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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this study was to obtain an objective measure of the helping skills level of student personnel staff and other campus community members at Trenton State College. The focus of the study was on the student personnel staff because members of this profession at Trenton State and elsewhere have presented themselves as the helping specialists of the campus. While helping, or facilitating personal growth, has been a clear goal of members of the student personnel profession, it has been less clear that they possessed the skills necessary to achieve that goal. Further, whatever level of helping skills they possess has important implications for their clients, their institutions, and themselves. At the same time, colleges provide many sources of help, and helping skills play an important role in a wide range of relationships. For these reasons, representatives of eight other campus groups were included in the study.

The standardized instrument used to measure the level of helping skills of the 235 subjects was Carkhuff's Index of
Communication (Carkhuff, 1969). Three trained raters independently evaluated the raw data, and then the results were analyzed for each of several hypotheses, using an analysis of variance technique. When significant differences occurred with more than two groups of subjects, the Scheffé method of multiple comparisons was used to identify the source of the differences.

The results clearly suggested that members of the student personnel profession possessed a higher level of helping skills than members of any other group studied at Trenton State College. Student personnel workers achieved significantly higher helping scores than did the staff of the Admissions, Placement, and Academic Advisement Offices, a random sample of faculty members, the student personnel secretaries, the undergraduate housing staff, the crisis intervention telephone staff, and selected students. While administrators scored significantly higher than selected students, the differences between the scores of remaining groups and students were not significant. Further, only student personnel workers scored significantly higher than groups other than selected students, and a sub-group of the student personnel staff scored significantly higher than residence hall advisors and selected undergraduates in campus housing.

A considerable range of helping skills existed, however, among the student personnel staff. When the staff was subdivided into different groupings, the helping scores of
the counselors were found to be significantly higher than those of the rest of the staff. Similarly, significantly higher helping scores were found with staff members on tenure, those with five or more years of experience, those forty years of age and over, and those holding an earned doctorate when each of these groups was compared to the rest of the staff. All other comparisons of staff groups studied failed to yield significant differences in helping scores.

This study lent support to the idea that members of the student personnel profession should be concerned with providing helping services and involved in attempts to facilitate personal growth. At the same time, the range of scores within the student personnel staff and the generally low helping scores obtained from members of other campus groups suggested a need for extensive and effective inservice training programs for those groups who wish to influence personal growth in a positive direction.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

The major focus of this study is the helping skills level of college student personnel professionals in relation to students and others in the campus community. The study is based on several major propositions:

First, that members of the student personnel profession view themselves as the representatives of higher education whose professional commitments are most focused on facilitating the personal growth of students.

Second, that the interaction between students and others in the campus community plays an important role in the personal growth of students.

Third, that one of the principal ways in which members of the student personnel profession attempt to facilitate personal growth is by working directly with individuals or small groups of students in what is often referred to as a helping relationship.

Fourth, that this relationship assumes that the helper possesses the necessary skills to foster positive change or to help individuals grow.

Fifth, that the goal of members of the student personnel profession to facilitate students' personal growth may or may not be matched by their possession of the level
of skills needed to achieve that goal.

Sixth, that whatever level of facilitative skills members of the student personnel profession possess has implications for individual students and their institutions.

Seventh, that research is needed which will focus on the level of facilitative skills of various members and subgroups within the campus community.

Much of the remainder of this chapter will be devoted to a further discussion of the introductory propositions as background to the study. A statement of the problem with which the study is concerned will then be made, and the hypotheses stated in literary form. Following that, several frequently used terms will be defined, and the methods and procedures used in the study will be described. Comment will be made regarding the limitations and significance of the study. Finally, a summary of the organization of the remainder of the dissertation will be provided.

**Background of the Study**

The personal, emotional, and social development of students is an important part of their higher education experience. The Committee on the Student in Higher Education (1968) reports that:

*Our basic assumption is that the college is a major agent in promoting the personality development of the young adult .... The college has a major effect*
upon the development of the whole human personality for the student between the ages of 17 and 25. Moreover, the young person becomes what he becomes not only because of what he hears in the classroom and not even mainly because of what he hears in the classroom. . . . By the very fact that it presumes to inform the minds of the young, the college becomes involved in the development of the whole person, of which the intellectual faculties are but a part. The time has come for the college to realize the extent of its power to influence personality development and to take full responsibility for the way this power is executed [pp. 5 and 6].

Further, many of the nonacademic challenges students face are common to all student generations regardless of the shifting concerns of both higher education and the larger society. Sanford (1968), commenting on the similarity of the concerns of students of the 1930's, the 1950's, and the late 1960's, suggests that each generation has been preoccupied with the perennial concerns of young people in Western society:

establishing independence of their parents, coming to terms with authority, maintaining adequate self-esteem while achieving a more or less accurate evaluation of themselves, deciding on a vocation, discovering members of the opposite sex and learning how to relate to them as individuals, adapting themselves to the requirements of the student culture while revealing themselves enough to make friendships possible, and attaining a perspective on our society that will permit them to see and to oppose its ills without lapsing into cynicism or total withdrawal [p. 177].

In addition to the more or less predictable developmental tasks that most college students face, individual students may find themselves faced with any manner of personal challenges ranging from minor dilemmas through major
crises. Higher education has recognized a need to maximize the positive role that colleges and universities may play in the resolution of students' problems and the development of students' personal growth. The institutional representatives most concerned with facilitating the personal growth of students are student personnel workers.

Student personnel workers provide a variety of helping services to students. The concern for fostering personal, social, and emotional development cuts across the various organizational specialities within student personnel work and provides the philosophical basis for the provision of all of these services. Financial aids officers, housing specialists, student activities and college union workers, medical personnel, various deans and counselors, and others are all organized around and within the student personnel umbrella because of their common commitment to help students. While the exact nature of the service offered by particular individuals or groups may vary, the uniting underlying assumption is that the student personnel staff person can use himself or herself as an effective helping tool in facilitating the growth and development of students.

This premise has remained remarkably constant during much of the history of student personnel work. Brown (1972) provides a contemporary view of the recent thrust of the profession when he states:
One major assumption . . . is that total student development has been and must remain one of the primary goals of higher education . . . . Since the end of World War II, student personnel workers have identified themselves as the professional group on campus most concerned about the development of the total student [pp. 7-8].

Shoben, writing twenty-two years earlier than Brown, made similar comments regarding the rationale for student personnel work. He is reported (Mueller, 1961) as describing the goal of personnel work "in relation to one of the basic functions of higher education, that of being a socialization agent in order to facilitate the personal development of young people in the interest of enriching the human resources of American society [p. 529]."

Formal statements of professional organizations have echoed the theme of facilitating student development. In 1938 and again in 1949 the Committee on College Personnel of the American Council on Education published descriptions of college student personnel work. The latter statement (Williamson, 1949) reads in part:

The development of students as whole persons interacting in social situations is the central concern of student personnel work . . . . This emphasis in contemporary education is the essential part of the student personnel point of view [p. 1].

Recent years have seen some movement in professional designation from "student personnel worker" to "student development educator." However, the underlying goal of aiding student growth has remained unchanged. Indeed, Brown
(1972) points out: "The most profound reason for the new emphasis on student development from student personnel workers is that they seek more fulfillment of their espoused goal of developing the whole student [p. 37]."

In 1971 the Commission on Professional Development of the Council of Student Personnel Associations issued a statement entitled "A Proposal for Professional Preparation of College Student Development Educators." This document recognizes the contributions of the 1938 and 1949 reports and builds on them to present "a new statement of educational and professional purpose." The 1971 statement comments:

An urgent need still exists in higher education to help students learn about themselves and others in their contemporary world and to participate in experiences which enlarge, apply and interrelate this learning, but with the significant difference that they are collaborators rather than recipients. The need exists to help students create patterns of behavior for progress toward a richer fuller life which is uniquely their own and which contributes constructively to the society. . . . Student development educators apply their competence especially to the process of growth in collaboration with students and other educators [pp. 1-2].

Through a change in name and over a long period of time, the idea that student personnel workers are concerned with facilitating student development has remained constant. However, the intention or the desire to provide helping services does not necessarily relate to the ability to facilitate student's personal growth. While student personnel workers see themselves as the helping specialists of the
campus, they may or may not be the campus group with the highest level of helping skills. Good intentions are not synonymous with positive results. O'Banion (1971) reiterates this point: "The model student personnel worker must not only be committed to positive human development; he must also possess the skills and the expertise that will enable him to implement programs for the realization of human potential [p. 10]."

The successful student personnel worker must possess a high degree of helping skills whether he or she is involved with programs for groups of students or working directly with individual students. In the latter case even a counseling background may not guarantee that specific staff members have highly developed skills. As Brown (1972) points out:

Curricular offerings in counseling have traditionally served as the core of many student personnel professional programs. Counseling centers have often been the proving ground for many student personnel administrators, and the counseling role has been perceived by many as central to the definition of what a student personnel worker is. One has to ask whether this has been the case because of the particular skills that counselors have possessed or whether it is because counselors were the kinds of persons who were able to listen patiently and show sincere interest in students. Although they may well be interrelated, patience and sincerity have probably been more evident than technique [p. 37].

The interest of student personnel workers in facilitating student growth seems clear. It is less clear that they possess the skills to achieve that goal.
Whatever level of facilitative skills student personnel workers possess has implications for students and their institutions. Student personnel workers who cannot help are not simply unproductive; rather, they may do damage as helping specialists. The continuum is not necessarily between excellent helpers and mediocre helpers. As Brown (1972) comments: "Not only can growth be inhibited but changes can be regressive [p. 35]." Further, he notes that:

Developmental changes in students are the result of the interaction of initial characteristics and the press of the environment. Changes in students do not occur in a vacuum, nor do they necessarily occur automatically or in a positive direction [p. 35].

While any number of variables may influence developmental changes in students, members of the student personnel profession are the group most concerned with furthering students' growth in their individual contacts with students and in their planning and implementing of programs for students. Because of their role on a campus, they may contribute much to the "press of the environment." Student personnel workers are likely to be in contact with significant numbers of students at critical points in their development. The nature of the contacts will vary. However, the student personnel worker, at least, will be concerned that the contacts be growth producing. There is evidence (Carkhuff, 1969) to indicate that "all effective interpersonal processes share a common set of conditions that are conducive to
facilitative human experiences . . . and that significant human encounters may have constructive or deteriorative con-
sequences [p. 21]."

In fact, after considerable research Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) concluded: "Children and students of parents, teachers and other significant persons who offer high levels of facilitative conditions improve (on a variety of change indexes) while those who offer low levels of these conditions deteriorate [p. 24]."

To reiterate, the facilitative efforts of student personnel workers may indeed be helpful, or those efforts may do damage to the students with whom they are in contact. In either case it seems reasonable to assume that the effect on the students involved will be important to their comfort, their productivity, and their contribution to those with whom they interact.

Although the traditional focus of student personnel workers has been student growth and the implications of their level of facilitative skills may be strongest and most important here, recent trends in the profession emphasize a broadened concern for sharing professional skills and insights with others in the campus community. The term "human development facilitator" is sometimes used to indi-
cate this expanded function. As O'Banion (1971) explained: "The human development facilitator does not limit his
encounter to students; instead he is interested in facilitating the development of all groups in the educational community (faculty, secretaries, administrators, custodians, and other service workers, and board members)[p. 9]."

As in the case of individual students, members of the student personnel profession attempting to provide growth facilitating experiences for wider groups in the campus community will not be helpful and may do damage to those with whom they work if their level of helping skills is not adequate for the task.

Similarly, economic and pragmatic implications of the level of facilitative skills of student personnel workers exist for members of the profession themselves as well as all those who are concerned with higher education. One reality of the current milieu in which the profession operates is that funding has become less certain. After providing a long list of examples of financial cutbacks in contemporary higher education, Boyer (1972) summarizes the current dilemma:

All of this suggests quite dramatically, I think, that the "glory days" are gone. We had become accustomed to using phrases such as "burgeoning enrollments," "explosions in growth," "constant development." Now the catch words of the day are "accountability," "stewardship," and "the public trust." . . . To put it as succinctly as I can, during the 1970's America's colleges and universities will be expected to do more with less [p. 15].

As colleges and universities "try to do more with
less," difficult decisions will be made regarding support for staff and programs. Ineffective student personnel workers will put not only themselves but others in the profession in a tenuous position when fiscal decisions are made regarding the distribution of limited institutional resources. While the various specialties in student personnel work may require a combination of skills, many administrative decisions will be properly based on the issue of whether or not student personnel workers possess the level of helping skills necessary to meet their stated concern for furthering student development. Those who cannot meet this standard will not only put themselves in jeopardy but will weaken the position of the profession and the acceptance of the values espoused by colleagues.

Statement of the Problem

In its simplest terms the problem is to obtain an objective measure of the facilitative skills level of various college community members who serve students in a helping role. In this study the focus of the research is on the facilitative skills level of the student personnel staff, who most clearly maintain concern for helping students as a primary goal. However, many others help students. Also, members of the student personnel profession bring different backgrounds to their work and function in several different
job classifications. In addition, measures of facilitative skills have limited value unless they can be related to the level of function of the potential helpees. The problem, then, is to obtain an objective measure of the level of helping skills of members of the student personnel profession and to compare both staff-wide and selected sub-group levels with the level of helping skills of other staff, faculty, and students who may function in a helping role with students, and with students themselves.

In order to investigate this problem it was necessary to select a research site where meaningful numbers of students and staff would participate in the study. Further, each subject needed to be contacted with a request that he or she provide a measure of their level of helping skills. Students and student personnel staff subjects were asked for additional data of a demographic nature. Finally, the raw data needed to be rated and evaluated. An expanded discussion of the methods and procedures used in this study will be found in Chapter III.

Hypotheses

Three hypotheses were developed regarding the problem stated above and are given here in broad terms. The specifics of the hypotheses are delineated in Chapter III.

The first hypothesis to be tested is that there is
no significant difference between the level of facilitative skills of the student personnel staff of a particular institution and the level of facilitative skills of other selected staff, faculty, and students from within that institution.

The second hypothesis is that there is no significant difference between the level of facilitative skills of the student personnel staff members working in student housing and the level of facilitative skills of undergraduate residence hall advisors and selected undergraduate residents.

The third hypothesis states that there is no significant difference in the level of facilitative skills of sub-group members of the student personnel staff when divided by certain job classifications and other selected demographic data.

Definition of Terms

To provide greater clarity several frequently used expressions are defined below in terms of their meaning for the purposes of this study.

Member of the student personnel profession.---The terms "student personnel staff member," "student personnel worker," and "member of the student personnel profession" are used synonymously in this study. These terms refer to
staff members in higher education whose primary job responsibility is to focus on service to students, whether that service most often is performed in a face-to-face manner or whether it involves the planning and implementing of programs for large groups of students. For the student personnel subjects at Trenton State College, the terms refer to the members of the staff headed by the Dean of Students, 96 percent of whom have at least a Master's degree in student personnel work or a closely allied field.

**Helping skills.**—The interchangeable terms "helping skills" or "facilitative skills" refer to a combination of abilities used to foster personal growth. Typically these skills include the capacity to be responsive to the feelings of others, to focus sensitively on the affect and content of human interaction in a nourishing way, and ultimately to introduce directionality in the behavior of another. Carkhuff (1972) defines "helping" as:

> ... a process leading to new behavior for the person being helped: the helper must guide him in his development. An effective helper is initially nourishing or responsive. This nourishment prepares the person being helped for the more directionful or initiative behavior of the helper [p. 6].

