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ABSTRACT

The Effects of Two Undergraduate Counseling Courses on Self-Actualization And on Three Facilitative Conditions of a Counseling Relationship: Empathy, Respect and Genuineness

May, 1978

Roger G. James, B.A., Pomona College
M.Ed., University of Massachusetts
Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Assistant Professor Sheryl Riechmann

This study was designed 1) to examine the relationship between students' participation in one or both of two counselor education courses, and two dependent variables: level of self-actualization (as measured by major scales of the Personality Orientation Inventory) and ability to communicate facilitative conditions -- empathy, respect, and genuineness -- during counseling (as measured by the Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning); and 2) to explore the relationship between the two dependent variables.

Fifty-one undergraduates participated in the study. Of this number, eleven were enrolled in the "Laboratory in Counseling: Self as Helper" (Group 1), which was primarily participatory/experiential in format; twenty-two in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" (Group 2), which was primarily didactic in format; and eighteen in both courses simultaneously (Group 3).

The POI was administered to all three participant
groups, and a control group (Group 4), at the beginning and at the end of the semester. The Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning were used by specially trained judges to rate portions of audiotaped counseling interviews. Each participant conducted two of these interviews (one at the beginning and one at the end of the semester) with two separate, randomly-selected same-gender clients.

The specific hypotheses investigated were the following:

1) Students participating in both courses will increase more in ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling than will students participating in only one of the courses.

2) Students participating only in the "Laboratory in Counseling" will increase more in ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling than will students participating only in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing."

3) Students participating in both courses will increase in self-actualization more than students participating in only one of the courses.

4) Students participating in the "Laboratory in Counseling" only will increase more in self-actualization than students participating only in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing."

5) Students enrolled in either or both of the courses under investigation will increase more in self-actualization than will students who did not participate in either course.

6) There will be a significant, positive correlation between participants' level of self-actualization and ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were tested by subjecting the data to a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA); Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 were tested by a separate MANOVA; and Hypothesis
6 was tested by calculating Pearson correlations for the data.

None of the results of the statistical analyses was significant (p<.05). There were, however, strong trends in support of Hypotheses 1 and 4. Results on each of Hypotheses 2, 3, and 5 were mixed. Hypothesis 6 was rejected.

The following major conclusions were drawn from the results:

1) Simultaneous participation in the more didactic "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" and the more experiential/participatory "Laboratory in Counseling" fostered integration of theory and practice, resulting in participants' increased ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling.

2) Because they were involved in planning and assessment of course activities, and were encouraged to develop their own ideas about counseling based on personal experiences, participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling" exhibited small increases in level of self-actualization.

3) There appears to be no consistent, significant relationship between level of self-actualization and ability to communicate core facilitative conditions.

The results of the study suggested that future researchers should investigate two major areas: 1) clarification of the relationship between counselors' self-actualization and counseling effectiveness; and 2) assessment of the efficacy of counselor education programs. The results further suggested that counselor educators need to devote more resources to assessment of training programs, and to development of integrated programs which demonstrably benefit students and their future clients.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION, BACKGROUND RESEARCH, AND RATIONALE FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

Research evidence (Eysynck, 1952, 1965; Levitt, 1957; Bergin, 1963) has shown questionable benefits of counseling on clients' growth. However, analysis of these findings suggests that there are counselor characteristics (e.g., willingness and ability to demonstrate particular behaviors and attitudes) which, when present, do result in facilitative helping relationships. This study is designed to explore the extent to which two counselor education courses resulted in participants' acquisition of those characteristics found in the literature to increase the likelihood of effective counseling.

This chapter presents the literature pointing to the selection of particular counselor characteristics for study, and provides a brief overview of the research design.

Background Research

Twenty-five years ago, Eysynck (1952) published a major review of studies assessing the effects of psychotherapy on neurotic adults, in which he concluded that "the figures fail to support the hypothesis that psychotherapy facilitates recovery from neurotic disorder" (p. 323). Five years later, Levitt (1957), in a review of the results of studies
assessing the efficacy of psychotherapy with children, came to a similar conclusion: there was no significant difference in outcome indices between people who received psychotherapy and those who did not. The published responses to the challenge implicit in these articles were, almost without exception, fervently negative. Eysynck, in particular, came under heavy attack: first, because he dared to raise the questions of the efficacy of psychotherapeutic practices (Sanford, 1954; Teuber and Powers, 1953); and second, perhaps more justifiably, because of the many uncontrolled variables in his statistical review (De Sharmes, Levy, and Wertheimer, 1954; Luborsky, 1954; Rosenzweig, 1954). However, as Aronson pointed out in his introduction to Eysynck's (1965) update of the earlier findings, "in spite of all the arguments that arose, not a single study emerged demonstrating beyond doubt the superiority of any form of psychotherapy over the spontaneous rate" (p. 100).

The research by Eysynck and Levitt served to raise serious questions about the efficacy of established counseling practices. A cursory examination of their results would seem to indicate that counseling has no greater impact on client outcome than does the passage of time. In short, counseling has no differentially beneficial effect. How-

---

1The terms "counseling" and "psychotherapy" will be used interchangeably throughout this paper. For an interesting discussion of the rationale for this word usage, see the Introduction in Patterson (1973).
ever, as Bergin (1963) noted, in one of the more thoughtful responses to Eysynck and Levitt, the data are open to another, perhaps more plausible, interpretation: namely, that "therapeutic conditions ... are found primarily among a selected group of therapists and that the remainder of therapists have a negative effect which accounts for the unimpressive results among experimental groups" (p. 253). In other words, the therapeutic relationship can result in either beneficial or deteriorative consequences for the client; and the evidence that there is no mean difference in outcome indices between those who receive counseling and those who do not would suggest that, on the whole, some counselors are doing as much harm to their clients as others are doing good for them.

If we operate on the premise that counseling, like any other human relationship, can result in either beneficial or harmful consequences for the client; if counseling is, as Truax and Carkhuff (1967) suggest, "for better or for worse," then a critical question arises: What does a counselor have to offer in a counseling relationship that will facilitate a positive outcome for her/his client? Or, framed another way, what attitudes, behaviors, or personality characteristics of a counselor correlate with positive client outcome? Two different sets of variables appear to be mentioned most frequently as concomitants of facilitative counseling situations. These variables are core facilitative conditions
(empathy, respect, and genuineness) and level of self-actualization. The research pertaining to each of these is reviewed below.

**Core facilitative conditions.** There is considerable agreement among researchers and practitioners in the field that there exists a primary core of facilitative conditions, which when communicated by the counselor to the client, contributes significantly to constructive personality change in the client.

These facilitative conditions were first postulated by Rogers (1957), who identified them as "empathic understanding, unconditional positive regard, and genuineness." Truax and Carkhuff (1967) refer to this same aggregate of conditions as "accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness;" Carkhuff (1969) uses the terms "empathic understanding, respect, and facilitative genuineness;" and Wideman (1970), "empathy, respect, and authenticity." For the purposes of this paper, the term "empathy" will be used to denote the willingness and ability of the counselor to accurately perceive and appreciate the way a client is experiencing her/his life at that point in time; the term "respect" will be used to denote the counselor's willingness and ability to accept a client as a separate and worthwhile individual, without establishing conditions for this acceptance; and the term "genuineness" will be used to denote the counselor's willingness and ability to express and act on her/his
experience of the counseling relationship in ways that facilitate the development of a mutually open, honest, caring, and trusting relationship between counselor and client.

