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INTRODUCTION

In practically all the theoretical writing appearing within the psychological literature within the past 50 years, the basic assumption has been made that specialized and often lengthy training within the professions of psychology, social work, or psychiatry is a prerequisite for the effective practice of psychotherapy. Cantoni (1962) and Schofield (1964), however, have both argued that many emotional problems could be handled and resolved as effectively by a perceptive, interested friend of the distressed party as by a professionally trained psychotherapist. This raises an issue fundamental for the practice of all professional psychotherapists. Namely, do professionally trained therapists have something to offer a client above and beyond that which one of the client's own friends might be able to offer him?

To answer this question in the deepest sense entails basically a consideration of what is helpful or therapeutic. As Cantoni defines him, a helping friend is a person who cares, who understands, and who can be physically near his distressed friend with a proven relationship. Studies by Barrett-Lennard (1962), Cartwright (1963), Dickenson (1965), and Truax-Carkhuff (1965) have all shown that the more the counselor can communicate to his client his caring and sensitive empathic understanding, the more likely the client will be to improve in therapy. The helping friend and the helping counselor would seem then to have certain characteristics in common.

Examining the writing of various theorists regarding the nature of the effective ingredients in psychotherapy provides a study in contrasts,
Freud (1932) had felt that to be effective, a therapist should remain detached, ambiguous, and relatively unknown to his client. By remaining ambiguous, he felt, the analyst encouraged the development of a transference relationship which through his clinical experience, he had come to feel to be one of the most therapeutic elements in the psychotherapeutic interaction, if handled correctly. Freud emphasized that the analyst should attempt to model his behavior after that of the surgeon who cast aside his personal sympathies in order to concentrate solely on the skillful performance of the operation. Thus, to Freud, in the process of psychotherapy, caring for the client and communicating to him a sensitive understanding of his feelings were at best secondary to the process of interpreting his unconscious wishes and explaining his behavior. The analyst, in short, was not a helping friend but an all-knowing, ambiguous but powerful authority figure.

Rogers (1961), at the opposite extreme, but also generalizing from his own clinical experience, felt that what patients needed most was an opportunity to explore themselves and their feelings in an unthreatening but real atmosphere. To make the atmosphere unthreatening and curative, Rogers felt, the therapist must above all try to communicate to his clients that he deeply cares for them and understands their feelings. To make the atmosphere real, Rogers believed, the therapist should be unpretentious and act as a companion toward his client, accompanying him in the frightening search for his own identity. By providing such a therapeutic atmosphere, the client would be encouraged to explore his own feelings and thus he might resolve his own problems.

However, while Rogers stresses that the counselor must actively
communicate to his patient his empathic understanding and unconditional positive regard, he seems to relegate the counselor's role in disclosing his own personal feelings or ideas to the client. The relationship between counselor and client is thus unrecciprocals in the sense that all attention is focused upon the client and in this way is distinctly different from the sharing of confidences typical in most friendship relations.

Many current theorists have gone beyond Rogers in emphasizing the importance of creating a real and open relationship between counselor and client. May (1956), for example, denounces the therapist who is merely a shadowy reflector of his client's feelings and asserts that the therapist should be able to relate to the patient as "one existence communicating with another." Jourard (1964) feels even more strongly that it is only when the counselor can feel free to express his own personal feelings and attitudes within the therapeutic encounter that the client's resistances will be fully overcome and he will feel totally free to expose his feelings. In a similar vein, Truax and Carkhuff (1965) believe a counselor should only expect his client to be real and open when the counselor himself provides a model of openness and transparency for his client to follow.

While theorists increasingly have tended to emphasize the importance of real and open encounters between counselor and client, research evidence has increasingly lent support to the contention that the more genuine, empathic, and caring counselor will get more patients well. The work of Seeman (1949), Wolfson (1949), Steele (1948), Elam (1953), Truax, Tomlinson and Van der Veen (1961), and Truax and Carkhuff (1965)
has all indicated that client depth and extent of self-exploration is positively correlated with successful client outcome in therapy. Further, studies such as those of Barrett-Lennard (1962), Dickenson (1965) and Truax and Carkhuff (1965) have also shown a high positive correlation between the measured levels of such counselor variables as empathic understanding, positive regard, and genuineness and the client variable of depth of intrapersonal exploration. In short, much theoretical writing and research evidence has indicated that there may be a common core of therapeutic conditions which tend toward positive client outcome in therapy.

From the foregoing, it might seem that friends and professionally trained psychotherapists might be compared along much the same dimensions. If there is such a common core of therapeutic conditions which may facilitate the resolution of emotional problems and distress, perhaps friends may provide these conditions for one another.

