know at all.

.543 94 But there should be some security in living at home.

.512 88 Different people find security in different ways.

Factor Number 2
Interrogative Prod

-.770 10 How long have you been in the east?

-.744 ** 12 Why did you decide on Aurora?

-.597 2 So if we begin now, we'd be through by eleven-thirty.

-.582 6 Um hum.

-.552 8 The uh the bigger environment frightening.

Factor Number 3
Minimal Social Stimuli

.769 98 Um hum.

.719 116 Um hum.

.709 108 Um hum.

.682 124 Um hum.

.671 120 Um hum.
Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

That might have been good.

Um hum.

Factor Number 4
Restating and Understanding

- .692 18 Knowing there was some security in terms of
- .671 16 Having a friend made it easier to go to.
- .524 30 You'd rather not try out a big one.
- .499 38 And if you're working within a section.

Factor Number 5
Unstructured Invitation

- .559 32 Parents like the idea of Aurora as well as you do.
- .510 28 Your friends in sociology?
- .460 ** 40 Yet if you didn't trans- back uh transfer back to Aurora, where would you?
- .458 *102 You could find, you could find your place in the social scheme of things.
And you feel you can succeed and be happy in sociology.

Um hum.

Earlier you said that you'd feel uncomfortable in a big setting with a lot of people and yet now now you say that you that you enjoy working with people.

Um hum.

Factor Number 6
Ability Potential

You can relax though in new situations with uh new people.

Perhaps knowing the security of Greenfield Community College uh is there and makes it possible to come down here and

So to be helpful then a person should know not only some information about the alternatives that are available to make a decision on but should know about the person making the decision.

Like Northfield.

The small town and the suburb gives more personal

Like you feel kind of nervous in in this office.

Yet big cities don't seem to worry you too much.

You mentioned that you find security as, you know, part of a whole and you mentioned a whole as usually as small group and uh yet if you talk about knowing people and knowing them well, as I hear you talking now, it might not be that you'd find security in the same school that he was in.

Why wouldn't a good engineer be an appropriate source of information?

You have to make a decision and one that sticks.
Factor Number 7
Interpretation - Understanding

.355  4  You know sometimes it's hard to figure out what to talk about right like that.

.348  44  So it's more important that you know what he wants than you know what you want.

.345*** 126  You mentioned that you find security as, you know, part of a whole and you mentioned a whole as usually as small as a small group and uh yet if you talk about knowing people and knowing them well, as I hear you talking now, it might not be that you'd find security in the same school that he was in.

.306 ** 40  Yet if you didn't trans- back uh transfer back to Aurora, uh where would you?

Factor Number 8
Interpretation and Clarification

.460  74  And you are learning too when you get the grades in order.

.459  144  Yet big cities don't seem to worry you too much.

.433  80  Like talking to roommates, uh being with

.419  70  Everybody.

.396 ** 64  What do you feel is your major difficulty or major trouble in college?

.394  54  Could you see where a foreign language would be important in social work?

.394  82  Yet in a small college.

.392  52  Have you found that to be true?

.385  72  And so the system built this type of orientation.
Table F 3

Counseling Session Number 3 -- Empathic Understanding Scale

Odd numbered items (1-149)

Factor Number 1
Minimal Social Stimuli

| .803 | 27   | Um hum.               |
| .774 | 21   | Um hum.               |
| .750 | 25   | Um hum.               |
| .747 | 19   | Yeah.                 |
| .746 | 75   | Um hum.               |
| .729 | 35   | Um hum.               |
| .704 | 17   | Um hum.               |
| .680 | 55   | Yeah.                 |
| .649 | 43   | Oh, really?           |
| .634 | 45   | Um hum.               |
| .620 | 39   | Um hum.               |
| .611 | 95   | Um hum.               |
| .598 | 91   | Um hum.               |
| .594 | 107  | Um hum.               |
| .591 | 49   | Um hum.               |
| .588 | 139  | Um hum.               |
| .584 | 13   | Yeah.                 |
Um hum. Yeah.
Um hum. Um hum.
Um hum. Um hum.
Um hum. Yeah.
Um hum. Yeah.
Um hum. Um hum.
Um hum. Um hum.
Um hum. Well you you could work for a few years and then take off again.

Factor Number 2
Reflection - Probe

Um hum, yeah. Well you uh you say you uh you have these small talks with yourself, you you're not really worried about it, or you don't seem worried about it.

Well, when you go on these trips, do you talk to yourself?

Um hum. That's good. You really look for excitement then.

Well, you could uh take some uh easy courses to restore your confidence.

You can uh you can take a trip by airplane as opposed to car where you can travel by some other means, you know, take long trips.
What kind of answer are you looking for?

That's uh that's that's interesting, course indeed there's only one type of person that you do that to.

That was kind of a uh shock effect, it sounds like, from him, wasn't it. Wasn't he, was he shocked?

Um hum.

Oh, you don't, do you?

Um hum. Why do you say you have a mental block towards it?

Yeah.

Um hum.

And what is that?

Well you seem to have the, you know, this idea for the broader concept you know, of honesty, and so on, and yet within that little narrow one you you take uh what mileage you can, is that right?

Um hum.

Um hum.

Oh, did you?

Why do you say that?

You know, you say that you like to travel on a moments notice yet you just said you want to be there on a certain schedule.

Um hum. How uh how, you know, what's the longest journey you would take in an instance like that?

Um hum.

Oh, really?
Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

What was the outcome? Did they uh did they let you go?

Factor Number 3
Active Agreement

Yeah, that's right, it's the most enjoyable too probably.

One choice.

Yeah, did you learn the language while you were there.

Yeah.

What's uh, what's the next move, where's the next place?

What possibility is there in the Air Force?