The research evidence demonstrating a significant, positive correlation between the presence of these core facilitative conditions in a counseling relationship and positive client outcome is massive and well-documented. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) conducted an exhaustive review of the research in this area, and concluded the following:

These studies taken together suggest that therapists or counselors who are accurately empathic, nonpossessively warm in attitude, and genuine are indeed effective; the greater the degree to which these elements were present in the therapeutic encounter, the greater was the resulting constructive personality change in the patient. These findings seem to hold for a wide variety of therapists and counselors, regardless of their training or theoretical orientation; and for a wide variety of clients or patients, including college underachievers, juvenile delinquents, hospitalized schizophrenics, college counselees, mild to severe outpatient neurotics, and the mixed variety of hospitalized patients. Further, the evidence suggests that these findings hold in a variety of therapeutic contexts and in both individual and group psychotherapy or counseling (p. 100)

In more recent reviews of the research in this area, Shapiro (1969) and Athay (1974) have drawn similar conclusions: there is a consistently significant relationship between the counselor-offered core facilitative conditions (empathy, respect, and genuineness) and constructive personality change in the client. Consequently, the extent to which counselor education courses or programs can aid participants in the
development of these three core competencies may well reflect the likelihood of participants' being able to facilitate positive growth in their future clients. How successful present educational efforts are in this regard needs study and documentation.

**Self-actualization.** For many years, professionals in the field of counseling and psychotherapy have theorized that the ability to facilitate positive outcome for the client in a therapeutic relationship may be, to some extent, a function of the counselor's psychological adjustment (Matarazzo, 1971), self-actualization (Maslow, 1967), humanness (Dreyfuss, 1967), or ability to "fully function" (Rogers, 1963). Since it is outside the scope of this dissertation, we will forego any attempt to explore the conceptual or operational interrelationships among these terms; we will, instead, focus only on the research evidence concerning the relationship between counselors' degree of self-actualization and ability to communicate core facilitative conditions in a therapeutic context. Much of the research in this area, including the present study, has been conducted using Shostrom's (1963) Personality Orientation Inventory (POI), an instrument designed to measure self-actualization. Shostrom, in his Manual for the POI (1966), defines the "self-actualized person" as

... a person who is more fully functioning and lives a more enriched life than does the average person. Such an individual is seen
as developing and utilizing all of his unique capabilities, or potentialities, free of the inhibitions and turmoil of those less self-actualized (p. 4).

The term "self-actualization," then, will be used in this dissertation to denote the degree to which a given individual or group of individuals is "self-actualized," as defined by Shostrom and measured by the POI.

A review of the research which has attempted to determine the relationship between counselors' self-actualization and ability to communicate facilitative conditions reveals limited and conflicting data. Foulds (1969b) conducted a study of graduate counselor education students (N=30) enrolled in a practicum, in which each student completed the POI and submitted a taped counseling interview which s/he considered representative of her/his best counseling efforts at that time. Random segments of these tapes were then rated by trained judges, using three of Carkhuff's (1969) Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning: Empathic Understanding, Communication of Respect, and Facilitative Genuineness. The results showed that empathic understanding was significantly related to one of the two major POI scales: Inner-Direction (p<.05); the ability to communicate facilitative genuineness was significantly related to the Inner-Directed scale (p<.01); and the total of conditions offered was significantly related (p<.01) to the Inner-Directed scale. No POI scales were significantly related to the communication of respect. Rowe and Winborn (1973), however, in
a carefully designed replication of Foulds' (1969b) study, reported no significant correlation between the major POI scales and any of the Carkhuff scales.

Williams (1972), in a study of graduate students (N=30) enrolled in a counseling practicum, also used the POI and taped interviews rated with the Carkhuff scales. The results showed no significant correlations between the major POI scales and the tape ratings. Using POI scores and supervisors' Facilitative Interpersonal Relationship Scale ratings in a study of graduate students (N=20) enrolled in a "counseling practicum class," Phillips (1974) reported no significant correlation between the two measures.

Hines (1974) conducted a study involving university residence assistants (N=43), who completed the POI and who were rated by students (using Truax's Relationship Questionnaire) whom they had seen in a quasi-counseling capacity. Results indicated that the RA's whose POI scores showed them to be "high self-actualizing" were perceived by their students/clients as providing significantly higher levels of the facilitative conditions (Accurate Empathy, Nonpossessive Warmth, Facilitative Genuineness, and Overall Therapeutic Relationship) than were the RA's whose POI scores placed them in the "low self-actualizing" category (p<.015).

Jansen and Garvey (1974), in a study of clergy (N=80) rated by their supervisors as "high" or "low" in clinical competencies, found that the high-rated clergy scored signi-
significantly higher than did the low-rated clergy on both major scales of the POI: Time Competence ($p < .05$) and Inner-Direction ($p < .001$).

Finally, Selfridge and VanderKolk (1976) recently conducted a study involving secondary school counselors ($N=33$). Each counselor completed the POI; listened to audiotaped client statements and made written responses, which were rated by trained judges using Carkhuff's (1969) scale for Empathic Understanding; and was rated by six students/clients, using the Relationship Inventory (Barrett-Lennard, 1962). Results showed that both major scales of the POI, Time Competence and Inner-Direction, were significantly related to communication of empathy, as well as to all scales of the Relationship Inventory ($p < .001$), in all cases. The authors concluded:

Generally, it appeared that the higher the level of self-actualization, the greater the ability to effectively convey the core conditions of facilitative interpersonal relationships.... Counselors who possess a high degree of positive attitudes and values toward self and others appear to be...more able to present themselves to clients in a manner that is perceived as attentively empathic, nonjudgmental, and worthy of trust (p. 192).

In summary, the hypothesis that there is a significant correlation between counselors' level of self-actualization and ability to communicate core facilitative conditions in a therapeutic context has been supported by a number of studies (Foulds, 1969b; Hines, 1974; Jansen and Garvey, 1974; Selfridge and VanderKolk, 1976) and not supported by others (Rowe...
and Winborn, 1973; Williams, 1972; Phillips, 1974). However, the positive findings do suggest that further consideration of this variable is worthwhile.

Rationale for the Present Study

The purposes of this study, as noted in the Introduction, are first, to explore the separate and combined effects of two undergraduate counselor education courses ("Laboratory in Counseling: Self as Helper" and "Theory and Practice in Interviewing") on participants' development of a) self-actualization and b) ability to communicate facilitative conditions (empathy, respect, and genuineness) during counseling; and second, to determine what correlation, if any, exists between level of self-actualization and ability to provide facilitative conditions in a therapeutic context. Both courses under investigation were offered through the Division of Human Services and Applied Behavioral Sciences of the University of Massachusetts (Amherst) School of Education during the Spring, 1977, semester.

"Laboratory in Counseling: Self as Helper," taught by the writer, was offered in two sections, with an enrollment of 14 in Section I and 15 in Section II. Each section met for 14 weekly three-hour sessions during the semester. The course was primarily experiential/participatory in format, and was designed to offer participants an opportunity to 1) explore their attitudes toward and preconceptions about
counselors and the counseling relationship; 2) identify a personal style of helping and being helped, through an examination of previous experiences in helping relationships; 3) improve their ability to function effectively in helping relationships, through practice counseling; and 4) develop a statement of personal assumptions, observations, and convictions about the ways in which the counseling relationship can facilitate human growth and development. (For a further description of this course, see Appendix A.)

"Theory and Practice in Interviewing," co-taught by Dr. Allen E. Ivey and Lynn Simek, was offered in one section, with an enrollment of approximately 150 students, who met for 1½ hours, twice weekly, for a total of 14 weeks. The course was primarily didactic in format, and was designed to offer participants an opportunity to 1) learn, through the viewing of videotapes, counseling and influencing skills; 2) learn to score and rate a helping interview and evaluate its effectiveness from their own point of view; 3) study major theories of counseling and psychotherapy; and 4) develop a plan of treatment to help a client, according to written case data, from a single theoretical perspective. (For a further description of this course, see Appendix B.)