Recently, Schofield (1964) published a provocative book defining the characteristics of much of the psychotherapy being conducted in the United States today. According to Schofield, patients may be grouped essentially into two categories: 1. A relatively small core group of mentally and emotionally disturbed individuals in need of help from professionally trained psychotherapists; 2. The overwhelming majority of all patients referred for psychotherapeutic help who are relatively normal but who suffer from what might be viewed as the more or less typical hazards, difficulties, and unhappinesses of everyday living. Much of psychotherapy today, Schofield feels, has become merely "the purchase of friendship." As a consequence of
modern man's acute awareness of psychopathological symptomatology, he has become increasingly "anxious about his anxieties" and as a result many people are referred for psychotherapy needlessly. Problems which in the past might have been discussed and resolved with friends, may now needlessly be taken to a professional therapist. Schofield feels that a public campaign at the national level should be undertaken to influence Americans to feel less anxious about their troubles and to return to the discussion of relatively small personal problems with their friends. More personal or embarrassing problems, he feels, might be taken up with a clergyman, physician, attorney or other trusted person. In such a way, the professional psychotherapist would be freed to treat the smaller number of people with severe mental and emotional disabilities and those who often are unable to obtain the attention they need.

Schofield's position, however, implies both that the contribution made toward mental health by a friend and by a professional therapist might be of a quite different nature and that in handling many problems a friend may serve as an adequate substitute for a professional therapist. From the above the following questions arise: 1. What is the unique contribution of the professionally trained therapist? 2. Can friends serve as adequate substitutes for professional therapists?

While certain research such as that by Riech (1963) has shown that individuals need not go through a lengthy period of graduate training to become effective therapists, no studies as yet have demonstrated that training will not improve a therapist's efficacy. As
Carlhoff (1985) notes, while some training programs for therapists may lead to no improvement or even deterioration in therapeutic functioning, good training will generally coincide with improvement in therapeutic efficacy. Further, Fieller (1950) has shown that experienced therapists, regardless of their particular theoretical orientation, tended to offer higher levels of such facilitative conditions as empathy, than did inexperienced therapists. Judging from the results of these studies, both training and experience must offer something toward increasing therapist effectiveness. If there is indeed a common core of therapeutic conditions which increase counselor efficacy, it is probable that increased familiarity and facility in providing these conditions are the unique contributions which training and experience can make.

Abelson and Weiss (1953) note, after surveying the psychological literature on friendship, that studies of friendship have thus far failed to show any definitive common bases upon which friendships are formed. While similar interests and attitudes may be a basis for one friendship, a dissimilarity between interests and attitudes may form the basis for another. Similarly, Wahlman (1962), after an extensive study of the character of the friendships formed between undergraduate students at a college in the Midwest, concluded that there is less than compelling evidence for general tendencies, either toward similarity or complementarity in friendship. Thus, available evidence in the area of friendship at present indicates that there are not merely a few but a great variety of reasons why any particular person may choose another as his friend. Generalizing from the complexity of the
nature of friendship choices, the great variety of personal needs which might be fulfilled through any friendship, and the great variation in definitions of friendship, the contention that most people who designate one another as friends may offer each other high levels of such conditions as empathy, unconditional positive regard or even genuineness may be questioned.

The present study was designed to compare the levels of therapeutic conditions provided by friends with those of experienced therapists during interview sessions. In view of the foregoing, although friends might have greater familiarity with the backgrounds of their respective friends than would therapists, it was felt that probably because of training and experience the therapists might be able to provide higher levels of such conditions as positive regard, empathy, and genuineness. Also, it was hypothesized that greater depth of intrapersonal exploration might be obtained with therapists than with the friends during the actual interviews themselves.

The first difficulty involved in implementing this study was that of providing some operational definition for level of friendship. To compare the level of therapeutic conditions provided by best friends with that provided by professional counselors seemed to furnish the most stringent test for counselor efficacy, since one might assume that one's most intimate friends on the average might provide the highest levels of such conditions as empathy, positive regard, and genuineness. In the subject population used, however, the very best friends were not always available and so the group of friend interviewers was composed of "best available friends." One might generalize, however, that often in time
of need the only individual a distressed person may have to turn to for help is his best available friend. If indeed such factors as empathic understanding, genuineness, and positive regard from another are conditions which may be universally facilitative for helping emotionally distressed people to overcome their problems, then one would hope that a "best available friend" might be able to provide high levels of these conditions.
METHOD

Subjects

Sixteen subjects were obtained through a notice posted in the lobbies of three boys' dormitories at the University of Massachusetts. The boys who responded to the notice, freshmen and sophomores, were requested to bring their best available friend along with them for an interview which was being conducted as part of a special research survey into college life. All subjects and their friends were paid one dollar each for participation.

The subjects and their respective friends ranged in age from 17 to 24 and were all full-time undergraduate students at the University. Within the sample of sixteen subjects and their sixteen friends a wide diversity of major subjects was found and excepting for the variable of interest in money the group seemed to constitute essentially an arbitrary or random sample from the population of undergraduate students.

Procedure

Each subject received two 45 minute interviews, one conducted by a professional therapist and one by the subject's friend. The sixteen subjects were divided evenly into two groups, comprised of eight subjects each. In a counterbalanced design, each subject in group I was interviewed initially by his friend and then by a professional therapist, half by one of the two professional counselors involved. Subjects in group II were interviewed first by a therapist and then by their friend, again with half of the subjects seeing one of the two counselors.
After each interview, every subject completed a fifty item questionnaire evaluating the person by whom he had just been interviewed. On this questionnaire, the subject was asked to rate his interviewer on a scale from 1 to 6 along four therapist dimensions—empathic understanding, positive regard, concreteness, and genuineness and to rate himself in terms of his own depth of personal self-exploration during the interview. Ten items for each process variable were included on the questionnaire to measure each of these five process variables (Appendix A). Half of the items measuring each of the dimensions were worded in the positive, half were worded in the negative. However, the numerical equivalents for true and untrue responses were constant. Thus, to render the relation between number and degree of the attribute possessed a constant, a numerical transformation of affirmative responses, was necessitated. Thus, the numbers 1, 2 and 3 became 6, 5 and 4 through the transformation.