Factor Number 4
Interrogative Prod

You said that uh you uh really enjoyed the uh German class last year, and yet uh you uh say here that you skipped it quite a bit.

Do you find you have to combat this kind of thing uh when people are a bit critical of women in service quite often?

Oh yeah.

Why uh why was this that you didn't tell them?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number</th>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Active Agreement</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>-.591</td>
<td>Where have you planned on going, where is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>-.499</td>
<td>Oh, Great. That's a rather adventuresome spirit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>-.451</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-.429</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>No interpretable factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No interpretable factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>No interpretable factor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even numbered items (2-150)

Factor Number 1
Active Agreement

.771  136  Yeah, you you think out loud?

.723  140  Um hum.

.653  150  Yeah.

.651  138  Yeah.

.649  118  The challenge?

.648  132  Um hum.

.643  126  That must be very pleasant, isn't it?

.621  116  Experiments.

.619  130  Or or just on the walks or when?

.615  148  Um hum (garbled).

.612  144  Yeah.

.610  142  Um hum.

.605 ** 122  What other types of adventurous type things do you do?

.602  128  I'll bet. I'll bet. (laugh)

.600  120  For the sake of adventure or

.577  134  Um hum.

.575  98  Oh, I see.

.574  124  Do you go on these walks like you do the uh, you know, traveling places in your car and so on?

.563  110  Um hum.
You're just kind of at a point now and waiting for the next door to open.

Um hum, what kind of mood you're in, too.

Um hum.

Yeah, it could work in the reverse way.

I bet it shocked him, didn't it?

Yous yours you say you're you're uh you're uh you have a kind of bad attitude toward it, yet the way it comes across to me you seem to really enjoy it by this saying that you like to do fractions and so on

Um hum.

Um hum.

That's great.

Factor Number 2
Reflection - Probe

The second semester.

You seem to uh, you know, to have these little white lies or whatever you call them, yet you also see uh the need for a real basic honesty too.

Um, you seem to have a a real broad interest yet you're saying here that you want to zero in on German.

Yeah, you you seem to have a real interest in German yet, you uh your attitudes, the way you talk here, it seems to have deteriorated a little bit.

Um hum. What do you what do you think of this? Your having been in Germany and knowing the value possibly of reading the language. Speaking the language, the grammar of the language, do you think this is good or bad?
You could apply for some kind of a scholarship.

Yous you say you're uh you have a kind of bad attitude toward it, yet the way it comes across to me you seem to really enjoy it by this saying that you like to do fractions and so on

Factor Number 3
Minimal Social Stimuli

| .786 | 46 | Um hum. |
| .785 | 32 | Um hum. |
| .725 | 24 | Um hum. |
| .707 | 22 | Um hum. |
| .698 | 42 | Oh, I see. |
| .695 | 38 | Yeah. |
| .679 | 86 | Um hum. |
| .667 | 14 | Umm. |
| .666 | 72 | Yeah. |
| .661 | 76 | Yeah. |
| .650 | 8  | Um hum. |
| .648 | 106| Um hum. |
| .626 | 80 | Um hum. |
| .613 | 56 | Um hum. |
| .612 | 84 | Um hum. |
| .611 | 108| Um hum. |
| .597 | 16 | Um hum. |
Um hum.

Um hum. Well they seem fairly understanding, anyway.

Um hum.

Oh.

You could listen to these.

Um hum, you would prefer uh older.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.
Factor Number 6
Minimal Social Stimuli

.362  82  Um hum.
.360  86  Um hum.
.307  88  Oh, I see. Well, you could always tell them that you've traveled abroad, approach it from that point-of-view.
.292 ** 104  What sets off one of these, one of these trips like this?

Factor Number 7
No interpretable factor

Factor Number 8
Ability Potential

.664  10  Well then, you can take your German and go back to Germany and you'll put them back on your kind of course work at Greenfield. You have taken German there.
.588 *  4  You could go back and uh learn the language.
.552  16  Um hum.
.530  18  And you finish up soon.
Table F.4

Counseling Session Number 1 -- Positive Regard Scale

Odd numbered items (1-149)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number 1 Reflection - Probe</th>
<th>.739*** 99</th>
<th>And yet you say you have a situation like that, it's very easy to think about her and you be somebody other than you'd like to be but right here you think about her. You're still yourself.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.686 129</td>
<td>But whereas, you're awfully afraid of having friends of the opposite sex.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.670 91</td>
<td>Um uh good, do you feel that you have to be that much more sensitive. More secure to keep people away from so that you make sure that nobody associates with your sister?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.668 145</td>
<td>I don't know if you were wrong. You felt that way, you felt like I'm not going to stay here and be wrong, you, I don't know if your feelings could be wrong.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.646 93</td>
<td>You have to have people know that you're you.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.607 * 97</td>
<td>Um hum. You can't be yourself on a date.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.602 89</td>
<td>I wonder if other things can become as easy as this after a while.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.584 137</td>
<td>You're caught in a bind right here. Can you go out and feel good when you go home.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.560 95</td>
<td>I see and so college is different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.557 109</td>
<td>Yet some people some people are able to do both in college.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.547 39</td>
<td>I take it you have chosen to avoid him rather than to deal with him.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.507 *** 123</td>
<td>Um hum. I see, well you're from a big family too and yet in this situation you act completely different.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
.504 147  Well, how do you feel about it?

Factor Number 2
Minimal Social Stimuli

.751 121  Yeah, um hum.
.741 103  Um hum.
.737  35  Um hum.
.729 131  Um hum.
.716  79  Um hum.
.714  51  Um hum.
.704  81  Um hum.
.646  55  Um hum.
.632  27  Um hum.
.591 125  Um hum.
.581  57  I wonder why?
.580  75  Yeah.
.557 115  Which one?
.548  13  Um hum.
.543 107  Um hum.