A further discussion of the elements of helping behaviors will be found in Chapters II and III.

**Personal growth.**—The term "personal growth" refers to the process of change in an individual characterized by increased self-exploration, self-understanding, and
constructive action.

**Methodology**

A brief description of the methods and procedures used in this study will be given here. Chapter III contains a more detailed treatment of the same subject.

One of the first steps in the study was to select a research site. Trenton State College, Trenton, New Jersey, was chosen for this purpose largely because the researcher's former association with that institution suggested that data could be obtained from members of several different campus groups. Also, the presence of a large student personnel staff supported this choice. Trenton State College is a medium-sized, multi-purpose public institution with a long history of the preparation of teachers.

Several Trenton State College groups were included in the study and were initially contacted in May of 1973. Student subjects included peer counselors as well as undergraduates approached in selected classes. Staff subjects included current and former student personnel staff members and student personnel departmental secretaries. Related professional staff, the administrative leadership, and a random sample of the faculty were also selected for the study.

The basic instrument used was Carkhuff's Index of
Communication (Carkhuff, 1969), which was given to all members of the study population. Further data were obtained from student personnel staff and undergraduates by the use of questionnaires written by the researcher which focused on demographic material (see Appendix). The Carkhuff instrument purports to reveal the level of facilitative skills of the respondent. Sixteen short paragraphs which express the thoughts and feelings of a woman client are included. Subjects were asked to respond to the written material as if the woman had expressed herself to them and they wanted to help her. The responses were evaluated by three independent raters and the data analyzed using a single-factor analysis of variance.

**Limitations**

Several factors may limit the results of this study. Initial comment will be made here regarding questions of representation, the instrument and its administration, and the prior role of the researcher. Further discussion of the limitations of this study will be presented in Chapter V.

Questions of representation may limit the meaning of the data in this study. All data were collected at Trenton State College, and the results may not be applicable elsewhere. Further, while efforts were made to obtain representative student subjects for the study, the problem of
obtaining a sample from several thousand undergraduates was such that the student data should be interpreted cautiously.

Both the nature of the instrument and circumstances surrounding its administration may provide further limiting factors. While the Carkhuff index has been used previously with undergraduates and college staff, it is not designed specifically for such use. In addition, the real life helpees of the subjects are largely undergraduate students, while the helpee portrayed in the instrument is an adult woman. Further, the use of raters in evaluating the raw data introduces several possibilities for human error. Also, the conditions under which the instruments were administered varied somewhat in time and mode of contact between the researcher and the subject. Despite efforts to minimize variation in administration of the instrument, differences here may limit the meaning of the results.

Finally, the prior association of the researcher and many of the subjects may influence the results of the study. (As a former Trenton State College student personnel staff member, the researcher's perceptions of the college may have affected his selection of subjects.) Also, some subjects, especially student personnel staff members and faculty, may have been influenced in a positive or negative way because of their prior association with the researcher.
Significance of the Study

The main importance of the problem has been alluded to earlier. People in the helping role who cannot help are not simply unproductive; they do damage to those with whom they work. Only those who have highly developed facilitative skills can be expected to foster students' personal growth effectively.

One of the many challenges facing education is to evaluate all programs in light of limited resources and to plan future commitments based on these evaluations. Members of the student personnel profession may or may not possess a higher level of facilitative skills than others in a campus community, or there may be different skill levels for different sub-groups within a student personnel staff. Further, members of the student personnel profession may or may not be trained, hired, and maintained in their positions because of their helping skills. On the other hand, they may possess helping skills and be prevented from using them as a result of their identification with other roles. Whatever the case, the level of facilitative skills of members of the student personnel profession will be a significant determinant of their influence on the attitudes, values, and emotional well-being of the students, faculty, and staff with whom they work. Planning for the future functions of members of the student personnel profession in higher
education should include an investigation of the degree to which they possess the skills necessary to meet their stated goals.

Organization of the Remainder of the Dissertation

Chapter II provides a brief review of the related literature of helping relationships and student personnel work in higher education.

Chapter III discusses the methodology of the study and presents detailed descriptions of the procedures involved.

Chapter IV details the results of the study in both statistical and narrative form. Data are presented in relation to the original hypothesis.

Chapter V provides a general discussion of the study with specific focus on the results, which are considered in terms of possible limitations, significance, implications, and suggestions for further research.
CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

This study is concerned with assessing the helping skills level of members of the major groups who attempt to facilitate the personal growth of students on a college campus. Particular attention has been paid to student personnel workers because members of this profession have presented themselves as the campus group whose state goals are most focused on facilitating the personal growth of students (Williamson, 1949; Mueller, 1961; O'Banion, 1971; Brown, 1972). Hurst and Ivey (1971) and Brown (1972) have suggested that, in addition to providing direct help to students, members of student personnel staffs should play an active role as facilitators or consultants to the entire campus.

The need for effective helping skills on a campus has been established by a number of researchers. Rust (1960) found that only 25 percent of the students identified as having emotional problems on his campus were seen in the student mental hygiene clinic. Similarly, Weiss, Segal, and Sokol (1965) found that, while 11.5 percent of the student body at their institution manifested clinically significant emotional impairment, only 28 percent of the most impaired saw the local mental health professionals. Snyder, Hill, and Derksen
indicated that students at their university reported that they would seek help on persistent social problems from friends first, close relatives second, and would turn to faculty and psychological services staff last for this kind of assistance. However, while many students who need help may not seek it from established helping agencies on college and university campuses, others have. Kirk (1973) reported that, over a period of four years, 25 percent of the students from a graduating class at her university used the counseling service and over 10 percent used the psychiatric services.

Students in need of help who turn to their friends instead of the campus helping specialists may have denied themselves opportunities for growth that would otherwise exist. Martin, Carkhuff, and Berenson (1966) compared the helping skills of the best available friends of a group of college students with trained counselors. In their study the counselors offered significantly higher levels of helping skills on all measures. Similarly, a study by Berenson, Carkhuff, and Myrus (1966) suggested that self-taught college students in a helping role functioned at less than minimally facilitative interpersonal levels. Nevertheless, Brown and Zunker (1966) found from a survey of a sample of all the colleges in the country that 63 percent of the small institutions and 67 percent of the large institutions use
student counselors in the guidance of freshmen. They also found that 89.6 percent and 87.8 percent of the small and large institutions, respectively, used students in residence hall counseling. An additional finding was that 52.9 percent of the small colleges provided no training for these student counselors and less than 50 percent of the larger institutions provided more than ten hours of training for the same group.

The need for effective helpers on college and university campuses expressed above has been found in the distinctive literature that exists for student personnel workers but also in the literature on psychotherapy. Psychotherapists constitute one of the major groups in the larger society whose goals focus on facilitating the personal growth of others. While many different orientations exist, psychotherapists of different schools have indicated a similar general concern for aiding in the resolution of individual difficulties and promoting new and more effective behaviors (Fromm-Reichmann, 1950; Shaffer and Shoben, 1956; Rogers, 1957; Harper, 1959; Frank, 1961; Vance and Volsky, 1962).

While the clients of student personnel workers may or may not be significantly different from those of psychotherapists, both groups have described similar broad goals for the people with whom they work. Members of each group are concerned with entering into relationships which are
intended to foster positive change in others. However, the theoretical and research contributions appropriate to helping relationships have been largely reported in the literature on psychotherapy.

This chapter provides a review of the literature related to the purposes of the study. Consequently, the chapter focuses on the literature on psychotherapy. However, within this literature a vast amount of empirical research and theoretical contributions have been reported. A comprehensive review of the contributions related to helping relationships would require several volumes. For the purposes of this study, it was necessary to approach the literature in a selective way to present a review that could be accommodated in a single chapter.

The method chosen to limit the scope of this chapter was to focus on the characteristics of helping relationships and, in particular, upon the helper characteristics within the relationship. The remainder of the chapter is divided into sections organized around different aspects of helper characteristics. The first section refers to some of the studies which challenged the effectiveness of psychotherapy and, in so doing, gave impetus to the search for the effective ingredients of helping relationships. The second section focuses on that part of the search which centered on the therapist variables. The concluding section discusses
the application of these findings beyond counseling and therapy.

**Challenge to Psychotherapy**

A major impetus for investigating the characteristics of helping relationships was provided by an ambitious and now classic study by Eysenck (1952). In this study the effectiveness of psychotherapy in achieving its goals was directly challenged. Eysenck reviewed the literature of the effects of psychotherapy as reported in nineteen studies concerning 7,000 cases and found that two-thirds of the subjects were markedly improved or recovered within two years of the onset of their neuroses whether they were involved with the psychotherapy relationship or not. Eysenck's major finding was that the literature failed to demonstrate that psychotherapy provided an effective means for helping neurotics.

Further evidence that served to question the efficacy of psychotherapy was provided by a number of studies. Levitt (1957) replicated Eysenck's basic design in a study reviewing the literature on psychotherapy with children. His study failed to demonstrate that psychotherapy provided an effective means for helping neurotic children. The similarity of the results obtained by Eysenck and Levitt in separate but extensive studies provided a strong challenge to the worth of psychotherapy.
Using different research designs, other investigators obtained additional evidence. Barron and Leary (1955) compared the progress of neurotics after some had received psychotherapy and others had not. Of 150 reasonably similar clients who had been accepted for therapy in a clinic, twenty-three were placed on a waiting list because sufficient therapist time was not available to see each client. Of the rest, forty-two entered individual therapy and eighty-five participated in group therapy. The therapists were trained and experienced. Progress was measured by the neurotic scales of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) after several months had elapsed. While some progress was noted among both treatment groups, the unanticipated finding was that similar progress was found among the clients on the waiting list who had received no therapy at all.

Cartwright and Vogel (1960) also looked at clients assigned to waiting lists but focused on measuring change during the waiting period as contrasted to a therapy period with the same clients. The clients in this study had asked for therapy at the University of Chicago Counseling Center. The therapists involved were both experienced and inexperienced client centered counselors. Two measures were used to assess the degree of change in clients while they were in therapy and while no therapy occurred as they waited their turn. On one measure, the Butler and Haigh Q sort, greater
change occurred during therapy than when therapy was not in progress. However, this test measured self-descriptions of the client. The Thematic Aperception Test (TAT), which is a projective technique, failed to yield significant differences in change between the two time periods. Further, within therapy the clients of experienced therapists showed greater improvement on both measures than did the clients of inexperienced therapists.

In a study concerned with even more specific outcomes, Broedel, Ohlsen, Proff, and Southard (1960) investigated the effect of group counseling on the grade point averages of gifted but underachieving ninth-grade students. The thirty-four subjects were divided into two control and two experimental groups. For the first eight-week period, only the experimental groups received counseling; however, subsequently the control groups were counseled also. While the authors believed that meaningful personal growth was achieved by members of three out of the four groups, the study failed to provide evidence that group counseling will result in improved grade point averages for underachievers.

Richardson (1960) found similar results for the effect of counseling with college students. He invited students in the lowest third of their class in the School of Technology of City College of New York to come for a counseling interview centered on vocational and educational concerns.
A matched group of students who received no counseling was used as a control group. The results indicated that the counseled students did no better academically than did those not counseled.

Another study with college students in academic difficulty also failed to support the desirability of vocational-educational counseling. Goodstein and Crites (1961) studied thirty-three students whose high school academic record and test scores were such that their admission to the University of Iowa was made conditional upon their academic performance in a summer session. Twenty-six of the students were invited to participate in counseling sessions, and nineteen of those students participated in at least two counseling sessions. However, the grade point averages of the counseled students were not superior to the other groups. In fact, after adjustments had been made to correct for the differences in the abilities of the groups, it was found that the students who were not contacted and who received no counseling at all received the highest grade point average.

Studies outside of educational settings have also found that control group members fared as well or better than those who were counseled. Levitt, Beiser, and Robertson (1959) investigated outcome variables of a sample of clients who had participated in at least five psychotherapy sessions at the Institute for Juvenile Research of the State of
Illinois. The subjects who received therapy were matched with similar subjects who had been accepted for therapy but had not participated. The original contact between the clients and the Institute occurred during the period 1944 to 1954. Follow-up studies conducted five and six years later found little difference between treated and untreated subjects. The differences that did exist indicated that those who had not received therapy were slightly better adjusted.

Similarly, Poser (1966) obtained results which questioned the value of psychotherapy offered through an agency. In this instance, the study was concerned with the efficacy of group psychotherapy with hospitalized schizophrenics. Some patients were seen in group settings by psychiatrists and psychiatric social workers. Similar patients met with untrained and inexperienced undergraduate college women. After five months a number of different measures indicated that significantly better therapeutic outcomes were achieved by members of the group who met with untrained college students as opposed to those who met with trained therapists.

The studies cited above, taken as a group, suggest that large numbers of clients have not experienced benefits as a result of their psychotherapy experiences that were significantly greater than those achieved by similar individuals who had no counseling. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) noted that the bulk of the evidence supported such a conclusion.
However, many of the studies reviewed have been criticized on methodological grounds. Bergin (1963), for example, argued that the studies reviewed by Eysenck and Levitt were poorly designed. Bergin conducted his own review of six studies in an attempt to account for the earlier results. One of his important suggestions was that the subjects of the earlier studies who were thought to be receiving no help might, in fact, have been involved in relationships outside of the formal therapy context which were equally growth facilitating. Bergin referred to Frank's study (1961) which indicated that as many as half of the members of experimental control groups may have extended contact with help-giving persons outside of therapy. More recent evidence (LeMay and Christensen, 1968) indicated that experimental subjects received counseling unknown to the researcher.

Bergin further reported that, in several studies, the failure of psychotherapy to demonstrate positive results could be related to the averaging of the effects of different therapists. When some therapists facilitate positive personal growth and others in the study population retard growth or promote negative change, the average effects of the different therapists would be mediocre. However, as Bergin pointed out, changes occurred in both the treatment and control groups. The suggestion of Bergin's work was that research efforts should be focused on the effective
ingredients within psychotherapy rather than the overall or average efficacy of psychotherapy. Berenson and Carkhuff (1967), in commenting on the same subject, concluded: "The hope for the profession lies in understanding the work of those counselors and therapists whose clients get well" (p. 56).

The Search for the Effective Therapist

At the same time that some researchers were conducting studies concerned with measuring broad outcomes of psychotherapy, other investigators were concerned wholly or in part with a more narrow focus centered around the goal of identifying the characteristics or ingredients of psychotherapy that led to successful outcomes. In particular, a number of studies focused on the variables the therapist brought to the therapeutic relationship.

Fiedler conducted a series of studies (1950a, 1950b, 1951, 1953) that were among the first to suggest that therapist variables or helper characteristics independent of theoretical orientation or technique may have accounted for successful outcomes in therapy. Fiedler (1950a) hypothesized that, if the differences between theoretical persuasions were the most important variables in determining therapeutic outcome, experienced therapists within schools would describe the ideal therapeutic relationship in terms most nearly
approximating those of inexperienced therapists within their own schools. Conversely, if experience and skill were the most important ingredients in successful therapy, experienced therapists would describe the ideal therapeutic relationship in terms that more nearly approximated other experienced therapists regardless of schools. Fiedler found that the more expert therapists agreed among themselves, suggesting that differences between schools might not be as significant as previously thought. In subsequent studies, Fiedler (1950b, 1951) employed raters from different theoretical backgrounds, different degrees of experience, rating recorded therapy segments from the sessions of different therapists from different backgrounds with different degrees of experience. Throughout his studies, Fiedler's initial hypothesis was confirmed. Experienced therapists described the ideal therapeutic relationship and behaved more like each other regardless of school rather than like inexperienced therapists of their own school. The direct suggestion of these studies was that experience and skill are more important variables in the therapy relationship than is theoretical allegiance.