Both of the courses described above have been designed by experienced counselor educators for the primary purpose of introducing the field of counseling and psychotherapy to students who have had little or no classroom or practical expo-
sure to this field. Both courses, will, presumably, be taught again in the future. It is not known, however, what effects these courses, either singly or in combination, have had on students who have participated in them. There is no systematically gathered and carefully interpreted data regarding the type or degree of benefits actually derived by those who participated in either or both of these courses. It is not known whether these courses have facilitated, hindered, or had no effects on participants' level of self-actualization. Nor is it known whether participants who choose to pursue a career in counseling will be better able to communicate facilitative conditions in a therapeutic context, thereby fostering constructive personality change in their future clients, as a result of having taken part in either or both of these courses.

It is hoped that acquisition of this information will assist counselor educators in their efforts to maximize the benefits which might accrue to participants in their courses. It is also hoped that this study will spur counselor educators to conduct further research into the effects of their courses, not only on participants' personal growth and psychological well-being, but also on participants' ability to facilitate constructive personality change in their future clients.
CHAPTER II

METHOD

Design

This study sought to determine the extent to which counselor education courses resulted in participants' development of self-actualization and ability to communicate core facilitative conditions in a counseling situation. Four groups of students participated. The three experimental groups each completed the POI twice and participated in two audiotaped counseling interviews, each 30 minutes in length. The control group completed only the POI. Scores from the POI, ratings of the tapes from the counseling sessions, and interviews with a sample of students from the courses at the end of the semester serve as the sources of data for studying the hypotheses.

Participants. Fifty-one undergraduate students participated in the study. Of this total number, 22 were enrolled in the course "Theory and Practice in Interviewing"; 11 were enrolled in the course "Laboratory in Counseling: Self as Helper"; and 18 were enrolled in both of these courses simultaneously. Students enrolled in the "Laboratory in Counseling" were required to take part in the study as an integral part of the course. Students enrolled in "Theory and Practice" volunteered to participate in the study as an option for fulfilling a term requirement for that course.
The control group was composed of six undergraduate students enrolled in an introductory accounting course. Control group members volunteered to participate in the study.

**Hypotheses.** The specific hypotheses investigated in this study were the following:

1) Students participating in both courses will increase more in ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling than will students participating in only one of the courses.

2) Students participating only in the "Laboratory in Counseling" will increase more in ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling than will students participating only in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing."

3) Students participating in both courses will increase in self-actualization more than students participating in only one of the courses.

4) Students participating in the "Laboratory in Counseling" only will increase more in self-actualization than students participating only in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing."

5) Students enrolled in either or both of the courses under investigation will increase more in self-actualization than will students who did not participate in either course.

6) There will be a significant, positive correlation between participants' level of self-actualization and ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling.

**Instruments.** The instruments used in the study were 1) the Personality Orientation Inventory (Shostrom, 1963); and 2) three of the Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning (Carkhuff, 1969): Empathic Understanding, Communication of Respect, and Facilitative Genuineness. These instruments are described in more detail below.

**Personality Orientation Inventory (POI).** The POI, developed by Shostrom (1963, 1966), purports to measure values
and behaviors seen to be important in the development of self-actualization. The POI consists of 150 paired-opposite, comparative-value-judgment statements. Scores are reported for two major scales: Inner-Direction (I) and Time Competence (TC); and ten subscales, which purport to measure specific values associated with self-actualization: Self-Actualizing Value (SAV), Existentiality (Ex), Feeling Reactivity (Fr), Spontaneity (S), Self-Regard (Sr), Self-Acceptance (Sa), Nature of Man — Constructive (Nc), Synergy (Sy), Acceptance of Aggression (A), and Capacity for Intimate Contact (C). The definitions of the scales, along with the number of items comprising each scale, are presented in Table 1.

Test-retest reliability coefficients (7 day interval), based on a sample of 48 undergraduate college students, are $r = .71$ for the Time Competence (TC) scale and $r = .77$ for the Inner-Direction (I) scale. Coefficients for the subscales range from $r = .52$ to $r = .82$ (Shostrom, 1966). A copy of the instrument, along with reliability coefficients of all the scales, are given in Appendix C.

Scoring. For data analyses, raw scores of each of the POI scales were used. These scores were computed by hand, using scoring templates provided by the publisher of the instrument.

Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning. Three scales developed by Carkhuff (1969) were used in the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Competence (TC)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Measures the degree to which the individual lives in the present rather than in the past or future. Self-actualizing persons are those living primarily in the present, with full awareness and contact, and full feeling reactivity. They are able to tie the past and the future to the present in meaningful continuity, and their aspirations are tied meaningfully to present working goals. They are &quot;time competent.&quot; In contrast, the &quot;time incompetent&quot; person lives primarily in the past -- with guilts, regrets, and resentments -- and/or in the future -- with idealized goals, plans, expectations, predictions, and fears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Direction (I)</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>Measures whether an individual's mode of reaction is characteristically &quot;self&quot; oriented or &quot;other&quot; oriented. Inner-, or self-directed persons are guided primarily by internalized principles and motivations while other-directed persons are, to a great extent, influenced by their peer group and other external forces.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Value (SAV)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Measures the affirmation of primary values of self-actualizing people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality (Ex)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Measures the ability to situationally or existentially react without rigid adherence to principles. Existentiality measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscale</td>
<td>Number of Items</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality (cont.) (Ex)</td>
<td></td>
<td>one's flexibility in applying values or principles to one's life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity (Fr)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Measures sensitivity or responsiveness to one's own needs and feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity (S)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Measures freedom to react spontaneously, to be oneself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard (Sr)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Measures affirmation of self because of worth or strength.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance (Sa)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Measures the affirmation or acceptance of oneself in spite of one's weaknesses or deficiencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man -- Constructive (Nc)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Measures the degree of one's constructive view of the nature of man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy (Sy)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Measures the ability to be synergistic -- to transcend dichotomies and to see opposites of life as meaningfully related.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression (A)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Measures the ability to accept one's natural aggressiveness -- as opposed to defensiveness, denial, and repression of aggression.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact (C)</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Measures the ability to develop contactful intimate relationships with other human beings unencumbered by expectations and obligations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
study to determine levels of facilitative conditions provided by students in audiotaped counseling interviews. The scales -- Empathic Understanding (E), Communication of Respect (R), and Facilitative Genuineness (G) -- consist of five levels each, with Level 1 designated as maximally detracting, Level 3 as minimally facilitative, and Level 5 as maximally facilitative on each scale. These scales were derived by Carkhuff from similar instruments designed by Truax and Carkhuff (1967), who reported extensive counseling-outcome validation for the instruments. A copy of the scales is given in Appendix D.

Scoring. For scoring and data analyses, numerical values were assigned to the five levels on each of the scales. Judges trained specifically in the use of the scales then rated excerpts from the audiotaped counseling interviews, assigning numerical values to represent the level of each of the facilitative conditions communicated by the student/counselor. More on the training of the raters and the procedure used by them is given below.