Factor Number 3
Ability Potential

-.730  49  Do you like others to be mad?
-.626  59  Um hum, are you concerned about it?
Um, so that she may not be getting along very well with her family. This might something you'd be concerned about.

They were all mad.

You could have gone back to him five times.

Oh yes, I'll have to agree with you he was wrong. There was no reason for him to do that.

But you could get mad.

You could have had dates in high school.

Factor Number 4

Interrogation - Passive Understanding

How are you doing at this point?

I see, very good.

Um hum.

Um hum. You find that's hurting your, the college level.

Factor Number 5

Minimal Interrogation

No shoes.

Which one?

Is that good?
Factor Number 6
Interrogative Prod

- .617 143 He might have said it. Let's assume he did say something like that.

- .568 141 And what if if you'd stayed there?

- .521 147 Well, how do you feel about it?

Factor Number 7
Interrogative Prod

- .672 73 Do you feel that that that the necking part of a date is always a part of it, you you there's no way to get around it?

- .508 **83 How do you feel about people that you know that's middle class people going to college, not this other group you've talked about?

- .487 77 Find it kind of hard to break that habit of saying no I don't want to go out on a date?

- .462 71 Sounds like, like you were embarrassed to be in a situation like that.

- .412 119 I see, when did you first find this thing out (garbled).

Factor Number 8

No interpretable factor
Even numbered items  (2-150)

Factor Number 1
Interpretation and Advising

.704 128 She's got a problem where she's got friends but they're the wrong sex.

.692 146 There's another way that you might might try handling something. Cause when you leave like that automatically what are you doing, you're saying I don't want to talk to you any more, even though I'm sure you do.

.638 148 Um hum. That way maybe. In the future if you run into situations like this, well what should I do, maybe I should think about it ahead of time. Maybe uh there's a way I could have handled things differently without sacrificing how I feel and still come out with some kind of a relationship along these lines.

.624 150 But you were out with a guy. I'm a guy.

.592 94 And it's hard when you don't go out and talk, be outgoing.

.571 * 144 Uh, would you be able to handle the situation?

.564 136 There are a lot of girls at don't necessarily go parking or or if they do go parking they don't go out of their way for trouble. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).

.543 88 But if you don't have that guitar, you find it hard to stand up in front of people and talk. You find it very uncomfortable to to be with other people in situations that that most other people find comfortable.

.527 98 If you could only be yourself on a date without thinking of her.

.520 140 Okay, this is a given. You're saying to him, now lookit buster, we're going to be going out together, here are the lines, here's where we go, and here's where we don't go.

.507 ** 124 What things are different from what you do that are things that she does?
### Factor Number 2
**Interrogative Prod**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>.469</th>
<th>106</th>
<th>Do you find this is hard to live in the city after you lived in the country?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.460</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>And you feel that there's bound to be something more than meets the eye here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.455</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Oh it's just the money aspect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.441 *</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Can you do it financially?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.436</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>And yet, does this happen with all the other people up there or just you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.426</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>And yet you seem to be able to hold yourself up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.400</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Tell me.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Factor Number 3
**Minimal Social Stimuli**

| .725  | 80    | Um hum.                                                                     |
| .714  | 126   | Yeah.                                                                       |
| .709  | 138   | Um hum.                                                                     |
| .696  | 58    | Um hum.                                                                     |
| .688  | 86    | Um hum.                                                                     |
| .666  | 130   | Um hum, um hum.                                                             |
| .665  | 70    | Um hum.                                                                     |
| .633  | 90    | Um hum.                                                                     |
| .623  | 72    | Oh, what do you mean?                                                       |
| .511  | 118   | She might, yeah.                                                            |
Factor Number 4

No interpretable factor

Factor Number 5
Interrogative Prod

- .598 14  And this is your major.
- .583 30  Do you have any idea what it is that you fear?
- .561 16  Did you have a good phys. ed. program in your high school?
- .515 ** 10  Well, what do you feel you should do about it?

Factor Number 6
Unstructured Invitation

- .694 48  You like others.
- .623 *** 68  You know you say you don't know what to talk about on a date, but right here is one person.
- .564 * 82  Um, um, you can't do things like that.
- .559 56  Just you?
- .538 60  Yet you must be concerned to some degree just to mention it.
- .516 42  Um hum, but you feel uncomfortable and yet he's wrong.
- .511 74  Oh, I see, this is something you just

Factor Number 7
Interrogative Prod

- .543 ** 40  What is it about your feelings to avoid. Why do you choose to avoid rather than to?
- .414 ** 100  How do you feel, how do you feel right now?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number 8</th>
<th>Assertive Reacting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.419</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>There are</strong> a lot of girls that don't necessarily go parking or if they do go parking they don't go out of their way for trouble. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.391</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>And you feel that there's bound to be something more than meets the eye here.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.386</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>You know, it seems that there's always somebody in every one of our lives that are always going to make us feel uncomfortable.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.344</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>She might, yeah.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F 5

Counseling Session Number 2 -- Positive Regard Scale

Odd numbered items (1-149)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number</th>
<th>Reflection - Probe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.640 99</td>
<td>Then you can build, then you feel safe and venture out and doing different things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.640 149</td>
<td>And this makes it safe to go out and explore a little bit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.638 89</td>
<td>It's difficult to find security by yourself though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.634 135</td>
<td>And just talking with a person, you feel sometimes, it's difficult to get to know them as well as if</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.604*** 139</td>
<td>So, in a big place it could be a little frightening because you don't know all the dimensions. It might be possible to find, uh, like UMass, it might be possible to find another individual, like in this situation. Be it a counselor or colleague, you could, could talk with.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.589 109</td>
<td>You know, somehow as we talk about the small school versus the large school and Greenfield versus Aurora I have the feeling sort of that there were more basic issues that really are involved in the whole thing than what we've been talking about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.585 67</td>
<td>Well, this interest in people. Then you probably have many friends on the college campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.583 115</td>
<td>How segregated do you feel that he would feel if you were at Aurora, Illinois?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.564*** 105</td>
<td>Well, uh I was thinking as you said that, uh you like people, and you like to know a lot about people and lot of different people and yet now you now you now what you're saying is that uh if there are too many people you seem to be insecure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.556 131</td>
<td>You didn't experience that type of a counselor.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You seem like you'd uh have some hesitancy about to a big school, yet now you seem to be very relaxed and happy and this is a big school.