While Zimmer and Pepyne (1971) disputed this conclusion on the basis of their study of films of three leading therapists of different schools, Fiedler (1971) pointed out that the conflicting evidence was based on only one sample
of each school and that the context was atypical of most therapy situations. In any event, of the qualities measured in his studies, Fiedler found that by far the most important dimensions affecting therapeutic outcome concerned the relationship between the therapist and the client. Specifically, Fiedler found the differences between experts and nonexperts to be related to the therapist's ability to understand, to communicate with, and to maintain rapport with the client.

Fiedler was not the only researcher to conclude that therapist variables were important to psychotherapeutic outcome. Some of the data from the series of studies at the University of Chicago reported by Rogers and Dymond (1954) suggested that the counseling relationships most associated with positive outcomes were characterized by respect and liking. Further, Snyder (1958) reported that a series of nine studies conducted earlier at Pennsylvania State University led clearly to the conclusion that counselor variables play an important role in the therapy relationship. Snyder added, however, that the question of which therapist variables were significant was less clear.

Betz (1963), investigating psychotherapy with schizophrenic patients, also found the helper variables to be important. She reported that clinical responses in the patients were related to the personality characteristics of the therapists, a finding she suggested was consistent with
earlier work done in collaboration with Whitehorn. Also, Cartwright and Lerner (1963) emphasized the importance of helper characteristics. Their conclusion was that differences in therapeutic outcome could be found in the therapist's ability to understand the client empathically. Combs and Soper (1963) also stressed the central role of helper characteristics as opposed to theoretical approach or methods in determining effective therapeutic outcomes.

While a number of researchers suggested that the qualities of the helper-helpee relationship were important in determining therapeutic outcome, it remained for Rogers to articulate most clearly and authoritatively the importance of helper behavior upon the outcome of the helping relationship. He stated the conditions which his research and clinical experience suggested were necessary and sufficient to initiate the process of constructive personality change or personal growth. Rogers' (1957) conditions included helper congruence or genuineness and authenticity in the relationship, unconditional positive regard for the helpee, and empathic understanding of the helper's frame of reference, as well as the ability to communicate these conditions in the relationship.

Rogers argued that no further ingredients were necessary for a helping relationship to facilitate personal growth. He emphasized the critical nature of the quality of the
relationship instead of focusing on questions of technique and doctrine. In commenting on his varied experience, Rogers (1962) concluded "that it is the quality of the personal relationship which matters most .... I believe the quality of my encounter is more important in the long run than is my scholarly knowledge, my professional training, my counseling orientation, the techniques I used in the interview" (p. 416).

A considerable amount of research was conducted as a result of the attention devoted to the characteristics of helpers in effective therapy relationships by Rogers and others. Much of the research considered the effect upon therapeutic outcome of therapists who demonstrated high levels of empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness as opposed to those who demonstrated low levels of the same qualities. Clients of therapists who offered high levels of those conditions demonstrated significant improvement on a variety of change indices (Rogers, 1962; Truax, 1963; Truax and Carkhuff, 1965; Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imbec, Battle, Hoehn-saric, Nash, and Steve, 1966; Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, and Truax, 1967; and van der Veen, 1967). When Dickenson and Truax (1966) looked at the effects of counseling on underachieving college students, they found that the grade point average of those who received group counseling improved and that those students in groups where the highest levels of helping conditions were offered tended to show the
greatest improvement.

Additional studies provided general support for the importance of the three therapist variables but differed somewhat in assessing the effects of individual variables among the three. For example, in working with secondary school students whose contact with counselors was limited to two or three contacts, Demos (1964) found that the ten counselors judged the best at a National Defense Education Act Institute offered higher levels of empathy and unconditional positive regard than did the counselors judged worst. However, a similar finding was not obtained for congruence. Similarly, Truax, Carkhuff, and Kodman (1965) found that hospitalized patients experiencing group therapy demonstrated greater improvement with therapists offering high levels of accurate empathy and unconditional positive regard. However, unlike earlier findings, patients in the Truax, Carkhuff, and Kodman study who received low levels of therapist self-congruence showed greater personality change than did patients receiving high levels of therapist self-congruence. Van der Veen (1967) found support for the relationship of therapist conditions to outcome but, in contrast to the findings of Truax, Carkhuff, and Kodman, found the strongest support for the conditions of empathy, somewhat less to for congruence, and least for positive regard. While also finding support for the relationship of therapist conditions to outcome,
Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imbec, Battle, Hoehn-saric, Nash, and Steve (1966) found that the therapist offered condition of warmth, considered alone, demonstrated little or no effect on outcome. Although Bordin (1970) viewed the inconsistency of the findings with individual conditions as a serious flaw in the work of Truax and Carkhuff (1967), Truax (1971) provided the following explanation: "The data thus suggest that when two conditions of the therapeutic triad are highly related but the third is negatively related, then the prediction of outcome should be based on the two that are most highly related" (p. 237).

Some who have regarded Rogers' conception of the effective characteristics of a helping relationship as important have argued that the three conditions of empathy, warmth, and genuineness were neither necessary nor sufficient for fostering personal growth (Garfield and Bergin, 1971; Strupp, 1973a, 1973b). In addition, Mills and Zytowski (1967) raised the question that the Rogerian core conditions may reflect some overriding but unknown characteristic of helping relationships. Mullen and Abeles (1971), on the other hand, found that empathy alone was related to positive outcomes. McMullin (1972) reported that clients engaged in meaningful recognition of their inner feelings when none of the three conditions were offered at high levels.

Despite certain conflicting evidence, there has been
wide agreement on the desirability of the Rogerian core conditions (Brammer, 1973). However, some theorists and researchers have considered other therapist variables in the attempt to identify the essential ingredients of effective therapy. For example, some authors (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969; Brammer, 1973) suggested that effective helpers need to be concrete and specific in their communications. Other researchers studied the relationship of therapist confrontation to client levels of self-exploration. Anderson (1968) found a positive relationship with client self-exploration when high facilitative therapists pointed out discrepancies between the perceptions of therapist and client. However, similar confrontation by therapists offering low levels of facilitative conditions was never followed by increased client self-exploration. On the other hand, Mitchel and Namenek (1972) found that clients of high facilitating therapists demonstrated a decreased level of self-exploration after therapist confrontation. Although Berenson, Mutchell, and Moravec (1968) failed to find a significant relationship between five different types of therapist confrontation and client self-exploration, they did find that the high level therapist often shared his or her experience and attended to client strengths while the low level therapist appeared to focus on exposure of client pathology. However, Kaul, Kaul, and Bednar (1973) found that
neither raters nor clients reported differences in self-explorations between high facilitating counselors divided on the basis of confrontive and speculative types. The authors suggested that client self-exploration was related more to the overall effectiveness of the counselor than to counselor style.

Carkhuff, whose work reflected an initial close identification with that of Rogers and others in the Wisconsin Schizophrenia Project (Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, Truax, 1967), was one of the major theorists and researchers who questioned whether the core conditions as defined by Rogers were both necessary and sufficient. He stated his viewpoint as follows (Berenson and Carkhuff, 1967):

Rogers is boldly challenging in his statement of conditions and in his points on outcome, training, diagnosis, and technique. His is a most distinctive contribution, which, however, suffers from generalization. It is unlikely, for example, at our present developmental level that any one series of conditions is 'necessary' and 'sufficient.' Furthermore, if the conditions are viewed as primary or general factors, it is likely that the weights of these factors will vary with therapist, client, and environmental variables, alone and in their various interactions. In addition, secondary factors in a given interaction of relevant variables may operate to facilitate or retard the effects of the principal conditions, as well as to contribute to effective processes (p. 85).

Carkhuff (1969), while building upon the Rogerian assumptions, moved in a somewhat different theoretical direction by adding directive helper behavior to Rogers' core conditions. Carkhuff's position stressed the need for action
as well as understanding. From his vantage point, a helper who is unwilling to be assertive in the helping relationship minimizes potential helpee growth. He argued that effective helpers are both receptive and responsive as well as action-oriented.

Carkhuff (1969) specified seven helper conditions which he suggested related directly to constructive change or personal growth and which form the basis for his Gross Rating Scale employed in this study. These seven conditions were empathy, respect, genuineness, self-disclosure, concreteness, confrontation, and immediacy. Carkhuff divided these conditions into those facilitative dimensions offered by the helper in response to the person being helped and those dimensions that are initiated by the helper. He noted that some, particularly concreteness or specificity and genuineness, may be either responsive or action-oriented. Carkhuff's responsive conditions of empathy, respect and warmth, specificity, and genuineness generally paralleled the core conditions offered by Rogers. However, Carkhuff's concern for expressing respect and warmth for the helpee and his world emphasized therapist activity not included in Rogers' notion of unconditional positive regard. Carkhuff's respect was focused on the potential of the helpee. He argued that conditionality based on genuineness is more respectful in the long run. Further, his emphasis on specificity was
unmatched by Rogers. Carkhuff argued that empathic understanding is enhanced and communicated more meaningfully to the helpee when the helper aids in making the expressions of content and feelings more concrete.

Carkhuff's emphasis on helper-initiated movement in the therapeutic relationship was in contrast with Rogers' client-centered focus. Carkhuff argued that insights need to be acted upon for effective growth to occur. Further, he suggested that occasionally understanding can be achieved only as a result of action. In either case, Carkhuff's effective helper must be able to be directive within the helping relationship.

Carkhuff's action-oriented helper dimensions were self-disclosure, confrontation, immediacy, and concreteness or specificity. Self-disclosure in this context was the assertive expression of genuineness. Confrontation of discrepancies between expressed feelings and behavior served to enable the helpee to confront himself and others. Similarly, Carkhuff felt that the effective helper facilitates growth by demonstrating and encouraging behaviors focused on the present in the relationship between helper and helpee. Finally, Carkhuff valued concreteness as an action-oriented dimension, especially in the later stages of the helping process. He felt that specific courses of action must be discussed and eventually one selected and followed.
In general terms, then, Carkhuff accepted the thrust of the Rogerian core conditions as a necessary part of effective helping relationships. He differed from Rogers in that he viewed the Rogerian conditions as an essential foundation upon which to build a relationship that allows for optimum acceptance of his action-oriented dimensions.

**Applications Beyond Therapy**

While Rogers and Carkhuff differed on the desirability of directive behaviors on the part of the helpers in a helping relationship, there was much that was common about their theoretical positions. The work of each has emphasized the importance of the helper offered conditions of empathy, warmth, and genuineness, even though they have disagreed about the sufficiency of these conditions. Significantly, Rogers (1961) and Carkhuff (1969, 1971) have agreed on the importance of helper offered conditions in therapy and that the same variables which account for positive outcomes in psychotherapy have wide applicability for all interpersonal relationships. Researchers working from other perspectives have come to the same conclusion. For example, the evidence from a series of studies at the University of Florida (Combs, 1969) indicated that, with teachers, counselors, and clergy, helpers could be distinguished from nonhelpers on the basis of their characteristic ways of perceiving in terms of their
general frame of reference as well as the way they saw others, themselves, the helping task and its problems, and the appropriate methods for helping. The further suggestion from the Florida group (Avila, Combs, and Purky, 1971) was that there was a basic similarity in the relationships required for effectiveness in the helping professions and that the principles underlying this similarity had wide applicability. Differences in approach have continued between major theorists. However, there has been substantial agreement that common principles underlie growth facilitating relationships and that those principles have wide applicability.

Different studies have supported the belief that high levels of facilitative helper conditions can be learned by lay persons as well as by professional therapists. Magoon and Golann (1966), in a pilot training program sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health, found that a group of women who had raised their families could be trained to function effectively in mental health roles. The suggestion of their work was that people from nontraditional sources could be used effectively in helping roles. Carkhuff and Truax (1965b) found that lay hospital personnel as well as graduate students could be trained to function at helping levels essentially the same as those of experienced therapists in less than 100 hours of training. Because the lay
personnel performed at higher levels than post-internship graduate students on the dimension of emphatic understanding, a further study (Carkhuff and Truax, 1965a) was undertaken to investigate the effect of the lay group counseling on hospitalized mental patients. The evidence from this study indicated significant improvement in the patients seen by lay group counselors compared to patients in control groups. In another institutional setting, counselor aides were recruited from among secretaries and compared to master's level counselors. In this context, Truax and Lister (1970) found that the greatest client improvement occurred when the aides saw clients alone rather than in combination with professional counselors. In another context, Dana, Heynen, and Burdette (1974) suggested that, in time of crisis, students prefer help from their peers to help from campus professionals and that students should be trained to provide peer assistance through crisis intervention centers. After providing such training for volunteers in a crisis intervention center, Knickerbocker and McGee (1973) reported that the lay volunteers demonstrated significantly higher levels of warmth, empathy, and total facilitative conditions when talking on the telephone to callers seeking help than did professional counselors.

Several studies have suggested the applicability of helping skills for teachers and teachers in training.
Christensen (1960) found that vocabulary and arithmetic achievement of fourth- and fifth-grade pupils was positively related to teacher warmth. Hefele (1971), in working with graduate teachers in training at a school for the deaf, found that training in helping skills related to improvement in general teaching skills. Further, the students of teachers in training who participated in the helping skills development program achieved significantly higher reading scores than did the students of those who did not participate in the program. Elementary education majors who received twenty-five hours of experiential and didactic training in helping skills were rated significantly higher by their classroom supervisors after eight weeks of student teaching than were members of three control groups of student teachers in a study reported by Berenson (1971). Further, Aspy (1972) reported significant and positive relationships between the cognitive gain of students on the Stanford Achievement Tests and the provision by teachers of high facilitative conditions.

While there has been wide applicability of the principles of effective helping skills to a number of settings, many cognitive and intellectually oriented graduate programs which provided credentials for professional helpers have failed to demonstrate a relationship between their training and the development of helping skills among their students (Arbuckle, 1968; Carkhuff, 1966, 1968, 1969). Carkhuff,
Kratochvil, and Friel (1968) found that trainees grew in the direction of the level of functioning of their trainers and that, in some instances, the result was a deterioration of helping skills during the training programs. However, programs led by persons who themselves were functioning at high levels of helping skills and which combined didactic and experiential components have been demonstrated to be effective (Carkhuff, 1969).

While Carkhuff has been a major figure in the development of training procedures emphasizing experiential components, others have made important contributions as well. Kagan's work with Interpersonal Process Recall (IPR) has emphasized client reviews of previously videotaped therapy sessions (Danish and Kagan, 1969). The use of IPR in training counselors has been suggested (Danish and Kagan, 1971). Further, Archer and Kagan (1973) found that IPR can be used successfully by college students to teach interpersonal skills to other college students. Another effective training vehicle, which also used videotapes, was provided by Ivey (1971). Emphasizing the acquisition of highly specific helping skills, Ivey's microcounseling techniques have been used in diverse situations. Haase and DiMattia (1970) used microcounseling techniques successfully in the training of support personnel. Ivey (1971) provided further examples, including the results of teaching specific human relations
skills to college students, mental health paraprofessionals, hospitalized mental patients, counselor trainees, and telephone crisis intervention volunteers.