All interviews were tape recorded and three four minute excerpts from each interview were rated by three graduate students with extensive experience in tape rating on five point scales of five process variables, empathic understanding (Berson, Carkhuff, and Southworth, 1964), positive regard (Carkhuff, Southworth, and Bersonson, 1964), genuineness (Carkhuff, 1964a), and concreteness (Carkhuff, 1964b) and depth of self-exploration (Carkhuff, 1964c).

Two therapists were employed and each conducted eight interviews. One therapist was a social worker with nearly ten years of counseling experience; the other was a psychologist from the college counseling center with about 15 years of experience.

After each interview each subject completed a friendship index
form compiled by the author. On these forms the subject noted the
following: 1. How long he had known his friend; 2. Rated his friend
along a ten point scale describing whether he felt his friend to be an
acquaintance, a good friend, or his best friend, categories in between
being included; and 3. Rated himself along a graduated seven point
scale describing the extent to which he typically confided his personal
problems to his friend. Combining the length of friendship with numeri-
cal ratings obtained from the other two scales provided the index of
friendship measures (Appendix 3).

Upon arriving, each subject was given the following instructions
in private:

All of us either in the present or during the past year or so
have had a number of experiences which have been very difficult
for us. If you feel the person whom you will be seeing is
helpful, please feel free to discuss these experiences with him.

Each subject then had the option of deciding whether or not he wished
to disclose his past or present difficulty or problems to his inter-
viewer.

The friend of the subject immediately before his interview with
the former was given these instructions in private:

Simply relate to the person you will see as you would
ordinarily do in order to be helpful to him.

Similar instructions were also given to the two therapists who were
kept naive concerning the nature of the experiment. After seeing sev-
eral subjects, however, instructions for the therapists were discon-
tinued since they appeared to understand them thoroughly.

The entire experiment was conducted during a two day period.
The first day, therapist A saw eight subjects who were also seen for
45 minutes immediately subsequent to or preceding this time by their respective friends. On the second day, therapist B served as counselor, the same procedure being utilized.

Research Scales:

Empathy

Degree of empathic understanding was conceived as the extent to which one person showed awareness and understanding of the feelings of another and concurrently communicated this awareness to the other. In measuring this variable, a scale developed by Berenson, Carthuff and Southworth (1964) was viewed along a quantifiable continuum divisible into five different stages (Appendix A). At the lowest level of empathic functioning, the first person or interviewer gave the appearance of being completely unaware or ignorant of even the most conspicuous surface feelings of the other person. At such a low level of empathic understanding, the first person may do practically everything except listen to what the second person is saying and first person responses evidencing this quality were given a numerical rating of 1. In essence, on this scale, the higher the level of empathic understanding, the more frequently and accurately the first person picks up and communicates to the second person his awareness of the latter's feelings. Thus, at the highest level, level 5, the facilitative empathizer almost always responds with understanding to all of the other person's deeper as well as more superficial feelings.
Positive Regard

Positive regard as seen in this experiment refers to the degree of respect, and warmth expressed by one person for another. A five stage scale developed by Carkhuff, Berenson and Southworth (1964) was used to measure this variable (Appendix A). At the lowest level of regard, the first person or interviewer is viewed as communicating a clear negative regard for the second person. At this level, he acts in such a way as to make himself the focus of evaluation and sees himself as responsible for the other person, as, for example, by actively offering advice or telling the second person what would be best for him. Higher stages of positive regard essentially entail progressive increases in the degree of expressed concern by the first person for the second. At level 5, the highest level, the first person, who is now being facilitative, is viewed as communicating a very deep respect for the second person’s worth as a person and his rights as a free individual, caring very deeply for the human potentials of the latter.

Facilitative Genuineness

Facilitative genuineness refers to the degree to which the interviewer’s verbalizations seem clearly in tune with what he is feeling at a given moment. At the lowest level of this 5 stage scale compiled by Carkhuff (1964a) the first person’s verbalizations are clearly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment or his only genuine responses are negative and may appear to have a completely destructive effect upon the second person. With increases in facilitative genuineness,
the first person's verbalizations become increasingly facilitative and congruent with what he is feeling at the moment of their utterance. At level 5, the facilitative counselor is being freely himself while concurrently employing his own genuine responses constructively (Appendix A).