I thought toward the middle you were more relaxed than you have been for the last, maybe, seven minutes.

But different

And yet, talking now, I get the feeling of ambivalence, uh security but a little anxious. Is that correct?

And you security is a friend at the college that you go to or security is a roommate that you can go to the snack bar.

Factor Number 2
Minimal Social Stimuli

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Your French.
Right.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Factor Number 3
Active Interpretation - Passive Understanding

You had a little reconnaissance on the place before you ever went in.

So you did enjoy Aurora.

Before you start majoring.

Um hum. And sociology you think would give you the opportunity to prepare to do something constructive you thought.

You have to psych him out a little bit.

And you found some teachers at Aurora that were helpful.

Factor Number 4
Interrogative Prod

How would you feel about say attending UMass if that would be the best decision?

You learn with social activities as well.

I was wondering, how would you use sociology if you if you majored in it?

Factor Number 5

No interpretable factor
Factor Number 6

No interpretable factor

Factor Number 7
Passive Understanding - Active Interpretation

- .362  111  Does he really? And you'd feel uncomfortable at UMass.
- .331  117    Yeah.
- .310    73    Um hum.
- .309   133    Um hum.
- .303   141    But not much help about sociology.

Factor Number 8

No interpretable factor
Then it's better to be with one, two or three people you know well than than with a lot of people you don't know at all.

Perhaps knowing the security of Greenfield Community College uh is there and makes it possible to come down here and

Different people find security in different ways.

You can relax though in new situations with uh new people.

Yet big cities don't seem to worry you too much.

So to be helpful then a person should know not only some information about the alternatives that are available to make a decision on but should know about the person making the decision.

You have to make a decision and one that sticks.

The small town and the suburb gives more personal

Could it be there's a conflict between independence on the one hand and security on the other?

But there should be some security in living at home.

Like Northfield.

Like you feel kind of nervous in in this office.

Some knowledge about places.

You can be happy and satisfied in relatively simple social activities.

So it's more important that you know what he wants than you know what you want.
The counselor should provide information.

Why wouldn't a good engineer be an appropriate source of information?

You mentioned that you find security as, you know, part of a whole and you mentioned a whole as usually as small a small group and uh yet if you talk about knowing people and knowing them well, as I hear you talking now, it might not be that you'd find security in the same school that he was in.

Involvement leads to security.

Factor Number 2
Minimal Social Stimuli

-.808 116 Um hum.
-.750 76 Um hum.
-.707 120 Um hum.
-.706 108 Um hum.
-.690 56 Um hum.
-.686 98 Um hum.
-.669 48 Um hum.
-.669 106 Um hum.
-.646 142 Um hum.
-.641 36 Um hum.
-.601 124 Um hum.
-.565 34 Um hum.
-.543 104 Um hum.
-.521 14 Um hum.
-.511 114 Um hum.
Factor Number 3  
Restating and Understanding

.589  28  Your friends in sociology?

.567  26  The lonely crowd concept.

.567  30  You'd rather not try out a big one.

.552  16  Having a friend made it easier to go to.

.540  20  And yet you came back to Greenfield.

.508  18  Knowing there was some security in terms of

Factor Number 4  
Interrogative Prod

.631  78  You learn with social activities too.

.626  80  Like talking to roommates, uh being with

.599  92  Have you found that going to college has helped you to be able to do this more so than high school?

.550 ** 40  Yet if you didn't trans- back uh transfer back to Aurora, uh where would you?

Factor Number 5  
Unstructured Invitation

-.580  4  You know sometimes it's hard to figure out what to talk about right like that.

-.565  2  So if we begin now, we'd be through by eleven-thirty.

Factor Number 6

No interpretable factor
Factor Number 7

No interpretable factor

Factor Number 8
Interrogative Prod

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- .489</td>
<td>10       How long have you been in the east?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- .391</td>
<td>52       Have you found that to be true?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- .327</td>
<td>42       You don't think you'd be known at UMass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- .310</td>
<td>134      So to be helpful then a person should know not only some information about the alternatives that are available to make a decision on but should know about the person making the decision.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- .303</td>
<td>124      Um hum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F.6

Counseling Session Number 3 -- Positive Regard Scale

Odd Numbered Items (1-149)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number 1</th>
<th>Minimal Social Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.775 75</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.758 83</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.747 45</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.724 91</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.711 69</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.706 55</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.702 79</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.694 95</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.670 109</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.667 43</td>
<td>Oh, really?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.666 59</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.650 89</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.649 139</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.648 101</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.642 53</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.642 67</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.638 149</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.633 17</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Um hum.

Um hum.

Oh yeah.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Factor Number 2
Reflection - Probe

Um hum, yeah, well you uh you say you uh you have these small talks with yourself, you you're not really worried about it, or you don't seem worried about it.

Well you seem to have the, you know, this idea for the broader concept you know, of honesty, and so on, and yet within that little narrow one you you take uh what mileage you can, is that right?
That's uh that's that's interesting. Course indeed there's only one type of person that you you do that to.

Oh, I see. You could, you can see the real value then in uh, you know even after the fact making sure that they know what you are.