The success of the various training programs in facilitating the learning of interpersonal skills has underscored the efficacy of these skills and their broad implications for a number of human relationships. Reviewing the wide scope of the relevance of these skills, Truax (1970) concluded:

... these same interpersonal skills are motivating, therapeutic, or change-inducing whether we measure delinquent behavior in delinquents, psychotic behavior in psychotics, arithmetic and reading achievement in the normal classroom, the degree of intimacy and self-disclosure in normal friendship relationships and parent-child relationships, socialization in pre-school children, neurotic behavior in neurotics, vocational progress in the physically, emotionally, or mentally handicapped, or indeed the person's sense of adequacy, satisfaction in living, or ability to live constructively across the broad areas of human relationships and human problems (p. 6).

Summary

In summary, the search for effective therapist helping characteristics was originally encouraged by findings that questioned the efficacy of psychotherapy and further spurred by research which suggested that critical ingredients in the therapy relationship led to successful client outcomes regardless of therapist theoretical orientations. Additional theoretical and research efforts, particularly
those led by Rogers, suggested the critical nature of empathy, warmth, and genuineness in the therapy relationship. While some conflicting evidence exists as to the necessity or sufficiency of the Rogerian core conditions, their central role in recent psychotherapeutic practice and research has been outlined. Carkhuff's work has been presented as an extension of earlier contributions. His position has been summarized to provide specific reference for the standardized instrument and rating scale used in this study. Finally, the efficacy of helping skills for different groups has been suggested and mention has been made of various training techniques emphasizing experiential components.
CHAPTER III
METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This chapter presents detailed descriptions of methods and procedures used in the study. Separate sections of the chapter are devoted to a description of the research site and the study sample. Additional sections describe the instruments used in the study, the data collection process, and the training of raters. The final sections enumerate the detailed hypotheses and the procedures used to analyze the data.

Research Site

Trenton State College was selected for this study for a variety of reasons. First, the institution would support such a study. Several Trenton State College students and staff members expressed the belief that such a study would have direct value to Trenton State in addition to any other meaning it might have to the investigator or to the professional literature. Second, while no one institution could represent all state colleges, Trenton State does share several important characteristics with many other medium-sized public institutions. It is an older college (1855) which existed for much of its history as a single-purpose teacher-education school. It abandoned this exclusive role in the 1960's and now offers several nonteaching degree
programs. It is a leading state college in a public system with several other state colleges, a number of community colleges, but only one state university. Trenton State is within the northeastern corridor of high population density or megalopolis but is associated with a distinct urban area. It provides significant housing (2,200 beds) for its undergraduate population but has large numbers of students commuting both from their own (parents') home and from off-campus housing. It has experienced rapid expansion of facilities, programs, and enrollments during the past decade. Finally, it purports to be concerned with research and community service as well as with teaching.

Sample

While the focus of this study is the student personnel staff, a number of other groups interact with students and provide services for them. It is impractical to survey all the people who may have meaningful contact with students on a college campus. Indeed, it could be argued that a wide range of people from the governor, state legislators, and Board of Trustees to maintenance men and campus police have significant interfaces with students. However, the majority of contacts a student will have on campus will be the kind of people represented in this study.

As mentioned earlier, the evidence indicates that
helpers tend to move in the direction of the level of functioning of their helpers. Students involved in helping relationships with other students, student personnel workers, administrative staff, faculty, or whomever will tend to grow toward the level of functioning of the person with whom they are working. In order to understand the desirability of students seeking help from different groups within the student personnel staff or within the larger community, it is necessary to obtain a measure of the helping skills of each group on the same instrument. Carkhuff's Index of Communication (1969) was given to 318 current and 30 former Trenton State College community members. Appendix B provides a copy of the Carkhuff Index and Table 1 indicates the distribution of subjects in the sample.

As indicated earlier, student personnel workers have traditionally maintained helping students as a major goal. Student personnel services are grouped together precisely because they share this underlying common rationale for aiding student growth and because a united structure allows for collaborative efforts to identify and program for student needs. However, student personnel workers' concern for helping students is not limited to the creation of new programs or collaborative staff efforts. Each of the sub-groups within the student personnel organization has helping, counseling, or advising as at least a major part of its activity.
### TABLE 1

**DISTRIBUTION OF SUBJECTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student Personnel Staff Members</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Student Personnel Staff who left the staff between June 1962 and June 1972</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time secretarial employees of the Student Personnel Staff</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff of the Admissions Office, the Placement Office, and the Academic Advisement Office</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The President, Vice Presidents, and academic deans and their assistants, and the division heads</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A randomly drawn sample of 10 percent of the full-time teaching faculty</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates employed as staff members in the residence halls</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate staff members of the campus crisis intervention telephone service (Dialogue)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates from selected classes</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The subjects were identified with the group listed in May 1973.*

Even in the most structured and businesslike division of the student personnel staff, each individual office's activities are seen as relating directly to facilitating student growth. Indeed, the current Trenton State College handbook states:
"Students may . . . approach any member of the Student Personnel staff for counseling."

At Trenton State College the student personnel staff has been organized in a way which consciously attempts to eliminate the pigeonholing of individual staff members. While all staff members operate primarily from some specific office, a considerable degree of overlap and sub-staff interaction occurs. This is particularly true in the central office which attempts to provide leadership and coordination for the entire program. The Dean of Students, the Associate Dean of Students, and the Assistant to the Dean of Students are available to deal with unanticipated needs from any segment of the program in addition to their specific responsibilities. The largest sub-group of the staff operates out of the Housing Office, which concerns itself with both on- and off-campus student housing. Six full-time staff members have major responsibility for living and working with students in residence halls. Additional live-in staff are either not full-time professional student personnel workers or have major responsibility outside of the residence halls. A Director of Housing and two Associate Directors work from the Central Housing Office. Unlike the housing staff which has widely ranging responsibilities for counseling, advising, educational programming, and a number of administrative functions, the Financial Aid staff is largely limited to working
with individuals concerned about student financial need. The Director and Assistant Director of Financial Aid spend most of their time with students, their parents, and other staff relating directly to financial aid matters. The Student Activities and College Union staff function as a unit from another campus office. The Director and Assistant Director of Student Activities work with the Director of the College Union in advising campus student groups and implementing a number of specific programs designed to meet the curricular and extracurricular needs of student groups. The Health Services Director occupies a unique position within the student personnel staff. She is a full-time, fully functioning member of the larger staff; however, the nurses and physicians who work with her, while considered related to the staff, focus largely on the delivery of medical services to individual students and have not been included in this study. The organization of the Counseling Center was in flux at the time of this study. Four full-time counselors were available to students. At the same time this sub-staff was responsible for coordinating the teaching of two student personnel courses and a number of human relations group activities. Two additional staff members were associated with the counseling center staff in the provision of remedial reading and related learning skill services. However, for the purposes of this study, only the four full-time members with
primary responsibility for counseling are regarded as the counseling sub-staff.

Thirty-four subjects who had been full-time student personnel staff members but left the college between June 1962 and June 1972 were also included in this study. Old staff members were included for three primary reasons. First, the focus of most of this study is centered on the characteristics of student personnel staff members. Only twenty-five such staff currently serve the college. Adding the former staff to the study had the potential to more than double the amount of data from student personnel workers. Second, if any striking but uncertain results were obtained from the data of the current staff, an examination of the scores of previous staff members in combination with their questionnaire responses might help to suggest explanations for those results. Finally, information derived from this source might be particularly valuable to the current staff as they evaluate themselves and plan for the future. Differences between former and current staff scores could provide a basis for a review of the selection procedures used to replace former staff members and might suggest action for future staff recruitment.

Student personnel staff secretaries were included in this study because of their frequent and varied contact with students and other Trenton State College community members.
In the offices of the Dean of Students, financial aid, counseling, housing, and to a lesser extent student activities, the first contact point for a person entering the office is a secretary. Typically, her desk is placed nearest the outer office door. She is the first to acknowledge the presence of an office visitor and in other ways is the person who performs the receptionist function. Much of the routine business of these offices is conducted by secretaries. In some instances, one secretary may refer a student visitor to another secretary for more "specialized" help. In any event, secretaries have a high degree of contact with students; they make judgments about the channeling of student and other requests; and when a professional staff member is not available, they may be the only persons a caller can see immediately.

The professional staffs of the Admissions Office (four), the Placement Office (two), and the Academic Advisement Office (three) were included in the study largely due to the close relationship of their office functions to the student personnel function. Indeed, until the early sixties the Admissions Office was a part of the student personnel staff, and both the Directors of Admissions and Academic Advisement still hold academic rank in Student Personnel Services. Moreover, all are in large part service organizations. In addition to its central function of determining
admissions to the college, the Admissions Office staff has frequent contact with potential students and their parents. Often the staff is called upon to assist students as they make choices between options in the curriculum, housing accommodations, and the like. The Placement Office does career counseling in addition to providing administrative services relating to teacher certification and job placement. The Academic Advisement Office is deeply involved in interpreting the academic requirements and procedures of the school to its students. It is also often in contact with upset students whose stated concerns regarding academic matters may be an expression of more deep-seated conflict.

The major administrators were included as a group within this study because they collectively represent the highest echelons of most of the campus hierarchies that directly affect other members of the Trenton State College community. As a group they have tremendous power within the institution. They are frequently consulted by members of all segments of the campus community. They have primary responsibility for hiring staff, setting and implementing policy, and, in general, running the institution. They act as an appellate structure when student and staff grievances cannot be resolved at a lower level. They have a formal supervisory function over most of the rest of the college as well as being concerned for the welfare of the entire college
enterprise. The administrators selected in this sub-group were the following:

1. The President and the two Assistants to the President (three).

2. The Executive Vice-President and his assistant (two).

3. The Vice-President for Academic Affairs and his assistant (two).

4. The Vice-President for Business Affairs, two Assistant Vice-Presidents for Business Affairs, and an Assistant to the Vice-President for Business Affairs (four).

5. The Dean and Associate Dean of Arts and Sciences (two).

6. The Dean of the School of Education (one).

7. The Directors of the Divisions of Industrial Education and Technology, Nursing, and Business (three).

8. The College Librarian (one).

A 10 percent random sample of the faculty was included in the study because of the central role of instruction in the life of the college. Also, individual faculty members purport to help students in a variety of ways whether the specific context is academic assistance, vocational guidance, or personal emotional support. In a real sense, the faculty competes with other potential helpers for
institutional resources. Finally, the faculty participates in the governance of the college through both the college committee system and the various faculty organizations. In this random sample of the Trenton State College faculty, there were thirty-four men and eight women. Five were instructors; twenty, assistant professors; nine, associate professors; and eight, full professors. Twenty-three had a master's as the highest earned degree, while nineteen had completed doctoral degrees. They hold rank in the various departments as follows: Art, two; Biology, two; Chemistry, one; Education, four; English, two; Geography, two; Health and Physical Education, three; History, three; Industrial Education and Technology, three; Mathematics, two; Media/Library Science, two; Music, four; Physics, two; Psychology, six; Special Education, two; and Speech and Drama, two.

Two groups of undergraduates have been organized on the Trenton State College campus to provide peer counseling. Forty-eight subjects employed as student workers in the residence halls were included in this study. They occupy a quasi-staff or junior staff role in the housing program and are selected, trained, and supervised by members of the student personnel staff. Their role closely parallels that of the professional residence staff in that they counsel students, advise groups, and fulfill administrative responsibilities. Along with the professional staff, they are the
officially designated helpers of the residence halls enterprise and, as such, are salaried. Twenty-four undergraduates serving as volunteers of the campus crisis intervention telephone service (Dialogue) were also included in the study. Like the undergraduate residence hall staff members, they were selected at least in part because of their supposed human relations skills and then involved in training programs to sharpen and develop their skills. However, they are unpaid and have few administrative responsibilities. Their basic goal is to try to respond helpfully to whatever calls are received by their staff. While in some instances the Dialogue staff performs a referral or information-giving service, they maintain counselor-like goals for their interaction with the callers.

Finally, 140 undergraduates were included in this study to provide a general reference group. Most of the helping services at Trenton State College are designed primarily for students. While the undergraduate subjects in this study were not randomly selected, their inclusion was based on the suggestions of the Registrar and the Dean of Arts and Sciences regarding those classes which would yield a relatively representative sample in terms of year in school and major. Freshmen and sophomores were contacted in two freshman English seminars, an underclass speech and communications class, and a predominately sophomore Health and
Physical Education course. Upperclass student subjects were obtained through two junior psychology courses, a senior business education course, and a senior elementary education course.

**Instrumentation**

The basic instrument given to all subjects in the study sample was Carkhuff's Index of Communication (1969). The instrument consists of sixteen short paragraphs suggesting feelings and content often associated with the counseling relationship. Table 2 contains Carkhuff's breakdown of the content of the instrument. Each paragraph reads as a portion of a conversation in which a woman expresses some of her thoughts and feelings. The task for the respondents is to read each paragraph and to assume that the material contained there has been expressed to them in a real life helping situation and that they wish to be of help to the woman. The final task for respondents is to write down what they think would be their response under the circumstances described above.

Both the validity of the instrument itself as well as that of the written form were investigated by Greenberg (1968) who established the close relation among the following three conditions: (1) responding in a written form to helpee stimulus expressions, (2) responding verbally to
helpee stimulus expressions, and (3) responding in the helping role. This research established that both written and verbal responses to helpee stimulus expressions are valid indexes of assessments of the counselor in the actual helping role.

Carkhuff's index has been used with a number of different kinds of people, and data from the index exist which provide comparisons of the way different populations respond.

Three groups in the study population received questionnaires written by the researcher in addition to the Carkhuff instrument. The most extensive questionnaires were sent to current and former student personnel staff members. Slight differences exist between the questionnaires sent to

---

**TABLE 2**

COMMUNICATION: DESIGN OF HELPEE STIMULUS EXPRESSIONS INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Areas</th>
<th>Affect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depression-Distress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social-interpersonal</td>
<td>Excerpt 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational-vocational</td>
<td>Excerpt 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child-rearing</td>
<td>Excerpt 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual-marital</td>
<td>Excerpt 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation of helper</td>
<td>Excerpt 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Silence</td>
<td>Excerpt 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TABLE 3

**COMMUNICATION: RATINGS OF FACILITATIVE CONDITIONS AND RESPONSE REPERTOIRE OF HELPER RESPONSES TO HELpee STIMULUS EXPRESSIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Populations (Levels)</th>
<th>N (Number of Subjects)</th>
<th>Level of Communication (Ratings of Helper Responses on Five-point Scales)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatients</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upperclass philosophy</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student leaders</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer helpers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior psychology</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay Personnel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay teachers</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lay counselors</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beginning psychology</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced counselors (not systematically trained)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced counselors (systematically trained)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

these two groups. However, these differences center around the prior and current nature of the group's association with the student personnel staff and do not reflect substantive differences. Both questionnaires were largely concerned with acquiring biographical or demographic information. The overall purpose of using these instruments was to ensure that respondents could be accurately assigned to the various categories tested by the hypotheses. An entirely different questionnaire was sent to all undergraduate participants in the study. Again, most information requested was demographic in nature. Copies of all memoranda and questionnaires given to members of the study sample are included in the appendix along with a copy of the Carkhuff instrument.

Data Collection

While most of the data were collected in May of 1973, the data collection period extended from late April to mid-October of that year. During this period the Carkhuff instrument was given to all subjects. In addition, each subject received a covering letter outlining the goals of the study and asking for his or her cooperation. Supplemental questionnaires were given only to students and student personnel staff. All students, regardless of their particular sub-group designation, received the same questionnaire. Student personnel staff members were given an entirely
different questionnaire with slight variation between that given to former and current staff members. In general, then, the approach to the study population was consistent; however, the wide degree of variation in accessibility of the subjects made it necessary to structure different approaches for particular groups.