**Concreteness**

Concreteness refers to the first person's capacity to express himself in specific and concrete terms and to help the second person to discuss personally relevant material in specific and concrete terminology. In this 5 stage scale developed by Carkhuff (1964b) at the lowest level, or level 1, the first person leads or allows all discussion with the second person to deal only with vague and anonymous generalities, not relevant to specific feelings of the latter. At increasing stages of concreteness, the first person more and more frequently enables or guides the second person into discussion of personally relevant material in specific terms. At stage 5, the now facilitative interviewer is always helpful in guiding the discussion so that the second person may discuss fluently, directly, and completely specific feelings and experiences. The first person at this stage involves the second in discussion of specific feelings, situations, and events, regardless of their emotional content (Appendix A).
Depth of Intrapersonal Exploration

This client variable refers to the degree to which the second person or interviewee discusses personally relevant material fully and deeply. At the lowest level of this 5 stage scale (Carkhuff, 1964a) the second person does not discuss personally relevant material either because he has no opportunity to do so or because he actively evades its discussion even when it is introduced by the first person. At higher levels of self-exploration, the second person voluntarily introduces personally relevant material and may discuss it with spontaneity and emotional proximity. At the highest or deepest level of self-exploration, the second person is viewed as actively and spontaneously engaging in an inward probing to newly discovered feelings or experiences about himself and his world. In essence, at this stage, the second person is fully and actively focusing upon himself and exploring himself and his world (Appendix A).
RESULTS

Measures of both inter-rater and intra-rater reliability were established (Tables 1 and 2). Intra-rater reliabilities on all five process variables were .79 or better and two-thirds of these reliability ratings were .90 or more. Correlations between raters varied from a high of .94 between one set of raters on the concreteness dimension to a low of .57 between two raters on the genuineness variable. Approximately half of the inter-rater reliabilities were .80 or more and only 2 ratings fell below .70. Correlations between raters on the average were lowest on the genuineness dimension and highest for positive regard and empathy. No systematic tendency for any pair of raters to correlate more highly than the other pairs was found.

Student t values for the differences between the means of the therapist and friend groups along all five process dimensions were computed (Tables 3 and 4). The results of the tape ratings showed level of empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness and depth of intrapersonal exploration to be significantly greater (p = .001) during counselor-subject interviews than during friend-subject interviews. Similarly, interviewer empathy, positive regard, genuineness and concreteness perceived by the subjects as evidenced in their ratings on the questionnaire was significantly greater (p = .01) for counselors than for friends. Although depth of intrapersonal exploration as measured with the questionnaire was not significant at the p = .05 level, a definite tendency toward greater self-exploration with the counselors was found.
Thus from the tape ratings, t values of 8.16, 5.32, 9.36, 8.35 and 5.16 were obtained respectively for empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness, and intrapersonal exploration (see Table 3). The t values from the questionnaire for these same process variables respectively were 3.37, 4.31, 3.55, 5.28 and 1.30 (see Table 4). The greatest discrepancies between t values obtained from tape ratings and questionnaire were found on the dimensions of genuineness, empathy and intrapersonal exploration, while the smallest discrepancy occurred on the variable of positive regard. t values for concreteness on both questionnaire and tape ratings, however tended to be consistently higher than comparable t values for empathy, positive regard, and intrapersonal exploration while with both methods of rating t values for empathy and positive regard tended to be somewhat higher than those for intrapersonal exploration.

Student t values for the differences between the mean levels of functioning of the two counselors on the five process variables, when measured with the questionnaire, revealed no significant differences between them. However, t values computed from the tape ratings revealed counselor A to be significantly higher in mean level of measured empathy (p = .05), positive regard (p = .01), genuineness (p = .05), and concreteness (p = .01) than counselor B, while the trends obtained from mean ratings of intrapersonal exploration were not significantly different from the questionnaire, t values of 1.20, .32, .05, 1.32 and .04 respectively were obtained for empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness, and intrapersonal exploration. The t values for these variables obtained from the tape ratings respectively were 3.00, 4.31,
and 5. Similar results, comparing Tables 3 and 5, show considerably higher \( t \) values for the differences between friends and counselors than for differences between the two counselors, when the questionnaire alone is used. Such results seem to indicate that while the two methods of measurement differ in their sensitivity, the magnitude of the difference between the functioning of the friends and counselors as a group is greater than the magnitude of the difference between the two counselors along the five process dimensions.

On the friendship index the 6.37 mean friendship rating indicates that subjects on the average viewed their designated friend as between an "above average friend" and a "good friend" (Appendix B). The 3.71 mean value on the level of confiding scale indicates that on the average the subjects confided between some and many of their personal problems and ideas to their designated friend. Finally, the average length of friendship was found to be one year seven months with nine of the subjects reporting friendships of over one year's duration and seven with friendships of under one year's duration. The 16 subjects used in this study may be seen as a homogeneous grouping in the respect that nearly
all described one another as relatively "good" friends and most had known one another for 1 year or more. On the friendship rating, only four subjects termed their designated friend a good acquaintance and none termed him merely an acquaintance. Although varying in other ways, the group of designated friends all appeared commonly and sincerely motivated to help their friend as best they could with whatever problem he confronted them with.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Rater A</th>
<th>Rater B</th>
<th>Rater C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Regard</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Exploration</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raters A &amp; B</td>
<td>Raters A &amp; C</td>
<td>Raters B &amp; C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Regard</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Exploration</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