What kind of answer are you looking for?

Well, when you go on these trips, do you talk to yourself?

You know, you say that you like to travel on a on a moments notice yet you just said you want to be there on a certain schedule.

Um hum.

Um hum. How uh how, you know, what's the longest journey you would take in an instance like that?

Um hum. Why do you say you have a mental block towards it?

Why do you say that?

Um hum.

Yeah.

Well, what uh what have you done uh outside of class to uh, you know, so you can increase this knowledge of of German?

Um hum, that's good. You really look for excitement then.

That was kind of a uh shock effect, it sounds like, from him, wasn't it. Wasn't he, was he shocked?

Oh, you don't do you?
Factor Number 3  
Active Agreement

.666  3  Yeah, did you learn the language while you were there?
.628  11  What possibility is there in the Air Force?
.572  9  Yeah, that's right, it's the most enjoyable too probably.
.541** 1  What's uh, what's the next move, where's the next place?
.526  5  One choice.

Factor Number 4  
Ability Potential

.680*  29  You could uh, you could always teach German.
.638  33  Yeah, well you can teach it among friends.
.634  15  Um hum, well you could work for a few years and then take off again.
.616*  145  Well, you could uh take some uh easy courses to restore your confidence.
.465*  105  You can uh you can take a trip by airplane as opposed to car where you can travel by some other means, you know, take long trips.

Factor Number 5  
Active Agreement

.608  61  Where have you planned on going, where is
.465  65  Oh, great. That's a rather adventuresome spirit.
.431  103  Um hum, now uh now, you know, what's the longest journey you would take in an instance like that?
.409  63  Oh, good.
### Factor Number 6
Unstructured Invitation

| .462 | 93 | Um hum. |
| .326 | 7  | Um hum. |
| .303 | 31 | Do you feel you have the background to to say, teach high school? Is this the age you're interested in? |
| .301 | 5  | One choice. |

### Factor Number 7
Interrogative Prod (Activity-Centered)

| .455 | 113 | Why do you say that? |
| .409 | **73 | What was the outcome? Did they uh did they let you go? |
| .355 | **87 | Why uh why was this that you didn't tell them? |
| .347 | 25  | Um hum. |
| .333 | **47 | Well, what uh what have you done uh outside of class to uh, you know, so you can increase this knowledge of of German? |

### Factor Number 8

No interpretable factor
Even Numbered Items  (2-150)

Factor Number 1  
Minimal Social Stimuli

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.671</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.657</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.620</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.602</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.541</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.539</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.529</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.525</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.512</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Number 2  
Unstructured Invitation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.714***</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>Yous yous you say you're you're uh you're uh you have a kind of bad attitude toward it, yet the way it comes across to me you seem to really enjoy it by this saying that you like to do fractions and so on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.644</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>Do you go on these walks like you do the uh, you know, traveling places in your car and so on?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.587</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>For the sake of adventure or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.583</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>Or or just on the walks or when?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.544</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>Yeah, you you think out loud?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.534**</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>What other types of ad- adventuresome type things do you do?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The challenge?

Yeah, it could work in the reverse way.

Factor Number 3
Ability Potential

- .706 * 54 You could apply for some kind of a scholarship.
- .638 * 68 Uh, you could travel around on your vacation.
- .608 78 The second se-semester.
- .605 50 You could listen to these.
- .576*** 28 Um, you seem to have a real broad interest yet you're saying here that you want to zero in on German.
- .570 20 Um hum, well you can kind of see the value of it too, I would imagine, having been out.
- .559 * 88 Oh, I see. Well, you could always tell them that you've traveled abroad, approach it from that point-of-view.
- .532 30 Um hum, you would prefer uh older.
- .471 *** 44 Yeah, you you seem to have a real interest in German yet, you uh your attitudes, the way you talk here, it seems to have deteriorated a little bit.

Factor Number 4
Minimal Social Stimuli

.692 32 Um hum.
.672 16 Um hum.
.643 24 Um hum.
.619 38 Yeah.
Factor Number 5
Passive Understanding - Active Interpretation

Factor Number 6
Assertive Reacting

Fact Factor Number 7
Minimal Social Stimuli
Factor Number 8
Reflection - Probe

.319 *** 6  Um hum, yeah, you uh say you want to learn German, yet you also in the same sentence seem to say you regret having not learned German.

.410 *** 90  You se- you seem to uh, you know, to have these little white lies or whatever you call them, yet you also see uh the need for a real basic honesty too.
Table F 7

Counseling Session Number 1 -- Appropriate Response Scale

Odd Numbered Items (1-149)

Factor Number 1
Reflection - Probe

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.703</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>I don't know if you were wrong, you felt that way, you felt like I'm not going to stay here and be wrong, you, I don't know if your feelings could be wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.701</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Whereas, you feel that your problem is a little different than her problem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.695</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>But whereas, you're awfully afraid of having friends of the opposite sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.678</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>You're firmly committed to tell them to forget it, right?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.674</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>I wonder if other things can become as easy as this after a while.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.673</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Um uh good, do you feel that you have to be that much more sensitive, more secure to keep people away from so that you make sure that nobody associates with your sister?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.668 ***</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>And yet you say you have a situation like that, it's very easy to think about her and you be somebody other than you'd like to be but right here you think about her, you're still yourself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.666</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>That might be another way you might think. Are those the only two ways you could think?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.666</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>He might have said it. Let's assume he did say something like that.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.651</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>I see and so college is different.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.647</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>You have to have people know that you're you.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
And what if you'd stayed there.

You're afraid she might get to like you very well too.

Um hum, well that's probably true, true. But there are a lot of girls that go out on dates very regularly.

I take it you have chosen to avoid him rather than to deal with him.

Um hum, I see, well you're from a big family too and yet in this situation you act completely different.