Procedure

Personality Orientation Inventory. The POI was administered to participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling" during the first class, and again during the final class of the semester. Participants in the "Theory and Practice" class completed the instrument during individually scheduled
appointments, the first taking place during the first two weeks of class and the second during the last two weeks of class. Members of the control group also completed the POI on an individual basis, during the fifth week and again during the last week of classes. The mean interval between pre- and post-testing for participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling" was 14 weeks; for participants in "Theory and Practice," 13 weeks; and for members of the control group, 10 weeks. During the final weeks of classes, all participants in the study were invited to attend a meeting, where the interpretation of their POI profiles, as well as the design of the study, were discussed.

Counseling interviews. Each participant conducted two counseling interviews, one during the first two weeks of classes and one during the last two weeks of classes. The mean interval between the first and second interviews was 13 weeks for each group of participants. Each interview was audiotaped, and was approximately 30 minutes in length.

Persons who volunteered to be clients for the counseling interviews were enrolled in either the Human Services Program or the Counseling Program of the Division of Human Services and Applied Behavioral Sciences. Clients were instructed to present to each participant/counselor a personal problem that was real and current. Clients were further instructed to use presenting problems of approximately the same emotional intensity. Each participant conducted the first interview with
a randomly-assigned client of the same gender, and the second interview with a different randomly-assigned client, also of the same gender. In no case were participant/counselor and client acquainted with each other before the interview.

The following procedural steps were followed in conducting each of the counseling interviews:

1) The participant/counselor was contacted by an interview coordinator (the investigator or a research assistant) to schedule a time and place for the interview.

2) At the appointed time and place, the participant/counselor was met and shown into the room by the interview coordinator, who then gave the following information:

   a) the problem presented by the client would be real and current;

   b) the interview was to last no longer than 30 minutes (a watch or clock was in plain view during all interviews);

   c) the interview would be audiotaped, if there was no objection.

3) After answering any questions from the participant/counselor the interview coordinator left the room, returned with the client, started the tape recorder, and left the room again.

4) Thirty minutes later, the interview coordinator returned to the room; turned off the tape recorder; and informed the participant/counselor that s/he could, if s/he
so desired, discuss the interview with the client, for a period not to exceed 10 minutes.

**Rating of audiotapes.** After all counseling interviews were completed, the audiotapes were randomly numbered. The data sample tapes were then assigned to one of two pairs of judges, each pair consisting of one male and one female judge. All judges were experienced counselors, and all were advanced Doctoral students in the Counseling Program of the Division of Human Services and Applied Behavioral Sciences. Judges were trained in the use of the three rating scales, and rated three segments (the first five minutes, the middle five minutes, and the last five minutes) on each of a series of training tapes. (A copy of the rating form is given in Appendix D.) Interjudge reliabilities over the final three training tapes were: .89 for Empathic Understanding (E), .92 for Communication of Respect (R), and .80 for Facilitative Genuineness (G).

The data sample tapes were rated in four sessions, over a period of three weeks. Three sections (the first five minutes, the middle five minutes, and the last five minutes) of each tape were rated on all three scales by each judge in the pair to whom that tape was assigned. The interjudge reliabilities over the ratings on all data sample tapes were: .85 for Empathic Understanding, .83 for Communication of Respect, and .84 for Facilitative Genuineness. The mean of both judges' ratings of the selected sections was calculated,
yielding one score for each of the three scales. These three scores (one for Empathic Understanding, one for Communication of Respect, and one for Facilitative Genuineness) for each tape were used in the statistical analyses.
CHAPTER III
RESULTS

The results of the statistical analyses for the study are presented below. Each of the hypotheses given in Chapter I will be considered in turn. (See p. 14 for a listing of the hypotheses.)

Hypotheses 1 and 2 are concerned with the relationship between a) ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling, as measured by scores on the Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning (dependent variables); and b) participation in one or both of the courses under investigation (independent variables). These hypotheses were tested by subjecting the data to a Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA).

Hypotheses 3, 4, and 5 are concerned with the relationship between a) self-actualization, as measured by scores on the major scales — Time Competence (TC) and Inner-Direction (I) — of the POI (dependent variables); and b) participation in one or both of the courses under investigation (independent variables). These hypotheses were tested by subjecting the data to a separate MANOVA.

Hypothesis 6 concerns the relationship between scores on all POI scales and scores on the Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning. This hypothesis was tested by calculating Pearson product-moment correlations for the
pre-test data and for the post-test data.

Hypothesis 1

This hypothesis predicted that students who participated in both courses under investigation ("Laboratory in Counseling: Self as Helper" and "Theory and Practice in Interviewing") would increase more in ability to communicate facilitative conditions (Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness) during counseling, than would students who participated in only one of the courses.

As can be seen in Table 2, results of the statistical analyses for all three of the five-point scales demonstrated a trend in the predicted direction: on the Empathic Understanding scale (E), those who participated in both classes (Group 3) showed a substantial mean increase ($M = .4375$), whereas participants in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" (Group 2) decreased on the whole ($M = -.0758$), and members of the "Laboratory in Counseling" (Group 1) decreased even more markedly ($M = -.2121$); on the Communication of Respect scale (R), Group 3 again demonstrated a mean increase ($M = .2083$) between pre- and post-test scores, while Group 1 decreased slightly ($M = -.0303$), and Group 2 showed a slightly greater decrease in mean scores ($M = -.1061$); and on the Facilitative Genuineness scale (G), all three groups increased their scores slightly, with Group 3 again showing a more marked increase ($M = .1146$) than either Group 1
(M = .0455) or Group 2 (M = .0152). 

Even though the mean scores on all three scales tended to support the hypothesis that participants in both classes would increase more in their ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness than would participants in only one of the courses, results of the MANOVA demonstrated that none of the shifts was statistically significant (p < .05). The multivariate F-Ratio was 1.0157 (p < .4205). The univariate F-Ratios and probabilities for the individual scales (Table 3) were as follows: for Empathic Understanding, F = 1.7444, p < .187; for Communication of Respect, F = .5241, p < .596; and for Facilitative Genuineness, F = .1058, p < .900.

Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2 predicted that students who participated in only the "Laboratory in Counseling: Self as Helper" (Group 1) would increase more in ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling than would students who participated only in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" (Group 2).

The results pertinent to this hypotheses are mixed, as can be seen by the figures presented in Table 2. On the Empathic Understanding scale, both groups exhibited a mean decrease in their scores, with Group 1 decreasing more (M = -.2121) than Group 2 (M = -.0753). Again on the Communication of Respect scale, both groups decreased in mean
Table 2

Cell Means and Standard Deviations For Differences Between Pre- and Post-Test Scores on the Scales for Interpersonal Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Class(es)</th>
<th>Laboratory in Counseling</th>
<th>Theory and Practice in Interviewing</th>
<th>Both Classes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>Mean -0.2121</td>
<td>-0.0758</td>
<td>.4375</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 1.0330</td>
<td>1.0062</td>
<td>.9735</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of Respect</td>
<td>Mean -0.0303</td>
<td>-1.061</td>
<td>.2083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 0.7521</td>
<td>1.0672</td>
<td>.8872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitative Genuineness</td>
<td>Mean 0.0455</td>
<td>0.1061</td>
<td>.1146</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 0.5275</td>
<td>1.0672</td>
<td>.7142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3

F-Ratios and Probability for Scales of Interpersonal Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>P Less Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathic Understanding</td>
<td>1.7444</td>
<td>.187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication of Respect</td>
<td>.5241</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitative Genuineness</td>
<td>.1058</td>
<td>.900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Multivariate F-Ratio = 1.0157, p < .4205
scores, but in this case, the results were in the predicted direction (if such a statement is not ludicrous when both groups decrease in measured ability): Group 1 decreased less ($M = -0.0303$) than Group 2 ($M = -0.1061$). Only on the Facilitative Genuineness scale were the resultant scores positive and in the predicted direction: participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling" (Group 1) increased slightly more ($M = .0455$) than did students in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" ($M = .0152$).