Undergraduates as a group were the most difficult to approach uniformly. Most undergraduates were contacted through scheduled classes, but even here researcher-student contact varied. There were several common elements. The initial contact with the student population was made through the faculty or staff member working with the individual student groups. In all cases this person received a verbal description of the study and had an opportunity to ask for clarification. Further, the materials to be used were gone over in each case. However, while every faculty or staff person approached agreed to support the study in general, their specific responses varied widely. In some cases, this was due to their feelings regarding the appropriate use of class time and, in other cases, it related to scheduling conflicts. In three instances the investigator was invited to use class time for the completion of the instrument. In two classes and a class meeting of the Dialogue staff, the researcher explained the project and administered the instrument. In another class the researcher introduced the study
but students were invited to complete the instrument independently outside of class. Students in three additional classes completed the instrument during class time, but without the presence of the researcher. Finally, the undergraduate housing staff and the two remaining classes neither heard the researcher nor had class or staff meeting time available for the completion of the instrument.

Faculty members and all individuals in the various current staff categories were initially contacted through the campus mail except for student personnel staff, who were first approached at one of their staff meetings. This was the only nonstudent group to discuss the study in detail as a group with the investigator. However, in addition to the mailings the researcher attempted to talk individually with all of the nonstudent groups in the population except for the former staff group. Over a period of some months, he was successful with 87 of 117 of the subjects (74 percent) in these categories.

Former staff members were contacted through the mails, and only in limited instances discussed the project directly with the investigator. Three primary sources were consulted to develop the list of former staff. The person who served as the Dean of Students from 1962 to 1968 and the current dean both developed lists of former staff upon request. Also, in many instances they were able to provide
current addresses. Finally, the inactive Trenton State College personnel files were perused to generate old addresses when current locations were not known and to provide a check on the lists submitted by the deans. Several current staff members and, after initial contact was made, several old staff members added updated addresses. All of this resulted in the thirty-four names of former staff members. Two were eliminated because of their intimate association with the study. Both the author and the chairman of his dissertation committee were Trenton State College staff members during that time period. Two more names were eliminated from the list when materials sent to them were returned marked "Addressee unknown; return to sender." All of the remaining thirty were sent a form letter and a questionnaire.

Early responses from most groups were minimal. One exception to this was the student groups who completed the materials during class time. Several follow-up procedures were used in an attempt to increase the data yield. Form letters were sent to faculty who had not responded by mid-June and again in early September. The September letter was sent to nonresponding members of the selected administrators category as well. Separate form letters were sent to undergraduate residence hall staff and to members of one senior class where a 100 percent
return was promised and zero return had been experienced. Also, in early October postcards were sent to faculty and former and current staff nonrespondents asking if they would respond. Throughout the late spring, summer, and early fall, a number of additional contacts were made with nonstudent members of the study population. The method of these contacts varied somewhat, although the difference had to do more with the timing of the contact than with the identity of the subject's sub-group. Student personnel staff members (current and former), secretaries, selected administrators, student-service-related administrators, and faculty members were visited individually in their offices or telephoned. Where contact could not be made directly with the subject, messages were left with colleagues, secretaries, and spouses. In some cases colleagues known to the researcher were asked to reinforce his request with individual subjects. Basically, the author attempted to remind nonresponding subjects that the study was important to him and, he believed, to the college. His attempt was to call the attention of the potential subjects to the study frequently in the hope that they would participate.

Throughout the data collection process the author's desire to standardize both his initial contact and follow-up procedures with subjects was frustrated by the great divergence of individuals within the overall study sample.
However, the content of the communication between researcher and subject was similar even where circumstances required that the method of communication was through a third party, was written, or occurred at a somewhat different point in time. The extent of the participation of the different groups in the sample is depicted in Table 4.

TABLE 4
DATA YIELD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Instruments Returned N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel staff</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former student personnel staff</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel secretaries</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions, placement, and academic office staff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate residence hall staff</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Dialogue staff</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected undergraduates</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Selection and Training of Raters

Carkhuff's Index of Communication does not immediately yield quantified data; rather, subject responses are open-ended. Respondents are asked to read each of sixteen excerpts and to assume that they wish to help the person who is expressing the thoughts and feelings portrayed therein. Each subject is free to respond by writing whatever seems appropriate to him or her in the space provided on the form. Each response needs to be evaluated individually in accordance with Carkhuff's gross rating scale in order to produce numerical scores. Independent raters are needed to minimize the possibility of conscious or unconscious bias.

Three raters were selected for this project. At the time of their selection, all were full-time graduate students in human relations programs. Rater A was a master's degree candidate at American International College in a program headed by Carkhuff. She is also the investigator's wife. Raters B and C were doctoral students in the Human Relations Center at the University of Massachusetts. Rater C had participated in a training workshop with Carkhuff. Since then Rater C has completed his degree and has taken a position as a university counseling center director.

Prior to the start of the rater training process, all raters independently completed Carkhuff's Index of Discrimination (1969). This instrument uses the Index of
Communication as a base but also provides alternative responses. Further, Carkhuff lists experts' ratings for each of the alternatives. Responses of the three raters were compared to those of the experts provided by Carkhuff with encouraging results. Even before training, the raters demonstrated high levels of discrimination in this instrument.

The rater training session itself lasted two-and-a-half days. Throughout this period, rater responses were related to Carkhuff's gross rating scale and a continuing attempt was made to clarify rater understanding of the scale. Similarly, extensive discussion occurred regarding the feelings and content expressed in each excerpt of the Index of Communication.

The attempt in the training process was to move in a systematic way from training approaches which would maximize rater interaction with each other and with the expert sources to those which would simulate as nearly as possible future rating conditions. Procedurally, the first step in the training process was a discussion of each response in the Index of Discrimination (Carkhuff, 1969). All raters reviewed each of the four alternative responses for each of the sixteen excerpts. Next, practice examples were rated and then discussed on an item-by-item basis which allowed for the review of additional data without the immediate Carkhuff reference.
## TABLE 5

**GROSS RATINGS OF FACILITATIVE INTERPERSONAL FUNCTIONING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.0</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>4.5</th>
<th>5.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None of the conditions are communicated to any noticeable degree in the person.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the conditions are communicated and some are not.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the conditions are communicated at a minimally facilitative level.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the conditions are communicated fully.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the conditions are fully communicated simultaneously and continually.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The facilitator is a person who is living effectively himself and who discloses himself in a genuine and constructive fashion in response to others. He communicates an accurate empathic understanding and a respect for all of the feelings of other persons and guides discussions with those persons into specific feelings and experiences. He communicates confidence in what he is doing and is spontaneous and intense. In addition, while he is open and flexible in his relations with others, in his commitment to the welfare of the other person he is quite capable of active, assertive, and even confronting behavior when it is appropriate.

Finally, the Carkhuff instrument was given to neighbors, friends, colleagues, and their college-age children. Data obtained in this manner were first evaluated independently and then reviewed collectively by the raters. The differences here were that the data were generated by live subjects and were received in handwritten form on the duplicated blanks to be used in the study, and the raters were instructed to complete several forms without stopping before the review took place. In summary, this process began with a discussion of each rater's response compared to the Carkhuff ideal rating. The training continued with item-by-item discussion of additional data which did not include experts' responses and ended with the rating of data obtained from groups similar to those in the major study with conditions that simulated as accurately as possible real rating conditions.

Several rating agreements were reached as a result of the process described above. These agreements clarify and extend the raters' understanding of the use of the Carkhuff gross rating scale and were specifically not intended to change the intent of that scale. The rating agreements were committed to writing for the use of the raters. The agreements were as follows:

1. Responses should be rated as they are explicitly stated. Assumptions about what may have been intended or
what might or might not happen if a given response is followed up are inappropriate.

2. However, when confronted with long, involved statements, raters must act in terms of what seems to be the major thrust of the response. Secondary themes need to add or detract significantly in order to be accounted for in the rating.

3. Advice giving would normally be rated at 1.5. Something special would need to happen to raise or lower the score. A 2.0 would be acceptable when advice giving is coupled with an attempt to reflect feeling and/or give a summary of content. A 1.0 should be used when the advice giving is ill-suited to the situation or negates the expressed feelings of the helpee.

4. A 2.5 is appropriate for attempts at reflection of feelings which are good attempts but somewhat inaccurate.

5. A failure to follow instructions would normally get a 1.0. A rating in such an instance would never go higher than a 1.5 unless something in the response is given in accordance with the instructions and is appropriate to a higher rating; e.g., "and I would say, 'You're feeling badly.'"

6. "Tell me more" and similar statements should be rated 1.0. Questions standing alone would normally be rated 1.0 or 1.5 unless the reflection of feelings is embodied in the question.
7. Agreements such as "Right on" and "I agree entirely" would be rated no higher than 1.5 if standing alone.

8. "Cold water" responses (i.e., those which place total responsibility for problems or failure on the client or those that move the client away from his thoughts or feelings) should be rated 1.0.

9. Self-reference feeling statements on the part of the helper may be rated highly if they are said in such a way as to paraphrase accurately the feelings of the helper.

10. In general, the scale may be thought of in the following fashion:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Facilitative</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Low Facilitative</td>
<td>Low Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Low Facilitative</td>
<td>1/2 High Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Low Facilitative</td>
<td>High Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1/2 High Facilitative</td>
<td>Low Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>High Facilitative</td>
<td>Low Action (interchangeable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>High Facilitative</td>
<td>1/2 High Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>High Facilitative</td>
<td>High Action (additive)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. The ratings 4.5 and 5.0 are reserved for use when the rating scale is applied to continuing contacts with people.

The final goal of the rater training process was to obtain a measure of inter-rater reliability that would demonstrate that the earlier phases of the training had resulted in a high degree of consistency in the raters' ratings. Ten subjects were selected to provide data for this reliability study. Most were either student personnel staff members, faculty members, or students at Worcester State College.
(Massachusetts). All were involved in education and, as a group, their roles in education roughly paralleled the make-up of the subjects in the main study.

Each rater independently evaluated each of the ten protocols, and the mean score of each rating was computed. A form of analysis of variance used to estimate reliability measurements (Winer, 1962) was selected to determine the reliability of these scores. Tables 6 and 7 indicate the results of this process.

**TABLE 6**

RATER EVALUATIONS OF PROTOCOLS FOR INTER-RATER RELIABILITY MEASUREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Person</th>
<th>Rater A</th>
<th>Rater B</th>
<th>Rater C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 7

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: RELIABILITY MEASUREMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between people</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within people</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability = .87

Hypotheses

I. At Trenton State College there is no significant difference between the mean score of all student personnel staff members on Carkhuff's Index of Communication and the mean scores of:

a. a randomly selected group of teaching faculty members.

b. the president, vice-presidents, and nonstudent personnel deans.

c. professional staff members of the Admissions Office, the Placement Office, and the Academic Advisement Office.

d. former student personnel staff members.

e. student personnel departmental secretaries.

f. the undergraduate residence hall advisors.

g. members of the crisis intervention telephone service.

h. members of selected undergraduate classes.
II. At Trenton State College there is no significant difference between the mean score of members of the student personnel housing staff on Carkhuff's Index of Communication and the mean score of:
   a. the undergraduate residence hall advisors.
   b. members of selected undergraduate classes who live in the residence halls.

III. At Trenton State College there is no significant difference between groups in mean scores on Carkhuff's Index of Communication when the members of the student personnel staff are divided as follows:
   a. counselors vs. all others.
   b. the leadership of the student personnel staff (Dean of Students, Associate Dean of Students, Assistant to the Dean of Students, the Director of Housing, the Director of the Counseling Center, and the Director of Student Activities) vs. all others.
   c. men vs. women.
   d. under thirty years of age vs. thirty years and over.
   e. those paid below and those paid above the median annual salary.
   f. those on tenure and those who are not on tenure.
   g. those holding only a master's degree vs. those
holding a doctorate.

h. those with graduate degrees in college student personnel vs. those with graduate degrees in other fields.

i. those with graduate degrees who had a practicum, internship, or assistantship in any aspect of student personnel services and those who did not.

j. those with five or more years of experience in college student personnel work vs. those with less than five years of experience.

k. those with academic rank of instructor or assistant professor vs. those with academic rank of associate or full professor.

l. those named at least twice by colleagues as someone they had turned to in time of personal crisis vs. the rest of the staff.

m. those who respond positively two or more times to questions about job satisfaction vs. those who do not.

n. those who respond positively two or more times to questions about staff social interactions vs. those who do not.

Data Analysis

Raw data were evaluated independently by each rater.
in accordance with Carkhuff's Gross Rating Scale (1969) and the agreements established in the rater training sessions. The raters received and completed the data in the same order. However, raters were unaware of the order of the different categories of groups represented within the data. In fact, each package of raw data given to raters contained responses from all the different categories in purposefully unsystematic order.

A mean score was obtained for each rater's evaluation of each respondent, and from these three means one overall mean score was obtained for each subject. Subjects who failed to respond to two or more of the sixteen items were identified, and their scores were omitted from further consideration. Next, the data were grouped for each of the three hypotheses, and a single-factor analysis of variance was obtained. Finally, where a significant variance was noted, the Scheffé method of multiple comparisons (Glass and Stanley, 1970) was applied in order to identify the source of the significant difference.
CHAPTER IV
RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study. Data are given in statistical form along with limited comment to provide clarity. A discussion of the results appears in Chapter V.

The basic data presented in this chapter were obtained from scores on Carkhuff's Index of Communication. Supplementary questionnaires were primarily used to provide information which would indicate the various groupings of individual scores necessary to test the hypotheses. When the term "helping scores" is used in this chapter, specific reference to the Carkhuff instrument is intended. The terms "staff" or "current staff" refer to members of the Trenton State College student personnel staff of 1973.

The remainder of this chapter is divided into three sections which present the data associated with each hypothesis, a fourth section which reports data from the questionnaire, and a final section which summarizes the results of the entire study.

Hypothesis I

The first hypothesis stated that at Trenton State
College there is no significant difference between the mean score of the student personnel staff members on Carkhuff's Index of Communication and the mean scores of:

a. a randomly selected group of teaching faculty members.

b. the president, vice-presidents, division heads, and the assistants to the president and vice-presidents (collectively referred to in this chapter as the administrative leadership).

c. the professional staff of the Admissions Office, the Placement Office, and the Academic Advisement Office (collectively referred to in this chapter as related staff).

d. former student personnel staff members.

e. student personnel division secretaries.

f. undergraduate residence hall staff (also referred to in this chapter as student housing staff).

g. undergraduate staff of the crisis intervention telephone service (also referred to in this chapter as Dialogue staff).

h. undergraduates from selected classes.

Mean scores for the sub-groups in Hypothesis I are given in Table 8. The reader is reminded that higher scores indicate higher levels of helping skills according to Carkhuff's Gross Rating Scale and that the range of possible
scores is one to four as the scale was used in this study. Also, it should be noted that each individual's score is the mean of scores received on sixteen separate items.