I still find it pretty difficult to believe, you keep saying you find it difficult to get along with people like this, and right here you're getting along very well.

Find it kind of hard to break that habit of saying no I don't want to go out on a date.

You say you you trust certain kinds of people to speak to and yet you don't know me here.

Sounds like, like you were embarrassed to be in a situation like that.

Do you feel that any possible relationship that your sister might have had would affect what you thought about other people's feelings toward you?

Yet some people some people are able to do both in college.

You could have had dates in high school.

I see. When did you first find this thing out (garbled).

Factor Number 2
Minimal Social Stimuli

Um hum.

Um hum.
Factor Number 3  
Interrogation - Passive Understanding

.629   19 How do you feel about your ability to do it?
.607 ** 23 How are you doing at this point?
.587   25 How is it so different?
.575   29 That's important. You don't agree with the sociology teacher.
.516   21 The teachers felt uh you don't give me any problem I'll pass you on. Is this the idea.
Factor Number 4
Ability Potential

.639 * 45  You could have gone back to him five times.
.606 49  Do you like others to be mad?
.554 43  Oh yes, I'll have to agree with you he was wrong. There was no reason for him to do that.

Factor Number 5

No interpretable factor

Factor Number 6
Unstructured Invitation

.476 109  Yet some people some people are able to do both in college.
.441 113  You wouldn't have done, you think it was overdone.
.369 105  No shoes.
.306 *** 123  Um hum, I see, well you're from a big family too and yet in this situation you act completely different.

Factor Number 7

No interpretable factor

Factor Number 8
Interrogative Prod

.450 85  Um hum. It seems as if it would be very hard, I I can't quite picture you picking up a guitar and playing it say.
.400 91  Um uh good, do you feel that you have to be that much more sensitive, more secure to keep people away from so that you make sure that nobody associates with your sister?
How do you feel about people that you know that's middle class people going to college, not this other group you've talked about?
Even Numbered Items (2-150)

Factor Number 1
Interrogative Prod

.705 146 There's another way that you might might try handling something. Cause when you leave like that automatically what are you doing, you're saying I don't want to talk to you any more, even though I'm sure you do.

.701 ** 142 What are some of the possible reactions he probably would have?

.696 * 144 Uh, would you be able to handle the situation?

.683 148 Um hum, that way maybe, in the future if you run into situations like this, well what should I do, maybe I should think about it ahead of time. Maybe uh there's a way I could have handled things differently without sacrificing how I feel and still come out with some kind of a relationship along these lines.

.667 136 There are a lot of girls that don't necessarily go parking or if they do go parking they don't go out of their way for trouble. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).

.651 128 She's got a problem where she's got friends but they're the wrong sex.

.629 88 But if you don't have that guitar, you find it hard to stand up in front of people and talk. You find it very uncomfortable to to be with other people in situations that that most other people find comfortable.

.579 150 But you were out with a guy. I'm a guy.

.577 98 If you could only be yourself on a date without thinking of her.

.565 ** 100 How do you feel, how do you feel right now?
Um hum, first and what?

What is it about talking to your brother?

And it's hard when you don't go out and talk, be outgoing.

What about the guys at the college?

You know, it seems that there's always somebody in every one of our lives that are always going to make us feel uncomfortable.

Factor Number 2
Minimal Social Stimuli

Yeah.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum, um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

She might, yeah.

And you feel that there's bound to be something more than meets the eye here.

Oh, why's that?
.527  92  Um hum.
.517  112  Tell me.
.505  134  You think so?
.499  74  Oh, I see, this is something you just

Factor Number 3
Interpretation - Understanding

-.645  48  You like others.
-.494 **46  You say you get mad sometimes and yet I don't see you getting mad here.
-.465  52  Some people some people could overlook it. Did some kids?
-.451  4  You're too close.
-.433  54  Yeah I guess I'd have to be. I guess that's true, come to think of it.

Factor Number 4
Interrogative Prod

-.611  106  Do you find this is hard to live in the city after you lived in the country?
-.482  16  Did you have a good phys. ed. program in your high school?
-.479  110  Um hum. And what do you do?
-.461  104  Um hum. Does he go out and does he tell you here do this?
-.442  136  There are a lot of girls that don't necessarily go parking or or if they do go parking they don't go out of their way for trouble. Yet they seem to be perfectly happy and (garbled).
Factor Number 5
**Interpretation - Understanding**

- **.642** * 22 I see, so you can do it.
- **.569** 20 Sounds to me that you feel you made it through high school more on personality rather than you know, sitting down.
- **.539** **.40** What is it about your feelings to avoid. Why do you choose to avoid rather than to?
- **.526** 38 You know, it seems that there's always somebody in every one of our lives that are always going to make us feel uncomfortable.
- **.501** 42 Um hum, but you feel uncomfortable and yet he's wrong.

Factor Number 6
**Ability Potential**

- **.485** * 2 Can you do it financially?
- **.436** * **.82** Um, um, you can't do things like that.
- **.425** 30 Do you have any idea what it is that you fear?