As mentioned above, the multivariate F-Ratio was not significant ($F = 1.0157, p<.4205$), so none of the individual intergroup contrasts was investigated.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that students who participated in both courses would increase more in self-actualization (as measured by scores on the Time Competence (TC) and Inner-Direction (I) scales of the Personality Orientation Inventory) than would students who participated in only one of the courses.

Results on the Inner-Direction (I) scale were in the predicted direction (Table 4): participants in both courses (Group 3) exhibited a substantial mean increase in scores ($M = 9.3333$), while participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling" (Group 1) increased slightly less ($M = 7.5455$), and students in "Theory and Practice" showed only a slight
### Table 4

Cell Means and Standard Deviations for Differences Between Pre- and Post-Test Scores on Major POI Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class(es)</th>
<th>Laboratory in Counseling</th>
<th>Theory and Practice in Interviewing</th>
<th>Both Classes</th>
<th>Control Group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>POI Scales</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Competence (TC)</td>
<td>Mean 1.0909</td>
<td>-.5714</td>
<td>.93333</td>
<td>-.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 2.7370</td>
<td>2.4611</td>
<td>2.5204</td>
<td>2.2509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Direction (I)</td>
<td>Mean 7.5455</td>
<td>1.4762</td>
<td>9.3333</td>
<td>1.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S.D. 9.8119</td>
<td>5.8790</td>
<td>6.6297</td>
<td>8.8333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N 11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5

F-Ratios and Probability for POI Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Univariate F</th>
<th>P Less Than</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Competence</td>
<td>1.6298</td>
<td>.195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Direction</td>
<td>4.23958</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Multivariate F-Ratio = 2.3121, p < .0397
increase in mean scores ($M = .4762$). Results in the Time Competence (TC) scale were mixed: Group 3 (both courses) increased more on this scale ($M = .9333$) than did Group 2 (who actually decreased: $M = -.5714$), but less than Group 1 ($M = 1.0909$).

Results of the MANOVA were supportive of the hypothesis: the multivariate F-Ratio (Table 5) was 2.3121 ($p<.0397$); and the univariate F-Ratios were $F = 4.2396$ ($p<.010$) for Inner-Direction, and $F = 1.6928$ ($p<.195$) for Time Competence. However, when confidence intervals were established at the $p<.05$ level, it was determined that none of the individual intergroup contrasts was significant: that is, although the multivariate F-Ratio and the univariate F-Ratio for the Inner-Direction scale were significant ($p<.0397$ and $p<.010$, respectively), it is not possible to state with any statistically significant degree of certainty that any differences between groups in improvement on the Inner-Direction scale can be attributed to differences in the two courses under investigation.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicted that students who participated in the "Laboratory in Counseling" only would increase more in self-actualization than would students who participated only in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing."

The results pertinent to this hypothesis exhibited a
trend in the predicted direction: on the Time Competence scale, participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling" (Group 1) showed an increase in mean score (M = 1.0909), while students in the "Theory and Practice" course (Group 2) actually decreased in mean score (M = -.5714); and on the Inner-Direction scale, Group 1 had a mean increase of M = 7.5455, while Group 2 had a mean increase of only M = 1.4762.

Again, however, when confidence intervals were established (at the p<.05 level), it was determined that none of the individual intergroup contrasts was statistically significant, in spite of the appearance of significance in the MANOVA results (multivariate F = 2.3121, p<.0397; univariate F = 4.2396, p<.010 for the Inner-Direction scale).

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 predicted that students who participated in either or both of the courses under investigation would increase more in self-actualization than would students who did not participate in either of the courses (Group 4). As the figures in Table 4 demonstrate, the results were in the predicted direction on both the Time Competence (TC) and Inner-Direction (I) scales for those who participated in both courses (Group 3): mean differences for Group 3 on the TC and I scales were M = .9333 and M = 9.333, respectively; whereas, mean differences for Group 4 on the same scales
were M = -.3333 and M = 1.8333, respectively. Results were also in the predicted direction on both scales for Group 1 ("Laboratory in Counseling"), which registered an increase of M = 1.0909 on the TC scale, and M = 7.5455 on the I scale. However, participants in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" (Group 2) did not show increases similar to the control group on either the Time Competence (M = -.5714) or Inner-Direction (M = 1.4762) scale.

Again, confidence intervals established at the p<.05 level demonstrated that none of the individual intergroup contrasts was significant.

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 predicted that there would be a significant (p<.05), positive relationship between all participants' level of self-actualization (as measured by the POI scales) and ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling (as measured by three of the Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning: Empathic Understanding, Communication of Respect, and Facilitative Genuine

The Pearson product-moment correlations, which were calculated for both the pre- and post-tests in order to test this hypothesis, are presented in Tables 6-A and 6-B, and are summarized below.

On the pre-tests, Empathic Understanding (E)
### Table 6-A

Pearson Correlations Between POI Scales and Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI Scales</th>
<th>Pre-Tests</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Facilitative Conditions</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Competence</td>
<td>.2483*</td>
<td>.1707</td>
<td>-.0038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Direction</td>
<td>.1481</td>
<td>.1744</td>
<td>.0141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Subscales

| Self-Actualizing Value      | .2806*    | .3366*   | .2075    |
| Existentiality              | .1696     | .2527*   | .1795    |
| Feeling Reactivity          | -.0600    | .0498    | .0368    |
| Spontaneity                 | .1982     | .2356    | -.0201   |
| Self-Regard                 | .3435*    | .4065**  | .2840*   |
| Self-Acceptance             | .0101     | .0288    | -.1771   |
| Nature of Man — Constructive| .2955*    | .2590*   | -.0300   |
| Synergy                     | .0243     | .0487    | .0929    |
| Acceptance of Aggression    | -.0670    | -.0424   | -.1475   |
| Capacity for Intimate Contact| .1058    | .1382    | .0963    |

* p<.05  
** p<.01
Table 6-B
Pearson Correlations Between POI Scales and Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Post-Tests</th>
<th>Facilitative Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POI Scales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Competence</td>
<td>.1798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner-Direction</td>
<td>.3239*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscales</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Value</td>
<td>.1575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality</td>
<td>.1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>.2185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>.3265*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard</td>
<td>.0810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>.2557*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man -- Constructive</td>
<td>.1585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>.1317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression</td>
<td>.3453**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact</td>
<td>.3263*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$  
** $p < .01$
correlated significantly only with the Time Competence scale 
(r = .2483, p < .05); and with the Self-Actualizing Value 
(r = .2806, p < .05), Self-Regard (r = .3435, p < .05), and 
Nature of Man -- Constructive (r = .2955, p < .05) subscales. 
Communication of Respect correlated significantly only with 
the Self-Actualizing Value (r = .3366, p < .05), Existenti-
ality (r = .2527, p < .05), Self-Regard (r = .4065, p < .01), 
and Nature of Man -- Constructive (r = .2590, p < .05) sub-
scales. And Facilitative Genuineness correlated significant-
ly only with the Self-Regard (r = .2840, p < .05) subscale.