$t$ Values Computed for the Differences in Tape Ratings Between Subjects' Mean Scores on Five Process Dimensions During Interviews with Friends and with Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Therapists</th>
<th>Mean Friends</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Therapists</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Friends</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Regard</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Exploration</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Mean Therapists</td>
<td>Mean Friends</td>
<td>Standard Deviation Therapists</td>
<td>Standard Deviation Friends</td>
<td>t</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Regard</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Intrapersonal Exploration| 4.28            | 4.05         | .87                           | 1.35                       | 1.30 | NS at .05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counselor A</td>
<td>Counselor B</td>
<td>Counselor A</td>
<td>Counselor B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Regard</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exploration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6

$t$ Values Computed for the Differences Between the Mean Scores of the Two Counselors on Five Process Dimensions From the Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean Counselor A</th>
<th>Mean Counselor B</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Counselor A</th>
<th>Standard Deviation Counselor B</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>NS  .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Regard</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>NS  .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuineness</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>NS  .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concreteness</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>NS  .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrapersonal Exploration</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>NS  .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

The results indicated that the difference between the friend-subject and the counselor-subject groups was significant both when measured with the questionnaire and through tape ratings. Thus, despite the fact that the friends had greater familiarity with the backgrounds and personal characteristics of their respective friends, the counselors were able to provide higher levels of such therapeutic conditions as empathy, positive regard, genuineness, concreteness, and intrapersonal exploration.

While it is possible that friends might be able to help one another in ways other than through providing high levels of these therapeutic conditions, the conclusion seems warranted that experienced counselors have a contribution to make in this area above and beyond that which a friend without training in psychotherapy might make. However, while a therapist’s time is limited, a friend may serve as a constant companion, lending advice, confidence, and helping his friend to overcome very practical obstacles. The special contributions which a helping friend could make toward therapeutic gain might be an area for further research.

The results, while not providing definitive evidence contraindicating the validity of Schofield's hypothesis that friends may serve as adequate substitutes for counselors in handling and solving minor emotional problems, certainly lend no support to his position. Further, while it is possible that these same friends in their private interactions with the subjects might provide higher levels of facilitative
conditions than did they during the interviews, within the context of
the present study the results definitely indicate that the professional
counselor has a unique contribution to make toward therapeutic gain.

The results may be further interpreted as favorable to the Rogerian
stand that providing a warm and unthreatening atmosphere may be a para-
mount condition for effecting therapeutic gain. The subject's depth
of intrapsychic exploration which has been found to correlate highly
with positive outcomes in therapy was greater with the two counselors
than with the friends when measured through tape ratings. Possibly,
by providing higher levels of empathy, positive regard, and genuineness,
the two counselors were able to create a more unthreatening atmosphere
for the subjects than were the friends as a group. Thus, in such an
atmosphere possibly the subjects felt more free to explore their personal
problems.

Friends in their daily encounters with one another often may be
somewhat guarded. As Abelson and Weiss (1953) note from their survey
of the psychological literature on friendship, the importance of the
real-self percept has been demonstrated in several studies of friendship.
Correlations of the real self percepts have been lower than those
of the ideal-self percepts or the ideal-self percept of one individual
with his percept of the friend's personality. Abelson and Weiss feel
these findings suggest that in friendship, congruence with the ideal-
self may be more important than congruence with the real-self percept.
Thus, in an attempt to hide what one is really like, friends may often
play roles with one another and guard against revelations of their
weaknesses or true feelings. Such a person might be more open in
talking with a stranger who seemed warm, understanding, and caring than with a friend whom he had known for years.

One possible limitation of this study was that no "best friend" of any subject could be obtained for the experiment. This was due to the fact that all subjects were away from home and to the fact that the experiment was run during the summer session of the university when many of the subjects' friends were away in other places. Since often individuals select from amongst their friends certain "target persons (Jourard, 1958)" toward whom they direct the bulk of their personal confidences, somewhat different results might have been obtained had "best friends" been used instead of merely "best available friends". On the other hand, it is quite likely that even "best friends", lacking training or experience with psychotherapy, might have the same difficulties in providing high levels of therapeutic conditions.

While the experienced counselors were able to provide significantly higher levels of therapeutic conditions than helping friends, the fact that the two counselors differed significantly between themselves when the tape rating measure was employed, indicates that individual differences in therapeutic functioning may be due to more than just experience and training per se. As Truax (1963) notes, empathy as well as other facilitative therapist variables are characteristics of particular therapists. While one counselor may possess one or all of these characteristics to a high degree, another may be totally lacking in them.

Such discrepancies, when they arise, may be a product both of training and individual personality differences. Certainly an ambiguous and detached Freudian analyst who models his behavior after that of
the surgeon would provide quite different levels of empathy, positive regard, and genuineness than would a product from a more client-centered training program. Similarly, some counselors possibly because of personal preoccupations or differing values may operate at lower levels of these process variables. However, while the two therapists did differ significantly between themselves, this difference was much smaller than that between the therapists as a group and the friends as a group, probably indicating, as Fiedler (1950) noted, that despite all else, there is a tendency for counselors as they gain increased experience in the practice of psychotherapy to provide higher levels of therapeutic conditions such as empathy.

A result which might require further explication was the finding that \( t \) values obtained from tape rating were consistently higher than comparable \( t \) values obtained from the questionnaire. The fact that the tape rating seemed a more sensitive measure than the questionnaire might be interpreted to indicate that the raters through their greater training and experience in psychology had become more sensitive to differences in levels of the various therapeutic variables than had the subjects.