Factor Number 7
**Unstructured Invitation**

- **.448** 6 Oh it's just the money aspect.
- **.411** 26 You don't feel good about that. What he's saying is right then. You do want to get away.
- **.384** 14 And this is your major.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number 8</th>
<th>Active Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.444</td>
<td>34 Yeah. So you think a person may have problems it might help to talk about them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.372</td>
<td>54 Yeah I guess I'd have to be. I guess that's true, come to think of it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.357</td>
<td>58 Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.331</td>
<td>84 Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.311</td>
<td>98 If you could only be yourself on a date without thinking of her.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F 8

Counseling Session Number 2 -- Appropriate Response Scale

Odd Numbered Items (1-149)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number 1</th>
<th>Reflection - Probe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.700</td>
<td>109 You know, somehow as we talk about the small school versus the large school and Greenfield versus Aurora I have the the feeling sort of that there were more basic issues that really are involved in the whole thing than what we've been talking about.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.675</td>
<td>127 And yet, talking now, I get the feeling of ambivalence, uh security but a little little anxious. I is that correct?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.648</td>
<td>59 That might be important then to get information as to what the requirements are for graduate work in social work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.643</td>
<td>99 Then you can build, then you feel safe and venture out and doing different things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.618</td>
<td>149 And this makes it safe to go out and explore a little bit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.612</td>
<td>147 Interaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.602 *</td>
<td>125 Yet you can accept the fact that the oppositeness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.598</td>
<td>137 I thought toward the middle you were more relaxed than you have been for the last, maybe, seven minutes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.577</td>
<td>91 You can feel more comfortable and uh.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.538</td>
<td>129 Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.515 ***</td>
<td>41 You seem like you'd uh have some hesitancy about to a big school, yet now you now you seem to be very relaxed and happy and this is a big school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.514</td>
<td>79 You learn with social activities as well.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
.506 ** 123 Why do you think that was funny?
.499 121 He'd go along with it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number 2</th>
<th>Minimal Social Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-.790 55</td>
<td>Right.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.759 53</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.752 33</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.732 15</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.718 133</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.716 73</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.689 97</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.678 113</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.667 17</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.666 57</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.657 37</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.656 107</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.628 47</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.615 25</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.611 49</td>
<td>Your French</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.586 77</td>
<td>Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.582 35</td>
<td>Steep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-.562 51</td>
<td>In social work.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Back to Aurora.

Difficult to concentrate.

Yeah.

Factor Number 3
Active Interpretation - Passive Understanding

It's difficult to find security by yourself though.

Why do you think some people need uh this other type of excitement and all that's going on is so important?

Um hum. And sociology you think would give you the opportunity to prepare to do something constructive you thought.

And you found some teachers at Aurora that were helpful.

You seem like you'd uh have some hesitancy about to a big school, yet now you seem to be very relaxed and happy and this is a big school.

That's important.

Living on campus is a unique experience.

So, in a big place it could be a little frightening because you don't know all the dimensions, it might be possible to find, uh, like UMass, it might be possible to find another individual, like in this situation, be it a counselor or colleague, you could, could talk with.

I was wondering, how would you use sociology if you majored in it?

And just talking with a person, you feel sometimes, it's difficult to get to know them as well as if

Before you start majoring.
You feel that you can go back uh or you can go back to Aurora next year.

And you could get to know people at Aurora.

So even though you say you feel uncomfortable in a large setting, you didn't feel uncomfortable uh say coming down here today or traveling out to Aurora or doing things of this type.

And you could get to know people at Aurora.

Do you have any questions?

You're a student.

How would he feel about uh you going back to Aurora?

How segregated do you feel that he would feel if you were at Aurora, Illinois?

How would you feel about say attending UMass if that would be the best decision?

But not much help about sociology.
Even Numbered Items (2-150)

Factor Number 1
Reflection - Probe

.665 94 But there should be some security in living at home.

.634 92 Have you found that going to college has helped you to be able to do this more so than high school?

.633 80 Like talking to roommates, uh being with

.614*** 62 Now you tell me that uh as as I've listened to you you say your interest in sociology is to be with people and learn to help people and yet uh, as you talk here, I get a feeling on the other hand you feel marks are the important outcome of your education.

.613 ** 40 Yet if you didn't trans- back uh transfer back to Aurora, uh where would you?

.609 ** 64 What do you feel is your major difficulty or major trouble in college?

.600 *** 126 You mentioned that you find security as, you know, part of a whole and you mentioned a whole as usually as small a small group and uh yet if you talk about knowing people and knowing them well, as I hear you talking now, it might not be that you'd find security in the same school that he was in.

.588 100 So now the decision is what beyond the sophomore year.

.586 60 But you would be happy in this type of activity then.

.585 90 Then it's better to be with one, two or three people you know well than than with a lot of people you don't know at all.

.564 * 84 You can be happy and satisfied in relatively simple social activities.
And you are learning too when you get the grades in order.

Perhaps knowing the security of Greenfield Community College uh is there and makes it possible to come down here and

Different people find security in different ways.

So to be helpful then a person should know not only some information about the alternatives that are available to make a decision on but should know about the person making the decision.

You can relax though in new situations with uh new people.

You could find, you could find your place in the social scheme of things.

So it's more important that you know what he wants than you know what you want.

Factor Number 2
Minimal Social Stimuli

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.
Um hum.
Um hum.
Um hum.
Everybody.
Um hum.
You're blushing.
Um hum.
You don't think you'd be known at UMass.

Factor Number 3
Interrogative Prod (Rapport-Building)

How long have you been in the east?
Why did you decide on Aurora?
And you feel you can succeed and be happy in sociology.
And yet you came back to Greenfield.
Knowing there was some security in terms of
The uh the bigger environments frightening.
Having a friend made it easier to go to.

Factor Number 4
Unstructured Invitation

Right. You're smiling.
You learn with social activities too.
Um hum.
Factor Number 5  
Passive Understanding - Active Interpretation

.646  30  You'd rather not try out a big one.

.586  28  Your friends in sociology?

.485 ** 140  Why wouldn't a good engineer be an appropriate source of information?

.431  38  And if you're working within a section.

.413  66  It's more interesting being with people than it is to be with the books.

Factor Number 6  
Unstructured Invitation (Rapport-Building)

.602  4  You know sometimes it's hard to figure out what to talk about right like that.

.579  2  So if we begin now, we'd be through by eleven-thirty.

Factor Number 7  
Interpretation - Understanding

.543  130  Some knowledge about places.