On the post-tests, there were significant correla-
tions between Empathic Understanding and the Inner-Direction 
scale (r = .3239, p < .05), as well as the Spontaneity 
(r = .3265, p < .05), Self-Acceptance (r = .2557, p < .05), 
Acceptance of Aggression (r = .3453, p < .01), and Capacity for 
Intimate Contact (r = .3263, p < .05) subscales. Communication 
of Respect correlated significantly with both the Time Com-
petence (r = .2672, p < .05) and Inner-Direction (r = .3285, 
p < .05) scales; and the Existentiality (r = .2540, p < .05), 
Feeling Reactivity (r = .3055, p < .05), Spontaneity (r = .2705, 
p < .05), Self-Acceptance (r = .2557, p < .05), Acceptance of 
Aggression (r = .3453, p < .01), and Capacity for Intimate Con-
tact (r = .3351, p < .05) subscales. Facilitative Genuineness 
did not correlate positively with any of the POI scales or 
subscales.

Of the 24 correlations calculated to test the
relationship between the Empathic Understanding and POI scales, only nine (37.5%) were found to be significant ($p < .05$); for the Communication of Respect and POI scales, 12 (50%) of the correlations were significant; and for the Facilitative Genuineness and POI scales, only one (4.2%) of the correlations proved to be significant. It is also important to note that only once did a correlation prove to be significant on both the pre-test and the post-test, suggesting perhaps that the significant correlations were, in fact, spurious.

Based on the figures presented in Tables 6-A and 6-B, and discussed above, the hypothesis that there is a consistently positive, significant relationship between scores on the Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning and scores on the POI scales is rejected for the Facilitative Genuineness scale; and tentatively rejected for the Empathic Understanding and Communication of Respect scales.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was designed 1) to examine the relationship between undergraduate students' participation in one or both of two counselor education courses (independent variables) and two dependent variables: self-actualization and ability to communicate facilitative conditions during counseling; and 2) to explore the putative correlation between the two dependent variables.

This chapter will be presented in four major sections: 1) a discussion of the results of the study, presented in Chapter III; 2) methodological issues in the present study; 3) implications of the results for future research; and 4) implications of the results for counselor education.

Discussion of the Results

Communication of facilitative conditions. The first two hypotheses specified for examination in this study concerned the ability of participants to communicate core facilitative conditions (empathy, respect, and genuineness) when conducting a counseling interview.

Hypothesis 1 predicted that students who participated in both courses under examination (Group 3) would increase more in this ability than would those who participated in only one of the courses. The statistical analysis (Table 2)
demonstrated a consistent trend in support of this hypothesis, although the results were not significant ($p < 0.05$).

Hypothesis 2 predicted that participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling: Self as Helper" (Group 1) would increase more in these skills than would participants in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" (Group 2). Once again, none of the contrasts is statistically significant; but in this case the results are not all in the predicted direction (Table 2): on the Empathic Understanding and Communication of Respect scales, mean scores for each group decreased between pre- and post-testing, with "Laboratory" students decreasing slightly more than "Theory and Practice" students on the Empathy scale, but slightly less than them on the Respect scale. On the Facilitative Genuineness scale, the results demonstrated a trend in the predicted direction (Table 2): Group 1 increased slightly more than Group 2.

Both the magnitude and direction of the changes between pre- and post-test means on the three scales are noteworthy. Regarding the magnitude of the changes, it seems plausible to suggest that the lack of statistical significance in the contrasts is attributable to a combination of three factors: 1) insufficient discrimination inherent in the scales; 2) failure of those who rated the data sample tapes to use the full range of the scales; and 3) relatively small changes (between the first and second counseling interviews) in the participants' ability to offer the
facilitative conditions under investigation. The first two factors are clearly interwoven. It was the consensus of the raters during the training sessions that the scales would, in fact, discriminate sufficiently well if all five points of each scale were utilized consistently. However, as the rating of the actual data sample tapes progressed, it became evident that the raters were scoring the tapes using the three middle points of each scale almost exclusively. When questioned about this phenomenon, the raters explained that the behaviors described in the definitions of the top and bottom points of each scale (see Appendix D) were extreme, and were rarely encountered in the taped interviews. Hence, the five-point scales were effectively reduced to three-point scales, thereby diminishing the statistical visibility of any changes which may have taken place. It does seem reasonable to surmise, however, that any flaws that may have existed in the design or application of the scales did not mask any major shifts in participants' behavior between the first and second counseling interviews; that, in fact, whatever changes did occur in participants' ability to communicate empathy, respect, and genuineness in these interviews were relatively small changes. This is hardly surprising, in light of the fact that the mean interval between pre- and post-test interviews was a mere thirteen weeks.

The direction of the changes is a more confusing matter, and one not so easily explained. On the one hand,
students who participated in both classes (Group 3) increased measurably in their ability to communicate all three facilitative conditions. This was predicted, and seems reasonable if one assumes, as the investigator did, that those who participated in the more experiential, self-directed "Laboratory" and the more didactic "Theory and Practice" simultaneously would have an opportunity to integrate theory and practice; and, further, that this integration would result in increases in the participants' skills in communicating these core conditions.

On the other hand, both groups of students who participated in only one of the courses under investigation decreased on both the Empathic Understanding and Communication of Respect scales (Table 2), the two scales on which those participating in both courses increased most dramatically. Bearing in mind that none of the contrasts was determined to be statistically significant (p<.05), it is still difficult to escape the paradoxical observation that participation in only one of the courses negatively affects students' ability to communicate attitudes which have been solidly linked to positive client outcome; whereas participation in both classes at the same time results in a strong, positive increase in the students' ability to communicate these same facilitative conditions.

In trying to understand this phenomenon, it might be helpful to know which activities/characteristics of the
courses in which they participated, the students found most helpful or detrimental to their learning. This information was gathered during the last week of classes, in interviews held with 28 randomly-selected participants: ten from the "Laboratory in Counseling" (Group 1); eight from "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" (Group 2); and ten who had participated in both courses (Group 3).

Those interviewed were first asked, "What about the course has been most instrumental in furthering your learning?" The two responses most frequently given by the 20 students who had participated in the "Laboratory" (ten from Group 1 and ten from Group 3) were 1) the practice counseling sessions (18 responses), and 2) the atmosphere of mutual exploration in the class (ten responses). Of the 18 interviewees who had participated in "Theory and Practice," (eight from Group 2 and ten from Group 3), ten mentioned the variety of theories presented during the semester, and eight mentioned the quality of the classroom presentations (lectures, videotapes, demonstrations) as being most helpful.

Those interviewed were then asked, "What about the course has most hindered your learning?" "Laboratory" participants cited two major problems with the course: slow development of a "group feeling" (11 responses), and not enough practice counseling (five). Participants in "Theory and Practice" most often stated that the greatest hindrances to their learning in the course were 1) lack of clarity about
assignments or the benefits to be derived from completing assignments (seven); and 2) the large number of people, and resultant impersonality, in the course (six).

Based on this information, it seems reasonable to conclude that the critical elements affecting learning were very different in the two courses. Participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling" derived the most benefit from performing the functions (counselor, client, and process observer) involved in the practice counseling sessions, and receiving feedback about their performance; and from the sharing, risking, self-direction, and trust which they experienced in the group. Also, the major criticisms of the course centered around the students' desire for more practice counseling, and more attention to the development of group cohesiveness. This would suggest that the "Laboratory" course tended to address the participants' needs for constructive feedback, a sense of inclusion, nurturance, support and self-directed exploration. Students in "Theory and Practice," on the other hand, benefited most from an interesting series of presentations (lectures, videotapes, demonstrations) about a wide variety of counseling theories. The major blocks to learning were the size of the class, and lack of clarity regarding the performance of assignments. This would suggest that the course addressed itself to the participants' need for externally-defined, "expert" information.