**TABLE 8**

**MEAN HELPING SCORES FOR SUB-GROUPS IN HYPOTHESIS I**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>( \bar{X} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current student personnel staff</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomly selected teaching faculty</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative leadership</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional staff from Admissions, Placement, and Academic Advisement Offices</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former student personnel staff</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries of the student personnel staff</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate residence hall staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate staff of crisis intervention telephone service</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students from selected undergraduate classes</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>235</td>
<td><strong>1.72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both current and former student personnel staff members achieved higher helping scores than did the remaining seven groups studied. An analysis of variance was performed to establish whether or not the differences between any of
the groups were large enough to be significant. An F value of 28.33 was obtained. Consequently, Hypothesis I was rejected. Table 9 provides the results of the analysis of variance procedure.

TABLE 9

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: HYPOTHESIS I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>28.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>27.56</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>54.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (.01, 8, 226) = 2.60
F (.05, 8, 226) = 1.88

The analysis of variance procedure indicated that a significant difference exists between the groups studied. The Scheffé method of multiple comparisons was used to identify specific groups where the difference between mean helping scores was large enough to be significant. The results of the Scheffé procedure reveal a significant difference in thirteen of the thirty-six possible comparisons. Table 10 lists all the groupings studied where a difference in helping scores was large enough to be significant. Table 11
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>t/69</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current staff</td>
<td>Selected undergraduates</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current staff</td>
<td>Student housing staff</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current staff</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current staff</td>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current staff</td>
<td>Related staff</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former staff</td>
<td>Selected undergraduates</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former staff</td>
<td>Student housing staff</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former staff</td>
<td>Dialogue</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former staff</td>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former staff</td>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former staff</td>
<td>Related staff</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>Selected undergraduates</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A significant difference exists where the reported value exceeds ± 3.88 with \( \alpha = .05 \) and ± 4.47 with \( \alpha = .01 \).

It should be noted that the meaning of the Scheffé results is found in the size of the number reported and that whether that number is positive or negative is of no consequence in this context.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Student Personnel Staff</th>
<th>Former Student Personnel Staff</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Secretaries</th>
<th>Student Housing Staff</th>
<th>Related Staff</th>
<th>Dialogue Staff</th>
<th>Selected Undergraduates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current Student</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>-6.3</td>
<td>-5.6</td>
<td>-8.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Student</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>-5.2</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
<td>-7.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>- .5</td>
<td>- .7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Housing</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Related Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue Staff</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A significant difference exists when the reported value exceeds ±3.88 with \( \alpha = .05 \) and ±4.47 with \( \alpha = .01 \).*
In summary, student personnel workers achieved the highest mean helping scores and students the lowest of those studied. A significant difference was found between the helping scores of student personnel workers and all other groups in the study except administrators. Only one non-student personnel group had significantly higher scores than any other group. Administrators scored significantly higher than students. Faculty members, related staff, secretaries, student housing staff, and Dialogue staff all failed to demonstrate significantly higher helping scores than students. In all other comparisons, no significant difference in helping scores was found.

**Hypothesis II**

The second hypothesis stated that there was no significant difference at Trenton State College between the mean score of the student personnel housing staff on Carkhuff's Index of Communication and the mean scores of:

a. the undergraduate residence hall advisors.

b. members of selected undergraduate classes who live in the residence halls.

Mean helping scores of the three sub-groups associated with college residence halls are given in Table 12. Hypothesis II was tested through the use of analysis of variance and, as Table 13 indicates, a significant difference in
TABLE 12
MEAN HELPING SCORES FOR SUB-GROUPS IN HYPOTHESIS II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel housing staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student housing staff</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate residents</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The helping scores of these groups was found. Consequently, Hypothesis II was rejected and the Scheffé method of multiple comparisons was used to detect the source of the significant differences. The results of the Scheffé procedure are given in Table 14.

TABLE 13
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: HYPOTHESIS II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>14.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total

\[ F (.01, 2, 46) = 5.10 \]

\[ F (.05, 2, 46) = 3.20 \]
TABLE 14
Scheffé Comparisons: Hypothesis II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>$\phi^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel housing staff</td>
<td>Student housing staff</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel housing staff</td>
<td>Undergraduate residents</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student housing staff</td>
<td>Undergraduate residents</td>
<td>.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A significant difference exists where scores exceed $\pm 2.53$ with $\alpha = .05$.

The results of the Scheffé procedures revealed a significant difference in helping scores between the student personnel housing staff and the student housing staff as well as between the student personnel housing staff and the undergraduate residents from selected classes. No significant difference was found between the student housing staff and the undergraduate residents.

**Hypothesis III**

The final hypothesis is similar to the two that precede it in comparing scores from Carkhuff's Index of Communication on the basis of groupings determined by job or role classifications at Trenton State College. However, the third hypothesis is unlike the first two in that some groupings are determined by demographic and attitudinal data.
provided on a self-report basis by the subjects.

The third hypothesis states that at Trenton State College there is no significant difference between groups in mean scores on Carkhuff's Index of Communication when the members of the student personnel staff are divided as follows:

a. counselors and all others.
b. the leadership of the staff (comprised of the Dean of Students, the Associate Dean of Students, the Director of the Counseling Center, the Director of Student Activities, and the Director of Student Housing, and all others).
c. men and women.
d. those under thirty years of age and those thirty and over.
e. those paid at or below and those paid above the median annual salary.
f. those on tenure and those who are not.
g. those holding only a master's degree and those holding a doctorate.
h. those with graduate degrees in college student personnel and those with graduate degrees in other fields.
i. those with graduate degrees who had a practicum, internship, or assistantship in any aspect of
student personnel services and those who did not.

j. those with five or more years of experience in college student personnel work and those with less than five years of experience.

k. those with academic rank of instructor or assistant professor and those with academic rank of associate or full professor.

l. those named at least twice by colleagues as someone they had turned to in time of personal crisis and those not so named.

m. those who respond positively to at least two out of three questions about job satisfaction and those who do not.

n. those who respond positively to at least two out of three questions about staff interaction and those who do not.

o. those who report that more than 50 percent of their usual workday was spent in counseling relationships with students and those who report that 50 percent or less of their workday was spent in this manner.

In three instances the data yield from sub-groups in Hypothesis III were considered insufficient for meaningful analysis and were not computed. In each case one group in the relationship contained three or less subjects. Table 15 lists the groupings where Hypothesis III was not tested.
TABLE 15

HYPOTHESIS III GROUPINGS WITH INSUFFICIENT DATA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Staff with practicum, internship, or assistantship experience</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Rest of staff</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructors and assistant professors</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Associate and full professors</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff reporting more than 50 percent of their day spent in counseling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rest of staff</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In two of the three groupings where insufficient data for meaningful analysis were obtained, no further study was suggested by the data that were available. However, in the questionnaire item concerned with percentage of day spent in counseling, respondents had been asked to choose between several options. One staff member reported that 41-50 percent of his or her day was spent in counseling. Four reported 31-40 percent, and three staff members said that 21-30 percent of their day was spent counseling students. As a result, it seemed reasonable to study the differences in helping scores between the ten staff members who reported that they spent 21 percent or more of their usual workday in counseling relationship and the thirteen staff members who reported that 0-20 percent of their day was spent in this
manner.

While sufficient data were available to test the hypothesis regarding staff members divided on the basis of their age in relationship to age thirty, additional age data suggested a further breakdown. Consequently, the helping scores of staff members under forty years of age were compared to those of staff members forty years of age and older.

Table 16 indicates the mean helping scores of the sub-groups originally a part of Hypothesis III where the data received included at least four subjects in each category. Table 17 gives the mean helping scores of the sub-groups added to Hypothesis III as a result of the process described above.

Each of the twelve remaining subsections of the original Hypothesis III and the two new categories added to the hypothesis were tested through the use of analysis of variance. In five of fourteen comparisons, a significant difference in helping scores was found and the null hypothesis was rejected. Counselors scored significantly higher than the rest of the staff. Significantly higher scores were also found with staff members on tenure and staff members holding an earned doctorate when compared with the rest of the staff. Finally, staff members forty years of age and over plus those with five or more years of experience scored significantly higher than the rest of the staff. The null hypothesis was
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Group A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Counselors</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Rest of staff</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff leadership</strong></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>Rest of staff</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Under 30</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>30 and over</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>At or below median salary</strong></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>More than median salary</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenured</strong></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Not tenured</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Master's degree</strong></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student personnel training</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>Other training</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Five or more years of experience</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>Less than five years of experience</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Named twice or more as helper</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>Rest of staff</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive response to two or more job satisfaction questions</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>Rest of staff</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive response to two or more interaction questions</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>Rest of staff</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*An explanation of these terms precedes the tables reporting analysis of variance results for these categories.*
TABLE 17
MEAN HELPING SCORES OF SUB-GROUPS ADDED TO
HYPOTHESIS III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 40 years of age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>Forty years of age and over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spent more than 20 percent of time counseling</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Spent less than 20 percent of time counseling</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

accepted with all other comparisons studied. Table 18 lists all of the subsections of Hypothesis III where the difference in helping scores was large enough to be significant.

TABLE 18
SUBSECTIONS OF HYPOTHESIS III WHERE SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES WERE FOUND

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>Group B</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Rest of staff</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured staff</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Not tenured</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forty years of age and over</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Under 40 years of age</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more years of experience</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>Less than five years of experience</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables 19 through 32 indicate the results of the analysis of variance procedure used with each subsection of Hypothesis III.

**TABLE 19**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: COUNSELORS VS. REST OF STAFF (HYPOTHESIS III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02 \\
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32
\]

**TABLE 20**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: LEADERSHIP VS. REST OF STAFF (HYPOTHESIS III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02 \\
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32
\]
### TABLE 21

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: MEN VS. WOMEN**  
(HYPOTHESIS III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02 \]
\[ F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32 \]

### TABLE 22

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: UNDER 30 YEARS OF AGE VS. REST OF STAFF** (HYPOTHESIS III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02 \]
\[ F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32 \]
### TABLE 23

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: STAFF UNDER 40 YEARS OF AGE VS. REST OF STAFF (ADDITION TO HYPOTHESIS III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02 \\
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32
\]

### TABLE 24

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: STAFF AT OR BELOW THE MEDIAN SALARY VS. REST OF STAFF (HYPOTHESIS III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7.76</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02 \\
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32
\]
### TABLE 25
**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: TENURED STAFF VS. REST OF STAFF (HYPOTHESIS III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02
\]

\[
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32
\]

### TABLE 26
**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: STAFF WITH DOCTORATE VS. REST OF STAFF (HYPOTHESIS III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02
\]

\[
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32
\]
TABLE 27

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: STAFF WITH STUDENT PERSONNEL TRAINING VS. REST OF STAFF (HYPOTHESIS III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32

TABLE 28

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: STAFF WITH FIVE OR MORE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE VS. REST OF STAFF (HYPOTHESIS III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>15.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32
Table 29 reports the analysis of variance of the helping scores of the student personnel staff divided on the basis of responses to questions thought to relate to job satisfaction. Subjects were asked if they would recommend that a friend seek employment on the staff, if they hoped to be working on a student personnel staff in five years, and if they wished they had prepared themselves for a career outside of student personnel services. Positive responses to the first two questions and a negative response to the third were assumed to be consistent with job satisfaction. A crude measure of job satisfaction was obtained by dividing the staff into those who responded to two or all of the three questions in the direction thought to indicate job satisfaction and those who did not.

Table 31 reports the analysis of variance of the helping scores of the staff divided on the basis of non-work
### Table 30

**Analysis of Variance: Staff with Positive Response to Two or More Job Satisfaction Questions vs. Rest of Staff (Hypothesis III)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>1.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32

### Table 31

**Analysis of Variance: Staff Giving Positive Response to Staff Interaction Questions (Hypothesis III) vs. Rest of Staff**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32
connected staff interaction. Questionnaire respondents were asked if they often or infrequently invited members of the staff to their homes, were invited to another staff member's home, or ate lunch with one or more staff members. A crude measure of high and low staff interaction was obtained by dividing the staff between those who responded by indicating "often" to at least two of the three questions and those who responded with "often" less than twice.

Table 32 reports the analysis of variance of the helping scores of the student personnel staff divided on the basis of the reported percentage of their usual day spent in counseling contacts with students. The reader is reminded that the division of the staff into those who reported 21 percent or more of their time spent in counseling and those who reported 20 percent or less of their time spent in this manner was suggested by the data yield and was not a part of the original hypothesis.

**TABLE 32**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: STAFF REPORTING MORE THAN 20 PERCENT OF TIME SPENT COUNSELING VS. REST OF STAFF (HYPOTHESIS III)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
F (.01, 1, 21) = 8.02
\]

\[
F (.05, 1, 21) = 4.32
\]
Additional Questionnaire Data

Most data generated by the staff and student questionnaires were gathered to provide information that would allow the grouping of subjects within broader categories according to the design of the various hypotheses. Two further purposes were served by the student questionnaires. First, information regarding the academic majors and class standings of student subjects was gathered and reviewed to assure that a variety of students were included in the sample. The second purpose was to obtain a measure of student willingness to turn to various potential sources of help on the Trenton State College campus. When asked to choose from a list of alternatives including five staff categories, two peer categories, and an open-ended category, most students indicated that they would seek out another student if they wanted to discuss a personal problem while at Trenton State College. These results are portrayed in Table 33.

Summary of the Results

When the helping scores of nine different groups from the Trenton State College community were analyzed, both current and former student personnel workers scored significantly higher than the subjects in six of the remaining seven groups. Administrators scored significantly higher than undergraduates from selected classes, but all other
TABLE 33

QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES OF STUDENTS ASKED WHOM THEY WOULD SEEK OUT ON THE TRENTON STATE COLLEGE CAMPUS IF THEY WANTED TO DISCUSS A PERSONAL PROBLEM. PEER AND STAFF CATEGORIES ARE COMPOSITES OF BROADER DATA RECEIVED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Peer %</th>
<th>Staff %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduates from selected classes</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate residence hall advisors</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Dialogue staff members</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons failed to yield any significant difference in helping scores.

A significant difference was found between the helping scores of the student personnel housing staff and both the undergraduate housing staff and undergraduate residents. The data did not yield a significant difference between undergraduate housing staff and undergraduate residents.

When the student personnel staff was divided, counselors' helping scores were found to be significantly higher than the rest of the staff. Similarly, significantly higher helping scores were found with staff members with tenure, those with five or more years of experience, those forty years of age and over, and those holding an earned doctorate.
when each of these groups was compared to the rest of the staff. All other comparisons of staff groups studied failed to yield significant differences in helping scores.

Finally, when faced with a choice between talking about a personal problem with members of three student personnel staff groups, two adult campus community groups, two peer counseling groups, or with other students, 84 percent of the students indicated that their first choice would be a peer and not an adult staff member.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Introduction

The final chapter begins with a summary of both the highlights of the study and conclusions based on the data. The second section of the chapter considers some limitations of the study, including those suggested by the data analysis. The chapter ends with a wide-ranging discussion of the implications of the results with particular emphasis on a series of recommendations for the staff of Trenton State College.

Summary of Rationale and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to obtain an objective measure of the helping skills level of student personnel staff and other campus community members of Trenton State College. The focus of the study was on the student personnel staff because members of this profession at Trenton State and elsewhere have presented themselves as the helping specialists of the campus. While the literature clearly suggests that student personnel workers maintain facilitating personal growth as a primary stated goal of the profession, it is less clear that student personnel workers as a group possess the level of helping skills necessary to achieve that goal.
At the same time, whatever level of helping skills student personnel workers possess has important implications for their clients, their institutions, and themselves. The literature supports the idea that relationships between student personnel workers and students may retard as well as promote growth depending on the helping skills level of the parties to the relationship. More specifically, Carkhuff (1969) suggests that, in any continuing relationship the person defined as less knowing in the relationship will grow in the direction of the level of functioning of the other party to the relationship. At a time of unsure funding for higher education but continued need for effective helping efforts, it is particularly important to understand the potential of helping specialists to help.