.482  132  The counselor should provide information.

.440  150  Perhaps knowing the security of Greenfield Community College uh is there and makes it possible to come down here and

.425  134  So to be helpful then a person should know not only some information about the alternatives that are available to make a decision on but should know about the person making the decision.

.416  128  You have to make a decision and one that sticks.
Factor Number 8

No interpretable factor
Table F.9

Counseling Session Number 3 -- Appropriate Response Scale

Even Numbered Items (2-150)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number 1</th>
<th>Minimal Social Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.674</td>
<td>110 Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.609</td>
<td>64 Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.606</td>
<td>106 Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.581</td>
<td>108 Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.563</td>
<td>72 Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.563</td>
<td>114 Um hum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number 2</th>
<th>Reflection - Probe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.677</td>
<td>100 You're just kind of at a point now and waiting for the next door to open.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.676</td>
<td>126 That must be very pleasant, isn't it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.659 ** 104</td>
<td>What sets off one of these, one of these trips like this?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.657 ** 122</td>
<td>What other types of adventuresome type things do you do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.649</td>
<td>120 For the sake of adventure or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.643</td>
<td>130 Or or just on the walks or when?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.640 *** 146</td>
<td>Yous vous you say you're you're uh you're uh you have a kind of bad attitude toward it, yet the way it comes across to me you seem to really enjoy it by this saying that you like to do fractions and so on</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
You seem to have these little white lies or whatever you call them, yet you also see the need for a real basic honesty too.

The challenge?

Do you go on these walks like you do the uh, you know, traveling places in your car and so on?

Um hum. What kind of mood you're in, too.

Yeah, you seem to have a real interest in German yet, you uh your attitudes, the way you talk here, it seems to have deteriorated a little bit.

Experiments.

Yeah, you think out loud?

Factor Number 3
Minimal Social Stimuli

Um hum.
Um hum.
Um hum.
Um hum.
Um hum.
Umm.
Yeah.
Oh, I see.
Um hum.
Um hum.
Yeah.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number 4</th>
<th>No interpretable factor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor Number 5</td>
<td>No interpretable factor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factor Number 6
Ability Potential

- .547 20 Um hum, well you can kind of see the value of it too, I would imagine, having been out.

- .544 36 Um hum. What do you what do you think of this? Your having been in Germany and knowing the value possibly of reading the language, speaking the language, the grammar of the language, do you think this is good or bad?

- .517 * 68 Uh, you could travel around on your vacation.

- .503 *** 28 Um, you seem to have a a real broad interest yet you're saying here that you want to zero in on German.

Factor Number 7
No interpretable factor

Factor Number 8
Ability Potential

- .318 * 88 Oh, I see. Well, you could always tell them that you've traveled abroad. Approach it from that point-of-view.

- .317 62 Oh I see, you just take off.

- .302 142 Um hum.

- .300 34 Maybe you can expand it.
Odd Numbered Items (1-149)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor Number</th>
<th>Minimal Social Stimuli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.852</td>
<td>95        Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.796</td>
<td>127       Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.770</td>
<td>125       Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.766</td>
<td>89        Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.757</td>
<td>147       Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.743</td>
<td>149       Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.710</td>
<td>107       Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.709</td>
<td>75        Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.704</td>
<td>69        Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.688</td>
<td>91        Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.684</td>
<td>93        Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.677</td>
<td>139       Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.658</td>
<td>83        Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.656</td>
<td>109       Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.642</td>
<td>59        Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.628</td>
<td>101       Um hum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.618</td>
<td>55        Yeah.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.568</td>
<td>115       Oh really?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.552</td>
<td>81        Oh yeah.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Um hum.

Oh, you don't, do you?

**Factor Number 2**

Well you seem to have the, you know, this idea for the broader concept you know, of honesty, and so on, and yet within that little narrow one you you take uh what mileage you can, is that right?

Do you find you have to combat this kind of thing uh when people are a bit critical of women in service quite often?

Um hum. That's good. You really look for excitement then.

Well, what uh what have you done uh outside of class to uh, you know, so you can increase this knowledge of of German.

Um hum, yeah, well you uh you say you uh you have these small talks with yourself, you you're not really worried about it, or you don't seem worried about it.

Um hum. How uh how, you know, what's the longest journey you would take in an instance like that?

Why uh why was this that you didn't tell them?

Oh, you don't, do you?

Well, you could uh take some uh easy courses to restore your confidence.

Um hum. Why do you say you have a mental block towards it?
Oh, I see. You could, you can see the real value then in uh, you know even after the fact making sure that they know what you are.

Well, when you go on these trips, do you talk to yourself?

What kind of answer are you looking for?

You said that uh you uh really enjoyed the uh German class last year, and yet uh you uh say here that you skipped it quite a bit.

You know, you say that you like to travel on a on a moments notice yet you just said you want to be there on a certain schedule.

You can uh you can take a trip by airplane as opposed to car where you can travel by some other means, you know, take long trips.

And what is that?

Factor Number 3
Minimal Social Stimuli

| .730 | 19 | Yeah. |
| .697 | 39 | Um hum. |
| .677 | 17 | Um hum. |
| .638 | 21 | Um hum. |
| .623 | 13 | Yeah. |
| .622 | 27 | Um hum. |
| .615 | 35 | Um hum. |
| .579 | 45 | Um hum. |
| .554 | 25 | Um hum. |
Factor Number 4
No interpretable factor

Factor Number 5
No interpretable factor

Factor Number 6
.398 3 Yeah, did you learn the language while you were there?
.360 99 That was kind of a uh shock effect, it sounds like, from him, wasn't it, wasn't he, was he shocked?
.347 3.1 Do you feel you have the background to to say, teach high school? Is this the age you're interested in?

Factor Number 7
No interpretable factor

Factor Number 8
No interpretable factor