In conclusion, the results indicated that while the two counselors obtained ratings which averaged out around 3.0 on the five process variables, the friends usually scored below this level when measures from the tape raters were taken. When functioning at level three, it is assumed according to the five process scales that the interviewer is being therapeutic and that his client will probably improve.
If this study were to be redesigned the following alterations would be made: 1. An attempt to find subjects' best friends would be made; 2. A larger number of counselors would be employed so as to obtain a better cross-section of the average level of therapeutic functioning of counselors as a group.
The purpose of this experiment was to compare the levels of four interviewer variables, empathy, positive regard, genuineness, and concreteness, and one interviewee variable, depth of intrapersonal exploration, elicited by experienced counselors and good friends. Sixteen male undergraduate subjects were each requested to bring a good friend with them for a research study. Eight subjects were interviewed in a counterbalanced design first by their friend for 45 minutes and then for 45 minutes by an experienced psychotherapist. The remaining eight were interviewed initially by an experienced therapist, and then by their friend. Two counselors were used, interviewing eight subjects apiece. All interviews were tape recorded and after each interview each subject was requested to fill out a 50 item questionnaire evaluating this interview in terms of the five process variables. Three experienced tape raters and the questionnaires were used to measure these process variables.

The results indicated that the counselors provided significantly higher levels of all four interviewer variables than did the subjects' respective friends. Depth of intrapersonal exploration was found to be significantly higher with the counselors when measured by the tape raters and although not significant when measured with the questionnaires, was also in the direction favoring the counselors. Tape ratings also revealed significant differences between the levels of the four interviewer conditions provided by the two counselors, but this difference was not significant when measured with the questionnaire. Interviewee depth of self-exploration was not found to vary between counselors.
These results were interpreted as tentative evidence supporting the notion that clinical experience in psychotherapy may enhance the development of a counselor approach to clients characterized by relatively high levels of these facilitative conditions. However, while experience may be a primary factor in the development of these conditions, other factors such as the personality and attitudes of the individual counselor were also seen as highly important. The fact that some friends provided higher levels of these facilitative conditions than others was also briefly discussed. Some qualifications were also added to Schofield's hypothesis that interested friends might often serve in place of therapists in handling some of the emotional difficulties of relatively normal people.
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Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes

A Scale for Measurement

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

Level 1
The first person appears completely unaware or ignorant of even the most conspicuous surface feelings of the other person(s).
Example: The first 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 person does everything but listen, understand or be sensitive to even the surface feelings of the other person(s).

Level 2
The first person responds to the surface feelings of the other person(s) only infrequently. The first person continues to ignore the deeper feelings of the other person(s).
Example: The first 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 person tends to respond to things other than what the other person(s) appear to be expressing or indicating.

Level 3
The first person almost always 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 almost always misses their import.
Example: The first 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 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 facilitator almost always responds with understanding to the surface feelings of the other person(s) and sometimes but not often responds with empathic understanding to the deeper feelings.
Example: The facilitator makes some tentative efforts to understand the deeper feelings of the other person(s).
In summary, the facilitator is responding, however infrequently with some degree of empathic understanding of the deeper feelings of the other person(s).

Level 5
The facilitator almost always responds with accurate empathic understanding to all of the other person's deeper feelings as well as surface feelings.
Example: The facilitator is "together" with the other person(s) or "tuned in" on the other person's wavelength. The facilitator and the other person(s) might proceed together to explore previously unexplored areas of human living and human relationships. The facilitator is responding with full awareness of the other person(s) and a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of his most deep feelings.

1. The present scale "Empathic understanding in interpersonal processes" has been derived in part from "A scale for the measurement of accurate empathy (Truax, 1961)" which has been validated in extensive process and outcome research on counseling and psychotherapy (Bergin and Soloman, 1963; Carkhuff and Truax, 1965, 1965a, 1965b; Rogers, 1962; Truax, 1963; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963, 1964, 1965). In addition, similar measures of similar constructs have received extensive support in the literature of counseling and therapy (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Demos, 1964; Halkides, 1958; Truax, 1961) and education (Aspy, 1965). The present scales were written to apply to all interpersonal processes and have already received research support (Carkhuff, 1965, 1965a; Testerman Carkhuff and Myrus, 1965).

The present scale represents a systematic attempt to reduce the ambiguity and increase the reliability of the scale. In the process many important delineations and additions have been made. For comparative purposes, Level 1 of the present scale is approximately equal to Stage 1 of the earlier scale. The remaining levels are approximately correspondent: Level 2 and Stages 2 and 3 of the earlier version; Level 3 and Stages 4 and 5; Level 4 and Stages 6 and 7; Level 5 and Stages 8 and 9.
Respect or Positive Regard in Interpersonal Processes
A Scale for Measurement

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

**Level 1**
The first person is communicating clear negative regard for the second person.

Example: The first person may be actively offering advice or telling the second person what would be "best" for him.

In summary, in many ways the first 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 person responds to the second person in such a way as to communicate little positive regard.

Example: The first person responds mechanically or passively or ignores the feelings of the second person.

In summary, in many ways the first person displays a lack of concern or interest for the second person.

**Level 3**
The first person communicates a positive caring for the second person but there is a conditionality to the caring.