At the risk of oversimplification, then, the
"Laboratory" is perceived as emphasizing emotional and social development, while "Theory and Practice" is experienced as emphasizing intellectual development. Both of these directions of emphasis seem laudable, and one would hardly expect either course to result in the diminished ability of participants to communicate empathy and respect in a counseling interview; yet, as the statistical analysis has demonstrated, that is precisely the result.

Only in combination, it would appear, do these two courses have a felicitous effect on participants' development of these core competencies. Only when the students have the opportunity to integrate theory and practice, intellectual and socio-emotional development, expert (other-defined) and experiential (self-defined) information -- only then do students increase in their ability to communicate empathy and respect to a client in a counseling situation.

Self-actualization. Three hypotheses specified for examination in this study were concerned with the relationship between a) participants' level of self-actualization, as defined by their scores on the two major scales (defined in Table 1) of the Personality Orientation Inventory (POI): Time Competence (TC) and Inner-Direction (I); and b) participation in one or both of the courses under investigation.

Hypothesis 3 predicted that those who participated in both courses (Group 3) would increase more in self-actualization than those who participated in only one of the courses.
Results on the Inner-Direction (I) scale (Table 4) were in the predicted direction, though none of the individual intergroup contrasts was significant (p < .05). Results on the Time Competence (TC) scale were mixed: mean scores for Group 3 increased more than those for students in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" (Group 2), but less than those for students in the "Laboratory in Counseling" (Group 1). Again, none of the individual contrasts was significant.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that scores for Group 1 would increase more than those for Group 2. The results (Table 4) showed a strong trend in the predicted direction, though again, none of the individual contrasts was significant (p < .05).

Hypothesis 5 predicted that scores for Groups 1, 2, and 3 would increase more than those for members of the control group (Group 4). Results (Table 4) were in the predicted direction on both the TC and I scales for Groups 1 and 3. However, members of Group 2 showed less mean improvement than those in Group 4 on both of the scales. Once again, none of the individual intergroup contrasts was significant (p < .05).

There are a number of salient points which must be mentioned in attempting to interpret these data. First, those who did not participate in either of the courses under investigation (Group 4) increased slightly (M = 1.8333) between pre- and post-testing on the Inner-Direction (I)
scale, but decreased slightly \(M = -0.3333\) on the Time Competence (TC) scale. Second, participants in "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" (Group 2) increased less \(M = 1.4762\) on the I scale, and decreased more \(M = -0.5714\) on the TC scale, than did members of the control group (Group 4); the differences in scores are so slight, however, that for the purposes of this discussion they could be considered virtually the same.

It is important to keep in mind that the control group's size \(N=6\) raises questions about the validity of their scores, and that participation in any one course is not solely responsible for changes in POI scores. Still, it is striking that the changes in scores on the major POI scales are so similar for the control group (Group 4) and the "Theory and Practice" group (Group 2); and that those changes are so much smaller than those for participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling" or in both courses (discussed below).

It seems reasonable to suggest that the relatively small increases on the Inner-Direction scale for Groups 2 and 4 are attributable, in large part, to the didactic nature of "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" and the control group course. In both courses, the students were, for the most part, "other-directed": that is, they were encouraged to learn an other-defined body of pre-existing knowledge. The decreases registered by these groups on the Time Competence
scale constitute an extremely puzzling, and apparently unique, situation: nowhere in the literature pertinent to studies using the POI in a pre- and post-test design is there mention of a decrease on either of the major scales. Because this situation is unique, and because the decreases in question were not significant, any interpretation of or conclusion based on these data would be gross speculation, at best. With that caveat, the tentative conclusion is that the control group course and "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" do not appear to foster the development of time competence in participants, because of the didactic nature of the courses.

Third, participants in the "Laboratory in Counseling" (Group 1) increased markedly on both the Time Competence (M = 1.0909) and Inner-Direction (M = 7.5455) scales. This is as predicted: the course was designed and intended, in large measure, to increase participants' autonomy, self-direction, and self-understanding; and to encourage intense involvement in the "here-and-now." The constant emphasis on development of one's own ideas about growth, development, and helping relationships, based on personal experiences; the involvement of participants in planning and assessment of activities; the attempts to develop feelings of mutual exploration, trust, and caring within the group; the use of real, current issues in the practice counseling sessions; and the requirement that students maintain a journal of personal learnings and observations: these and other facets of the
course were intended to promote self-actualization, as the
concept was understood by the instructor. And, granting the
premise that the major scales of the POI measure self-
actualization, the course must be said to have achieved some
success in this area.

Fourth, and perhaps most important, it would appear
that participation in both courses has a cumulative effect on
level of self-actualization: that is, on both the TC and I
scales the mean shift (between pre- and post-testing) for
those who participated in both courses (Group 3) is almost
exactly the sum of the means for members of Groups 1 and 2
(Table 4). If self-actualization is a goal of counselor edu-
cation, this information has serious implications: courses
within the same program can either negate whatever benefits
one course might achieve independently; or, conversely,
courses might be developed to complement each other, thereby
substantially increasing the benefits to be derived by stu-
dents on this critical dimension. The ways in which this
finding might be used to improve counselor education will be
discussed in the final section of this chapter.

Relationship between self-actualization and facilita-
tive conditions. Hypothesis 6 predicted that there would be
a significant ($p<.05$), positive relationship between parti-
cipants' level of self-actualization (as measured by the POI
scales and subscales) and ability to communicate facilitative
conditions during counseling (as measured by Carkhuff's
Empathic Understanding, Communication of Respect, and Facilitative Genuineness scales). The results, expressed in Pearson product-moment correlations, are presented in Table 6.

From the results obtained in this study, it would appear that there is no consistent, significant relationship between level of self-actualization and ability to communicate facilitative conditions. These data support the findings of Rowe and Winborn (1973), Williams (1972), and Phillips (1974), which were reported in Chapter I. It is puzzling that other studies, particularly those of Foulds (1969b) and Selfridge and VanderKolk (1976), also discussed in Chapter I, have obtained results which so clearly demonstrated significant correlations among these variables. One can only hope that further investigation of this phenomenon will shed some light on this matter. As it stands now, it would appear that counselor education courses which focus on raising the level of participants' self-actualization will not necessarily result in an increase in students' ability to communicate core facilitative conditions to their future clients.

Methodological Issues

A considerable amount of time, thought, and energy was employed in the design and implementation of this study. Every attempt was made to eliminate uncontrolled variables,
and to develop and maintain uniform procedures throughout the investigation. As is the case with any field research, however, there were a few questionable design features and procedural inconsistencies in this study. These methodological concerns/issues are presented below, in the hope that future investigators in this field will be able to overcome or avoid them.

Courses. Three issues center around the two courses under investigation. First, the investigator had designed and was teaching one of the courses ("Laboratory in Counseling"). This situation made it very difficult for the investigator to remain disinterested in, or objective about the results of the study. It became difficult, on occasion, to resist the feeling that the investigation was, in fact, a contest in which one course would be declared "winner" and the other, "loser." This is a wholly undesirable situation, and should be avoided in future studies. Second, there was a large difference in the number of students enrolled in each course. It seems reasonable to assume that class size had some effect on the outcome of this study; but since this variable was not isolated for examination, there is no way to assess its relative impact. Third, students in the "Laboratory" were required to participate in the study, as an integral part of the course; whereas, students in "Theory and Practice" volunteered to take part in the study. Again, the relative impact of this inconsistency is not known.
Counseling interviews. Three methodological issues became apparent in that part of the study dealing with the audiotaped counseling interviews, and subsequent rating of the data sample tapes. First, since it was deemed desirable that clients present real, current, personal concerns/problems to the participant/counselors, there were necessarily differences in the content and intensity of the presenting problems (even though the clients were instructed to use problems of approximately the same emotional intensity). This is an unfortunate situation; however, the alternatives -- repeated use of a standard problem, or role-playing -- seemed even less desirable, since they removed even the hint of reality or spontaneity from the interview. Second, each client took part in 8-12 interviews within a period of one week. This had two distinctly negative results: the clients became increasingly drained, both emotionally and physically; and, at the same time, the clients' ability to gage the scope and intensity of their presenting problems decreased as time passed. It would be prudent, in the future, to limit the number of a client's interviews to five or less during a given week. Finally, each of the two teams of judges was responsible for rating 50 separate audiotaped interviews (a total of approximately 30 hours of work per team) within a two-week period. The judges were exhausted at the end of their work. And, in spite of the fact that the interjudge reliabilities were high on all the tapes (.85 for Empathic
Understanding, .83 for Communication of Respect, and .84 for Facilitative Genuineness), there is some concern that rater fatigue may have affected the validity of the ratings. It would be advisable in the future to lower the ratio between the number of ratings to be made and number of judges.