Colleges are complex institutions which may provide many sources of help outside of the student personnel staff. Moreover, helping skills levels play an important role in a wide range of relationships including teacher-student and employer-employee. For these reasons, representatives of eight other campus groups were included in the study. The helping scores of the various campus groups were compared. Finally, various identifiable groups within the student personnel staff were compared to each other and, in one instance, to two groups of students with whom they work directly.

The standardized instrument used to measure subjects’
level of helping skills was Carkhuff's Index of Communication. Three trained raters independently evaluated the raw data, and the scores from each rater were averaged to provide a mean score for each subject on the Index of Communication. The data for groups of subjects were evaluated using the analysis of variance technique for each of the three different hypotheses. Where significant differences occurred with more than two groups of subjects, the Scheffé method of multiple comparisons was used to identify the source of the differences.

The data associated with the first hypothesis clearly suggested that student personnel staff members possessed a higher level of helping skills than any other group studied at Trenton State College. Table 34 lists the mean helping scores of the various groups in rank order. While all the groups purporting to help students scored higher than selected students, only current and former student personnel workers and administrators had significantly higher helping scores than students. Further, the only other differences in helping scores that were significant occurred between student personnel workers and six of the remaining seven groups.

In the second hypothesis a sub-group of the student personnel staff demonstrated significantly higher helping scores than two groups of students with whom they work directly. While the undergraduate housing staff achieved
TABLE 34

MEAN HELPING SCORES OF NINE TRENTON STATE COLLEGE GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current student personnel staff</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former student personnel staff</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrators</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dialogue staff</td>
<td>1.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admissions, Placement, and Academic Advisement staff</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel secretaries</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate housing staff</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected students</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapters III and IV contain detailed descriptions of the groups and the collection and analysis of the data.

higher helping scores than the undergraduate residents, the difference in their scores was not significant. Table 35 indicates the mean helping scores of the three groups studied in Hypothesis II.

The third hypothesis was formulated to investigate the differences in the mean helping scores of several subgroups within the student personnel staff. Table 36 provides a list of the mean helping scores of these groups with the highest scores in a given relationship reported in rank.
TABLE 35
MEAN HELPING SCORES OF THREE GROUPS ASSOCIATED WITH STUDENT HOUSING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Helping Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Student personnel housing staff</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate housing staff</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate residents</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Chapters III and IV contain detailed descriptions of the groups and the collection and analysis of the data.

order. The differences in the scores of the first five relationships reported are significant. The remainder are not.

In general terms, the data from this study suggest that student personnel workers as a group possess higher levels of helping skills than other campus groups. Within the student personnel staff, the data suggest that counselors, those staff members holding tenure, those with earned doctorates, those with five or more years of experience, and those forty years of age or over have higher levels of helping skills than the rest of the staff. These data provide rich implications for Trenton State College in particular. However, before the implications of the data are discussed, some limitations of the study will be considered.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Helping Score</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean Helping Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 40 and over</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>Under age 40</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On tenure</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>Not on tenure</td>
<td>2.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>Non-counselors</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five or more years of experience</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>Less than five years of experience</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hold doctorate</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>Do not hold doctorate</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Named twice as helpers</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>Not named twice as helpers</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No student personnel degree</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>Hold student personnel degree</td>
<td>2.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low reported staff interaction</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>High reported staff interaction</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High reported job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>Low reported job satisfaction</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff leadership</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>Staff other than leadership</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At median salary or below</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Above median salary</td>
<td>2.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 20 percent of time counseling</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Less than 20 percent of time counseling</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 30 and over</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>Under age 30</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a*Chapters III and IV contain detailed descriptions of the groups and the collection and analysis of the data.
Limitations

This section includes comment on factors which may limit the meaning of the results of the study. Chapter I also contains a section which discusses the limitations of the study. While some overlap exists between the two sections, the fundamental difference between them is that the earlier comment anticipated limitations that might occur as a result of the design of the study, and the comment here is based on the experience of conducting the study.

Some basic limitations of the study are suggested by the dependence on one standardized instrument. Although Carkhuff (1969) has done extensive work with the Index of Communication and the Gross Rating Scale, the reader is reminded that the helping scores reported in this study are based on data from this single paper-and-pencil instrument. Also, the theoretical perspective reflected in Carkhuff's work has been widely accepted but not universally so. Further, the investigator's use of the Carkhuff instrument may have included errors of interpretation which could have influenced the results. The selection and training of raters, in particular, was an important part of the study, and any misuse of the instrument or the rating scale at that point could have greatly affected the results.

Additional fundamental limitations are suggested by the nature of the sample. Even if all other possible
limitations did not apply, the results obtained at Trenton State College may not be applicable elsewhere. Indeed, it is the researcher's belief that the student personnel staff at Trenton State College is larger and better qualified than the norm at most state colleges. Further, other groups in the study may differ significantly from their counterparts at other institutions as well. Finally, while the faculty was randomly sampled and high data yields were experienced in other groups where attempts were made to obtain a 100 percent response rate, those who participated in the study may have been atypical of the larger groups they were thought to represent. The student group, in particular, may not have been representative. While care was taken to obtain undergraduate subjects from a cross section of majors and class years, some students were in effect required to participate in the study, some were strongly encouraged to do so, and some were merely given the opportunity to become involved.

Several factors which may limit the meaning of the study derive from the use of the supplemental questionnaires. While only the third hypothesis used questionnaire results directly, the information from the questionnaires consisted of unverified self-reports and could have been inaccurate. Further, the questionnaires were not pre-tested and may have been unclear. While most questionnaire items asked for matters of fact, in several specific instances the questionnaire
results may be misleading. For example, on the basis of the questionnaire results, the student personnel staff was divided into one group reporting possession of a student personnel degree and one group of approximately the same size without this training. However, a close investigation of the latter group revealed that most respondents here held degrees that were closely related to student personnel work. Consequently, two categories which appeared to be quite different were in reality closely akin. Also, the division of the staff on the basis of time spent counseling may have limited meaning, since counseling was not defined, and the time range options provided were wider than desirable for fine distinctions. Finally, the questions intended to relate to job satisfaction and staff social interaction were merely suggestive and may or may not reveal meaningful measures of these phenomena.

Finally, differences in the administration of the instrument may have affected the results. While attempts were made to standardize the administration of the instrument, the researcher did not have direct contact with all subjects. Further, many subjects completed the instrument in a group setting, while others did so at their leisure. Many individuals in this latter group took weeks and, in some cases, months to respond to the instrument. This uneven administration of the instrument may have encouraged
more or less thoughtful responses from individual respondents.

Implications and Recommendations

The fact that student personnel workers at Trenton State College achieved significantly higher helping scores than members of the other groups studied may have implications for other student personnel workers in other institutions. However, while Trenton State College and its staff and students share many characteristics with other institutions, no link has been established between helping skills at Trenton and elsewhere. Further research is needed before generalizations can be confidently made about the levels of helping skills of various groups within college communities. A replication of this study with subjects from another institution would be a helpful step in that direction. However, such a replication would be time-consuming and costly. Data collection alone would be an enormous task, and the results would remain subject to cautious interpretation unless the institutions were randomly sampled. Another worthwhile and presumably more achievable research effort would be to investigate the level of helping skills of student personnel workers alone on a national or regional basis. Professional organizations could be expected to support, if not sponsor, such an effort. Student personnel workers as a group would
probably respond to a request to participate in such a study with a higher percentage of return than most other campus groups. If the findings of Carkhuff and others are not considered sufficiently broad, some other basis for comparisons with student personnel workers would need to be found. In any event, the helping skills level of student personnel workers has vastly important meanings to the profession and to the students and staff with whom they work and interact on college and university campuses. Research efforts such as those described above or any effort which would focus on objective measures of helping skills levels should be employed to expand knowledge related to the degree to which the helping specialists known as student personnel workers possess the level of skills commensurate with their stated goals.

While the findings of this study suggest further research outside of the Trenton State College community, the major implication for Trenton State is a need for immediate and extensive action. Even though many student personnel workers and some individuals from other campus groups demonstrated high levels of helping skills, most subjects in this study did not. Of those who failed to demonstrate high or even moderate levels of helping skills, some are directly cast in helping roles and others occupy positions where helping skills are desirable, if not necessary. The implication
of these data seems clear. If the staff and students of Trenton State College want to influence the personal growth and development of community members in a positive direction, a means to improve the helping skills of a large number of people needs to be found.

Ideally, Trenton State College should make a major effort to design and implement a number of new and expanded curricular and extracurricular efforts to involve individuals from all campus groups in programs focused on improving helping skills. Whatever combination of workshops, courses, and in-service training programs might be created to meet this need should be headed by individuals who already possess highly developed helping skills. Carkhuff (1969) has indicated that preferred programs will involve both didactic and experiential components. Ivey (1971) and Haase and DiMattia (1970) provide specific help in suggesting the design of training programs. Trenton State College has vast resources, and the need to improve the helping skills of a number of individuals from all campus groups has been demonstrated. It is a major recommendation of this study that, at Trenton State College, strong emphasis be placed on developing broad new programs for the improvement of the helping skills level of staff, faculty, and students.

Some additional comments directed on a college-wide basis will be made before turning to a discussion of the
helping skills of the specific sub-groups in the study. First, the extent of the lower levels of helping skills demonstrated by some individual student personnel staff members and most administrators, faculty, staff, and student peer counselors is a source of surprise to the researcher. Trenton State College has an admirable record of concern and support for human relations training activities and for administrative policy making and program development based on a counseling frame of reference. Given that record, these data are difficult to interpret. The researcher knows of no study which provides data on a college-wide basis similar to the data of this study. It may be that the need to improve the level of helping skills of a number of groups at Trenton State College is no greater than a similar need in most other institutions. Indeed, data from Carkhuff’s findings roughly parallel the findings of this study when similar groups exist (Carkhuff, 1969). In fact, the student personnel staff at Trenton State College achieved a mean helping score slightly higher than that reported by Carkhuff for experienced counselors. However, the stated concern of the student personnel staff and others at Trenton State College to foster the personal growth of community members suggests a need to improve helping skills levels whether or not this need is typical of other institutions.

Some problems may be anticipated in implementing
programs designed to improve helping skills on the Trenton State campus. First, programs with this general goal already exist. Neither the extent nor the efficacy of existing programs on campus is known to the researcher. Nevertheless, it is clear that some groups such as peer counselors have been involved with programs of questionable effectiveness, while other groups, including faculty and most staff groups, are not currently involved in human relations skills building programs in any great numbers. A valuable initial step would be the careful evaluation of all existing programs concerned with developing helping skills on the Trenton State College campus. It is important to know if the generally low scores of many groups in this study relate to the absence of sufficient programs, or the ineffectiveness of those that exist, or both. Next, a thorough evaluation of the real need for helping skills from people in different roles should be conducted. While it might be desirable to maximize the helping skills of all members of the campus community, realistic programs will have to be based on priorities developed for the allocation of training time and resources. Finally, a means will need to be found to encourage participation in programs that are made available. Students, including those who are student employees, are traditionally, in effect, required to participate in a number of programs whether or not they individually conclude specific programs are
worthwhile. Certainly, this fact may relate to the efficacy of some programs designed for students. However, no strong tradition exists for involving faculty and staff in human relations training programs on anything but a voluntary basis. The data of this study suggest that many faculty and staff could make a more positive contribution to the personal growth of community members with whom they interact if their helping skills levels were improved. However, there is no guarantee that voluntary programs would attract the staff members whose helping skills are most questionable. One way for individuals who participated in this study to have a further basis for determining their own need to work on their helping skills would be to request feedback on their scores on the Carkhuff instrument. Nevertheless, individuals might properly resist concluding that a need for personal action has been unequivocably demonstrated on the basis of their response to one instrument. This reality strengthens the need for major emphasis to be directed to all phases of the levels of helping skills of community members at Trenton State College. In the final analysis, a campus-wide program with strong administrative support may offer the highest probability of significantly affecting the helping skills level of large numbers of campus community members. In any event, any action in this area will have to emanate from within the Trenton State College community. What is proposed
here is that major attention be placed on the question of improving the helping skills levels of campus community members in order that the resources of the college can be brought to bear on all the problems that will confront those who want to design and implement such programs.

The data from this study clearly suggest that members of the student personnel staff should continue to lead counseling and other human relations activities at Trenton State College. They are the group with the highest demonstrated level of helping skills and should find wide support in an institution where facilitating personal growth is a valued goal. However, a considerable range of helping scores was found within the student personnel staff. These data do not support the assumption that all student personnel workers should be involved with human relations programs or that students should consult any member of the student personnel staff for counseling as suggested by the student handbook.

Some means should be found to improve the level of helping skills of several members of the student personnel staff, whether or not similar programs are developed for other groups on the campus. Many of the difficulties in implementing training programs alluded to earlier would have to be overcome in setting up programs for those student personnel staff members who need to improve their helping skills. Nevertheless, as the helping specialists of the
campus, all student personnel staff members should be able to demonstrate high levels of helping skills, or some student personnel roles need to be redefined or recognized as primarily technical to deemphasize the role of helping skills. Some change needs to occur. It is a strong recommendation of this study that the student personnel staff carefully evaluate their own need to develop helping skills.

The data of this study fail to establish unequivocally the presence or absence of a need for training among sub-groups of the student personnel staff. In general, the division of the staff into various groups suggested that counselors possessed higher levels of helping skills, as did staff members who were older, those with greater experience, those holding tenure, and those with earned doctorates. The counselors as the helping specialists of the helping specialists could be expected to score higher. That they did so supports their continued leadership in counseling and training efforts. However, neither this finding nor any of the others establishes a clear concentration of staff members who fail to demonstrate high levels of helping skills. While staff with greater experience, age, and training score higher as groups, several individual staff members who were younger, had little experience, or did not possess an earned doctorate demonstrated high levels of helping skills. Also, tenure has been phased out at Trenton State College, and those few staff
members holding tenure tend to be older and more experienced. Nevertheless, these general trends of helping skills levels do exist within the staff and could be referred to when the staff evaluates the importance of helping skills in various student personnel staff roles. In that context, the staff should also consider that more than half the student personnel staff reported that zero to 20 percent of their usual workday was spent in counseling activity.

Regardless of any redefinition of individual student personnel roles, it is assumed that the staff as a whole will continue to be concerned with facilitating personal growth. One finding of this study was that 64 percent of the Trenton State students polled reported that they would turn to a peer and not a staff member if they wanted to discuss a personal problem. At the same time, the helping scores of both groups of peer counselors at Trenton State were not significantly higher than the scores of other students. These results suggest that staff members should emphasize working with student groups to develop student helping skills. Indeed, the existing knowledge and skills of the student personnel staff, when combined with benefits expected from a new emphasis on in-service training, should equip them to lead helping skills development programs for faculty and staff groups as well. Perhaps the new role for student personnel workers as human facilitators for the
campus suggested by Brown (1972) is a viable alternative for
the staff at Trenton State College. In any event, if the
staff wishes to facilitate personal growth on campus, they
must not only develop their own helping skills but should
also encourage the development of the helping skills of all
those to whom students and others turn for help.