Example: The first person communicates that certain kinds of actions on the part of the second person will reward or hurt the first person.

In summary, the first 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 facilitator clearly communicates a very deep interest and concern for the welfare of the second person.

Example: The facilitator 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 facilitator.

In summary, the facilitator sees himself as responsible to the second person.

**Level 5**
The facilitator 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.
The present scale, "Respect or Positive Regard in Interpersonal Processes," has been derived in part from "A tentative scale for the measurement of unconditional positive regard (Truax, 1962)" which has been validated in extensive process and outcome research on counseling and psychotherapy (Carkhuff and Truax, 1965, 1965a, 1965b; Rogers, 1962; Truax, 1963; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963, 1964, 1965). In addition, similar measures of similar constructs have received extensive support in the literature of counseling and therapy (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Demos, 1964; Halkides, 1958; Spotts, 1962) and education (Christenson, 1961; Truax and Tatum, 1962). The present scales were written to apply to all interpersonal processes and have already received research support (Carkhuff, 1965, 1965a; Berenson, Carkhuff and Myrus, 1965).

The present scale represents a systematic attempt to reduce the ambiguity and increase the reliability of the scale. In the process many important delineations and additions have been made. For comparative purposes, the levels of the present scale are approximately equal to the stages of the earlier scale, although the systematic emphasis upon the positive regard rather than upon unconditionality represents a pronounced divergence of emphasis.
Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal Processes

A Scale for Measurement

Robert R. Carkhuff

Level 1
The first person's verbalizations are clearly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment, or his only genuine responses are negative in regard to the second person(s) and appear to have a totally destructive effect upon the second person.

Example: The first person may be defensive in his interaction with the second person(s) and this defensiveness may be demonstrated in the content of his words or his voice quality and where he is defensive he does not employ his reaction as a basis for potentially valuable inquiry into the relationship.

In summary, there is evidence of a considerable discrepancy between the first person's inner experiencing and his current verbalizations or where there is no discrepancy the first person's reactions are employed solely in a destructive fashion.

Level 2
The first person's verbalizations are slightly unrelated to what he is feeling at the moment or when his responses are genuine they are negative in regard to the second person and the first person does not appear to know how to employ his negative reactions constructively as a basis for inquiry into the relationship.

Example: The first person may respond to the second person(s) in a "professional" manner that has a rehearsed quality or a quality concerning the way a helper "should" respond in that situation.

In summary, the first person is usually responding according to his prescribed "role" rather than to express what he personally feels or means and when his is genuine his responses are negative and he is unable to employ them as a basis for further inquiry.

Level 3
The first person provides no "negative" cues between what he says and what he feels, but he provides no positive cues to indicate a really genuine response to the second person(s).

Example: The first person may listen and follow the second person(s), but commits nothing more of himself.

In summary, the first person appears to make appropriate responses which do not seem insincere but which do not reflect any real involvement either. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4
The facilitator presents some positive cues indicating a genuine response (whether positive or negative) in a non-destructive manner to the second person(s).
Example: The facilitator's expressions are congruent with his feelings although he may be somewhat hesitant about expressing them fully.

In summary, the facilitator responds with many of his own feelings and there is no doubt as to whether he really means what he says and he is able to employ his responses whatever their emotional content, as a basis for further inquiry into the relationship.

Level 5
The facilitator is freely and deeply himself in a non-exploitative relationship with the second person(s).

Example: The facilitator is completely spontaneous in his interaction and open to experiences of all types, both pleasant and hurtful; and in the event of hurtful responses the facilitator's comments are employed constructively to open a further area of inquiry for both the facilitator and the second person.

In summary, the facilitator is clearly being himself and yet employing his own genuine responses constructively.

1. The present scale, "Facilitative genuineness in interpersonal processes" has been derived in part from "A tentative scale for the measurement of therapist genuineness or self-congruence (Truax, 1962)" which has been validated in extensive process and outcome research on counseling and psychotherapy (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Dickenson, 1965; Haikides, 1958; Jourard, 1962; Truax, 1961) and education (Aspy, 1955). The present scale represents a systematic attempt to reduce the ambiguity and increase the reliability of the scale. In the process, many important delineations and additions have been made. For comparative purposes, the levels of the present scale are approximately equal to the stages of the earlier scale, although the systematic emphasis upon the constructive employment of negative reactions represents a pronounced divergence of emphasis.
Personally Relevant Concreteness or Specificity of Expression in Interpersonal Processes
A Scale for Measurement

Robert R. Carkhuff

Level 1
The first person leads or allows all discussion with the second person(s) to deal only with vague and anonymous generalities.
Example: The first person and the second person discuss everything on strictly an abstract and highly intellectual level.
In summary, the first person makes no attempt to lead the discussion into the realm of personally relevant specific situations and feelings.

Level 2
The first person frequently leads or allows even discussions of material personally relevant to the second person(s) to be dealt with on a vague and abstract level.
Example: The first person and the second person may discuss "real" feelings but they do so at an abstract, intellectualized level.
In summary, the first person does not elicit discussion of most personally relevant feelings and experiences in specific and concrete terms.