Clearly, Dialogue and undergraduate residence-hall
staff members maintain helping goals for their work with stu-
dents. As has already been suggested, a new emphasis should
be placed on programs to improve their levels of helping
skills. The student personnel staff is in a position to
facilitate the effective implementation of such programs.
It is less clear that there is a high priority to facilitate
the personal growth of students among the goals of faculty;
staff from the Admissions, Placement, and Academic Advisement
Offices; and the student personnel secretaries. Similarly,
the administration may or may not have facilitated the per-
sonal growth of faculty and staff as a major goal. If mem-
bers of any of those groups wish to foster the personal devel-
opment of campus community members with whom they interact,
some means must be found to improve their helping skills.
Even if members of the groups mentioned above do not include
fostering personal growth as a central goal, their work func-
tions, outlined in Chapter III, involve them with people who
may be seeking personal help. Furthermore, Carkhuff (1969)
suggests that helping skills levels are important factors in determining the effectiveness of a variety of relationships, whether or not the goal of facilitating personal growth is permanent. For these reasons, it is a recommendation of this study that in-service training programs designed to improve helping skills be provided for the faculty; staff from the Admissions, Placement, and Academic Advisement Offices; and the student personnel secretaries in addition to the groups already mentioned.

In conclusion, the broad recommendation of this study is that a variety of programs to improve individual levels of helping skills be designed and implemented for all groups within the Trenton State College community. If this cannot be accomplished, the relevance of helping skills to a number of staff roles should be established or denied. In-service training programs should be created or revitalized for any group where a need for high helping skills levels is determined. In particular, new efforts should be made to improve the helping skills of some student personnel workers and most Dialogue and undergraduate residence hall workers for whom helping others is a clear goal, but for whom the data of this study indicate a need for more training. While the extent to which faculty and nonstudent personnel staff members share the goal of facilitating the personal growth of students is less clear, it is the researcher's belief that
In-service training programs for these groups are equally desirable. Finally, any training programs that are offered should be systematically developed around experiential and didactic bases under the leadership of individuals who have themselves demonstrated high levels of helping skills.
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APPENDICES
TO: Members of the Trenton State College Community
FROM: Dave Smith, former TSC Staff Member (1961-71)
SUBJECT: The attached

I need your help. I am involved in a study which I believe will have value to T.S.C. It will also help me to meet the requirements for a doctorate at the University of Massachusetts. However, neither purpose will be met without the help of a number of people such as yourself. I hope that you will be willing to fill out the enclosed form(s) and return them to Mrs. Frances Appleget in the Student Personnel Office in Green Hall. She will forward them to me.

The purpose of this study is to gather data regarding communication skills as measured by Robert Carkhuff's Index of Communication (Helping and Human Relations, Vol. I). While the major focus of the study is the Student Personnel staff, I am asking selected members of the TSC faculty, student body and other staff members to participate as well. Comparisons between mean scores of these groups will be made. Further comparisons will be made between various sub-groups within the Student Personnel staff. However, while group scores will be reported, no individual score will be published or in any way made available to anyone except the person involved at his or her request. I will be on campus later in the year to meet with those who wish feedback on their own scores.

Faculty members were selected randomly for this study. Students, while not randomly selected, will hopefully be fairly representative of the student body.

The instructions are included on the attached. Your help is deeply appreciated.
APPENDIX B

CARKHUFF'S INDEX OF COMMUNICATION

Introduction and Instructions

The following excerpts represent sixteen helpee stimulus expressions; that is, expressions by a helpee of feeling and content in different problem areas. In this case the same helpee is involved in all instances.

You may conceive of this helpee simply as a person who has come to you in a time of need. We would like you to respond as you would if someone came to you seeking assistance in a time of distress. In formulating your responses, keep in mind those that the helpee can use effectively in his own life.

In summary, formulate responses to the person who has come to you for help. The following range of helpee expressions can easily come in the first contact or first few contacts; however, do not attempt to relate any one expression to a previous expression. Simply try to formulate a meaningful response to the helpee's immediate expression.

EXCERPT I

Helpee: I don't know if I am right or wrong feeling the way I do. But I find myself withdrawing from people. I don't seem to socialize and play their stupid little games any more. I get upset and come home depressed and have headaches. It seems all so superficial. There was a time when I used to get along with everybody. Everybody said, "Isn't she wonderful. She gets along with everybody. Everybody likes her." I used to think that was something to be really proud of, but that was who I was at the time. I had no depth. I was what the crowd wanted me to be--the particular group I was with.

Response:
EXCERPT 2

**Helper:** I love my children and my husband and I like doing most household things. They get boring at times but on the whole I think it can be a very rewarding thing at times. I don't miss working, going to the office every day. Most women complain of being just a housewife and just a mother. But then, again, I wonder if there is more for me. Others say there has to be. I really don't know.

**Response:**

EXPERT 3

**Helper:** Sometimes I question my adequacy of raising three boys, especially the baby. I call him the baby--well, he is the last. I can't have any more. So I know I kept him a baby longer than the others. He won't let anyone else do things for him. If someone else opens the door he says he wants Mommy to do it. If he closes the door, I have to open it. I encourage this, I do it. I don't know if this is right or wrong. He insists on sleeping with me every night and I allow it. And he says when he grows up he won't do it any more. Right now he is my baby and I don't discourage this much. I don't know if this comes out of my needs or if I'm making too much out of the situation or if this will handicap him when he goes to school--breaking away from Mama. Is it going to be a traumatic experience for him? Is it something I'm creating for him? I do worry more about my children than I think most mothers do.

**Response:**
EXERPT 4

Helpsee: It's not an easy thing to talk about. I guess the heart of the problem is sort of a sexual problem. I never thought I would have this sort of problem. But I find myself not getting a fulfillment I used to. It's not as enjoyable—for my husband either, although we don't discuss it. I used to enjoy and look forward to making love. I used to have an orgasm but I don't any more. I can't remember the last time I was satisfied. I find myself being attracted to other men and wondering what it would be like to go to bed with them. I don't know what this means. Is this symptomatic of our whole relationship as a marriage? Is something wrong with me or us?

Response:

EXERPT 5

Helpsee: Gee, those people! Who do they think they are? I just can't stand interacting with them any more. Just a bunch of phonies. They leave me so frustrated. They make me so anxious, I get angry at myself. I don't even want to be bothered with them any more. I just wish I could be honest with them and tell them all to go to hell!

Response:
EXCERPT 6

Helpsee: They wave that degree up like it's a pot of gold at the end of the rainbow. I used to think that, too, until I tried it. I'm happy being a housewife; I don't care to get a degree. But the people I associate with, the first thing they ask is where did you get your degree. I answer, "I don't have a degree." Christ, they look at you like you are some sort of a freak, some backwoodsman your husband picked up along the way. They actually believe that people with degrees are better. In fact, I think they are worse. I've found a lot of people without degrees that are a hell of a lot smarter than these people. They think that just because they have degrees they are something special. These poor kids that think they have to go to college or they are ruined. It seems we are trying to perpetrate a fraud on these kids. If no degree, they think they will end up digging ditches the rest of their lives. They are looked down upon. That makes me sick.

Response:

EXCERPT 7

Helpsee: I get so frustrated and furious with my daughter. I just don't know what to do with her. She is bright and sensitive, but damn, she has some characteristics that make me go on edge. I can't handle it sometimes. She just--I feel myself getting more and more angry! She won't do what you tell her to. She tests limits like mad. I scream and yell and lose control and think there is something wrong with me--I'm not an understanding mother or something. Damn! What potential! What she could do with what she has. There are times she doesn't need what she's got. She gets by too cheaply. I just don't know what to do with her. Then she can be so nice and then, boy, she can be as ornery as she can be. And then I scream and yell and I'm about ready to slam her across the room. I don't like to feel this way. I don't know what to do with it.

Response:
EXCERPT 8

Helpee: He is ridiculous! Everything has to be done when he wants to do it. The way he wants it done. It's as if nobody else exists. It's everything he wants to do. There is a range of things I have to do. Not just be a housewife and take care of the kids. Oh no, I have to do his typing for him, errands for him. If I don't do it right away, I'm stupid--I'm not a good wife or something stupid like that. I have an identity of my own and I'm not going to have it wrapped up in him. It makes me--it infuriates me! I want to punch him right in the mouth. What am I going to do? Who does he think he is, anyway?

Response:

EXCERPT 9

Helpee: I finally found somebody I can really get along with. There is no pretentiousness about them at all. They are real and they understand me. I can be myself with them. I don't have to worry about what I say and that they might take me wrong, because I do sometimes say things that don't come out the way that I want them to. I don't have to worry that they are going to criticize me. They are just marvelous people! I just can't wait to be with them. For once I actually enjoy going out and interacting. I didn't think I could ever find people like this again. I can really be myself. It's such a wonderful feeling not to have people criticizing you for everything you say that doesn't agree with them. They are warm and understanding and I just love them! It's just marvelous.

Response:
EXCERPT 10

Helpee: I'm really excited! We are going to California. I'm going to have a second lease on life. I found a marvelous job. It's great! It's so great, I can't believe it's true--it's so great! I have a secretarial job. I can be a mother and can have a part-time job which I think I will enjoy very much. I can be home when the kids get home from school. It's too good to be true. It's so exciting. New horizons are unfolding. I just can't wait to get started. It's great!

Response:

EXCERPT 11

Helpee: I'm so pleased with the kids. They are doing just marvelously. They have done so well at school and at home; they get along together. It's amazing. I never thought they would. They seem a little older. They play together better and they enjoy each other and I enjoy them. Life has become so much easier. It's really a joy to raise three boys. I didn't think it would be. I'm just so pleased and hopeful for the future. For them and for us. It's just so great! I can't believe it. It's marvelous.

Response:
EXCERPT 12

Helpee: I'm really excited the way things are going at home with my husband. It's just amazing. We get along great together now. Sexually, I didn't know we could be that happy. I didn't know anyone could be that happy. It's just marvelous! I'm just so pleased, I don't know what else to say.

Response:

EXCERPT 13

Helpee: I'm so thrilled to have found a counselor like you. I didn't know any existed. You seem to understand me so well. It's just great! I feel like I'm coming alive again. I have not felt like this in so long.

Response:

EXCERPT 14

Helpee: (Silence. Moving about in chair.)

Response:
EXCERPT 15

Helpee: Gee, I'm so disappointed. I thought we could get along together and you could help me. We don't seem to be getting anywhere. You don't understand me. You don't know I'm here. I don't even think you care for me. You don't hear me when I talk. You seem to be somewhere else. Your responses are independent of anything I have to say. I don't know where to turn. I'm just so -- doggone it -- I don't know what I'm going to do, but I know you can't help me. There's just no hope.

Response:

EXCERPT 16

Helpee: Who do you think you are? You call yourself a therapist! Damn, here I am spilling my guts out and all you do is look at the clock. You don't hear what I say. Your responses are not attuned to what I'm saying. I never heard of such therapy. You are supposed to be helping me. You are so wrapped up in your world you don't hear a thing I'm saying. You don't give me the time. The minute the hour is up you push me out the door whether I have something important to say or not. I--ah--it makes me so God damn mad!

Response:

APPENDIX C

STUDENT PERSONNEL STAFF QUESTIONNAIRES

Form A

1. Name: ________________________________

2. My job title is ____________________________.

3. I hold academic rank of ____________________________.

4. My current age is:

   _____ 20-29
   _____ 30-39
   _____ 40-49
   _____ 50-59
   _____ 60 and above

5. My current annual salary is ____________.

6. I am on tenure.

   _____ Yes  _____ No

7. My highest earned degree is a:

   _____ bachelor's
   _____ master's
   _____ doctorate

8. My highest earned degree was in ____________ field of specialization.

9. As a graduate student I had a practicum, internship, or assistantship in any aspect of student personnel services.

   _____ Yes  _____ No

10. Counting this year I have the following number of years of experience in college student personnel work:

    _____ 1-2  _____ 3-4  _____ 5-6
    _____ 7-8  _____ 9-10  _____ 11 or more
11. In my usual work day I spend the following amount of time in counseling relationships with students:

- 0-20%
- 21-30%
- 31-40%
- 41-50%
- More than 50%

12. I (would, would not) recommend that a friend seek employment on this student personnel staff.

13. I am (often, infrequently) a guest in the home of another member of the student personnel staff.

14. In time of personal crisis, I (have, have not) turned to a colleague on the student personnel staff for help.

15. If the answer to question #14 is positive, name the person(s).

16. I (wish, do not wish) that I had prepared myself for a career outside of student personnel work.

17. I (often, infrequently) invite members of the student personnel staff to be a guest in my home.

18. I (do, do not) hope that I will still be working on a student personnel staff in five years.

19. I (often, infrequently) eat lunch with one or more members of the student personnel staff.
Form B

Please note that the questions in Part II of this form relate only to your situation when you were at Trenton State College. Part I questions cover a wider time period. However, in Part II you are asked to relate your answers specifically to your T.S.C. experience.

PART I:

1. My current job title is ________________________________

2. My current age is _____ 20-29  _____ 50-59
   _____ 30-39  _____ 60 and above
   _____ 40-49

3. My highest earned degree is a _____ bachelor's,
   _____ master's
   _____ doctorate
   _____ other

4. My highest earned degree was in __________________ field
   of specialization and was awarded ______________ (date)
   by ________________________________ (institution).

5. As a graduate student I had a practicum, internship, or
   assistantship in any aspect of Student Personnel Serv-
   ices (____ Yes, _____ No).

6. In total I have the following numbers of years of expe-
   rience in Student Personnel work:
   _____ 1-2  _____ 7-8
   _____ 3-4  _____ 9-10
   _____ 5-6  _____ 11 or more

7. I first went to Trenton State primarily because of
   ________________________________.

8. I left Trenton State largely due to _________________________.
PART II: (When at Trenton State)

1. My job title(s) was (were) ____________________________.

2. In my usual work day I spent the following time in counseling relationships with students:

   ______ 0-20%
   ______ 21-30%
   ______ 31-40%
   ______ 41-50%
   ______ more than 50%

3. I (would, would not) have recommended that a friend seek employment on that student personnel staff.

4. I was (often, infrequently) a guest in the home of another member of the student personnel staff.

5. In time of personal crisis I (did, did not) turn to a colleague on the student personnel staff for help.

6. If the answer to Question #5 is positive, name the person(s):

   _________________________________

7. At the time I (did, did not) wish that I had prepared myself for a career outside of student personnel work.

8. I (often, infrequently) invited members of the Student Personnel staff to be guests in my home.

9. I (did, did not) hope that I would be working on a Student Personnel staff in five years.

10. I (often, infrequently) ate lunch with one or more members of the Student Personnel staff.

11. My salary was in the (upper, lower) half of the Trenton State Student Personnel staff salaries.
APPENDIX D

STUDENT INFORMATION SHEET

No. __________

TO: Undergraduate Participants in the "Carkhuff Study"

FROM: Dave Smith

You will note that a number appears on the upper right-hand corner of the first page of the Carkhuff instrument. Would you please write this same number at the same place on the remaining five pages and on the top of this page if it has not already been done. Do not sign your name unless you wish individual feedback on your score.

It would be helpful if you would provide the following information about yourself:

year in school __________ major ______________

participated in T.S.C. freshman orientation

____ yes  ____ no

If I wanted to talk about a personal problem while at T.S.C. I think I would be most likely to seek out . . . (Please indicate order of preference.)

______ a faculty member

______ another student

______ one of the campus chaplains

______ a member of the student personnel staff

______ someone in the counseling center

______ someone in the health services

______ someone at dialogue

______ other (please specify)

I live: ____ At Home  ____ In the Dorms  ____ Off Campus