Level 3
The first person at times enables the second person(s) to discuss personally relevant material in specific and concrete terminology.
Example: The first person will help to make it possible for the discussion with the second person(s) to center directly around most things which are personally important to the second person(s) although there will continue to be areas not dealt with concretely and areas which the second person does not develop fully in specificity.
In summary, the first person sometimes guides discussions into consideration of personally relevant specific and concrete instances, but these are not always fully developed. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative functioning.

Level 4
The facilitator is frequently helpful in enabling the second person(s) to fully develop in concrete and specific terms almost all instances of concern.
Example: The facilitator is able on many occasions to guide the discussion to specific feelings and experiences of personally meaningful material.
In summary, the facilitator is very helpful in enabling the discussion to center around specific and concrete instances of most important and personally relevant feelings and experiences.

Level 5
The facilitator is always helpful in guiding the discussion so that the second person(s) may discuss fluently, directly and completely specific feelings and experiences.
Example: The first person involves the second person in discussion of specific feelings, situations and events, regardless of their emotional content.
In summary, the facilitator facilitates a direct expression of all personally relevant feelings and experiences in concrete and specific terms.
1. The present scale "Personally Relevant Concreteness or Specificity of Expression" has been derived from earlier work (Truax, 1961; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963, 1964). Similar measures of similar constructs have been researched only minimally (Pope and Siegman, 1962). The present scale has received support in research on the training of counselors (Berenson, Carkhuff and Myrus, 1965). The systematic emphasis upon the personally meaningful relevance of concrete and specific expressions represents a pronounced divergence of emphasis.
Self-Exploration in Interpersonal Processes

A Scale for Measurement

Robert R. Carkhuff

Level 1
The second person does not discuss personally relevant material, either because he has had no opportunity to do so or because he is actively evading the discussion even when it is introduced by the first person.
Example: The second person avoids any self-descriptions or self-exploration or direct expression of feelings that would lead him to reveal himself to the first person.
In summary for a variety of possible reasons, the second person does not give any evidence of self-exploration.

Level 2
The second person responds with discussion to the introduction of personally relevant material by the first person but does so in a mechanical manner and without the demonstration of emotional feeling.
Example: The second person simply discusses the material without exploring the significance or the meaning of the material or attempting further exploration of that feeling in our effort to uncover related feelings or material.
In summary, the second person responds mechanically and remotely to the introduction of personally relevant material by the first person.

Level 3
The second person voluntarily introduces discussions of personally relevant material but does so in a mechanical manner and without the demonstration of emotional feeling.
Example: The emotional remoteness and mechanical manner of the discussion give the discussion a quality of being rehearsed.
In summary, the second person introduces personally relevant material but does so without spontaneity or emotional proximity and without an inward probing to newly discovered feelings and experiences.

Level 4
The second person voluntarily introduces discussions of personally relevant material with both spontaneity and emotional proximity.
Example: The voice quality and other characteristics of the second person are very much "with" the feelings and other personal materials which are being verbalized.
In summary, the second person introduces personally relevant discussions with spontaneity and emotional proximity but without a distinct tendency toward inward probing to newly discovered feelings and experiences.

Level 5
The second person actively and spontaneously engages in an inward probing to newly discovered feelings or experiences about himself and his world.
Example: The second person is searching to discover new feelings concerning himself and his world even though at the moment he may be doing so perhaps fearfully and tentatively. In summary, the second person is fully and actively focusing upon himself and exploring himself and his world.

1. The present scale, "Self-exploration in interpersonal processes," has been derived in part from "The measurement of depth of intrapersonal exploration (Truax, 1963)" which has been validated in extensive process and outcome research on counseling and psychotherapy (Carkhuff and Truax, 1965, 1965a, 1965b; Rogers, 1962; Truax, 1963; Truax and Carkhuff, 1963, 1964, 1965). In addition, similar measures of similar constructs have received extensive support in the literature of counseling and therapy (Blau, 1953; Braaten, 1953; Peres, 1947; Seeman, 1949; Steele, 1948; Wolfson, 1949).

The present scale represents a systematic attempt to reduce the ambiguity and increase the reliability of the scale. In the process many important delineations and additions have been made. For comparative purposes, Level 1 of the present scale is approximately equal to Stage 1 of the early scale. The remaining levels are approximately correspondent: Level 2 and Stages 2 and 3; Level 3 and Stages 4 and 5; Level 4 and Stage 6; Level 5 and Stages 7, 8 and 9.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Friendship Index</th>
<th>Mean Length of Friendship</th>
<th>Mean Friendship Rating</th>
<th>Mean Level of Confiding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 year, 7 months</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Friendships of Less Than 1 Year's Duration</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Friendships of Over 1 Year's Duration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Not once.
2. Passing acquaintance.
3. Acquaintance.
4. Good acquaintance.
5. Friend.
6. Above average friend.
7. Good friend.
8. Very good friend.
9. One of my best friends.

I have known my friend for ____________________.

1. I never confide my personal problems or ideas to my friend.
2. I confide a few of my personal problems and ideas to my friend.
3. I confide some of my personal problems and ideas to my friend.
4. I confide many of my personal problems and ideas to my friend.
5. I confide a great many of my personal problems and ideas to my friend.
6. I confide most of my personal problems and ideas to my friend.
7. I confide all of my personal problems and ideas to my friend.