**Control group.** The final problems to be noted here are procedural in nature, and concern the control group. In the first place, the group was disappointingly small (N=6); and, in the second place, the interval between pre- and post-testing with the POI for this group was three weeks shorter than that for the other groups. This is a serious flaw in methodology, and should be avoided at all costs in future studies.

**Implications for Future Research**

The results of this study, presented in Chapter III and discussed above, suggest that future investigators in the field of counselor education might find it worthwhile to concentrate their efforts on elucidation of two major issues.

The first of these issues is the nature of the relationship between an individual's level of self-actualization and her/his ability to communicate core facilitative conditions in a therapeutic context.

As discussed in Chapter I, above, a number of eminent scholars and practitioners in the field of counseling psychology have theorized over the years that the ability to foster
constructive personality changes in clients is directly related to the counselor's level of psychological adjustment (Matarazzo, 1971), humanness (Dreyfuss, 1967), or self-actualization (Maslow, 1967).

On the face of it, this contention seems sound and reasonable, as does the allied hypothesis that the counselor's level of self-actualization is directly related to ability to communicate facilitative conditions (empathy, respect, and genuineness), which are demonstrably linked to positive client outcome. However, in spite of considerable efforts in this area, researchers have, over the past ten years, failed to establish a consistent relationship between these two variables: of eight major studies, four have concluded that there is a significant, positive correlation between these variables, while the other four (including the present study) have demonstrated no such correlation.

It would appear that the variability of outcomes in these studies is attributable in large part to two design features: first, the sample populations were relatively small, ranging from N=20 to N=80, with a mean of N=42; and second, six of the eight studies were conducted with students on college campuses, rather than with experienced counselors in clinical settings as their sample populations. If, in future studies, these two design features were changed -- if research were conducted with larger numbers of experienced counselors in clinical settings -- the nature of the
relationship between self-actualization and ability to communicate facilitative conditions to clients might well be clarified. This clarification would, in turn, allow those responsible for curriculum development in counselor education programs an opportunity to make informed decisions regarding the extent to which programmatic efforts to foster the development of students' self-actualization will result in increased benefit for the students' future clients. It is hoped that this would result in the development of counselor education courses and programs that would be more fully responsive to the psychological and professional needs of their students.

The second area which clearly warrants further examination is the assessment of the impact of different counselor education courses and programs on students' growth and development, as well as on their ability to deliver effective services to their future clients.

Over ten years ago, Carkhuff (1966), in an extensive review of research and development in the field of counselor education, concluded: "There are no well-designed, controlled, and implemented studies assessing the efficacy of training programs" (p. 362). Since that time, very little has been done to rectify this situation. There have been a number of studies (including the present study) which have attempted to assess the impact of counselor education courses; however, there have been only a few serious attempts
(e.g., Anderson, 1970; Pearson, 1974; and Carkhuff, 1972) to assess, by outcome criteria, the short- or long-range impact of training programs on participants' personal growth or effectiveness as counselors.

In light of recent calls for accountability in the delivery of human services, the apparent reluctance of counselor educators to assess the efficacy of their training programs is unacceptable. It is hoped that some of the many outstanding researchers in the field of counselor education will recognize the urgent necessity of program evaluation, and will direct their skills, interests, and efforts accordingly.

**Implications for Counselor Education**

The results of this study hold several implications for the field of counselor education.

First, the results failed to demonstrate a consistently positive correlation between participants' level of self-actualization and ability to communicate core facilitative conditions in a counseling situation. If these results are borne out by future research, it would strongly suggest that counselor training which is designed exclusively to increase participants' level of self-actualization will not result in increases in participant's effectiveness as counselors.

Second, the short-term effect of participation in
either "Theory and Practice in Interviewing" or the "Laboratory in Counseling" was an overall reduction in students' ability to communicate facilitative conditions when conducting a counseling interview. Yet, simultaneous participation in both courses resulted in appreciable gains by students on this same dimension. This strongly suggests that the opportunity to integrate theory and practice in a personally meaningful way is critical to the participants' development of these basic, core competencies.

None of the conclusions outlined above is particularly novel: they are based on information that has been available to clinicians, researchers, and educators for a number of years. The results of this study do, however, support the work of Wideman (1970), Carkhuff (1969, 1972), Ivey (1973), and others who have contended for years that only integrative programs -- programs which incorporate experiential and didactic learning in an atmosphere characterized by high levels of empathy, respect, and genuineness, and which are designed in accordance with the developmental levels of participants -- can reasonably be expected to develop highly self-actualized and effective counselors. Carkhuff, in particular, has been vehement in his call for the development and implementation of integrative programs, perhaps because his own such programs have been subjected to rigorous scrutiny over time, and have repeatedly demonstrated their efficacy in terms of positive client outcome.
It would appear from the literature that very little energy has been devoted to the evaluation of current counselor education programs, based on outcome indices. With the exception of those mentioned above, apparently no programs in existence today have been demonstrated to be differentially effective in developing counselors who facilitate constructive personality change in their clients.

It would also appear from the literature that the design, development, and implementation of counselor education programs are consistently undertaken in an unsystematic fashion, with apparent disregard for those few studies which have attempted to isolate efficacious design features, and with no effective procedures for ongoing program evaluation and improvement.

It is hoped that the information developed in the course of implementing and reporting this study will assist other counselor educators in their efforts to maximize the benefits which might accrue to participants in their courses and programs. It is also hoped that this study will spur other counselor educators to conduct further research into the short-term and long-term effects of their courses and programs, not only on participants' personal growth and psychological well-being, but also on participants' ability to facilitate constructive personality change in their future clients.
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APPENDIX A

Course Description:
"Laboratory in Counseling: Self as Helper"
Format

"Laboratory in Counseling: Self as Helper" is an undergraduate, introductory course, which is strongly recommended for first-semester students in the Undergraduate Human Services Program of the HAPPS Cluster (although students from other programs and departments have participated in the course in the past). All participants (with the exception of the instructor) are at the Junior or Senior level. Participants in this semester's offering of the course range in age from 19 to 42 years, and have widely diverse socio-economic, educational, and occupational backgrounds. The total number of participants (including instructor) may, for any given offering of the course, range from eleven to sixteen. The course meets weekly, with a total of fourteen, three-hour meetings/sessions per semester.

Course Aims

The stated aims for the course are as follows:

1) To explore our attitudes toward and preconceptions about counselors, clients, and the counseling relationship;

2) To explore our experiences in helping/counseling relationships, in order to identify a) a personal style of helping and being helped, and b) factors in effective helping relationships;

3) To improve our abilities to function effectively in helping/counseling relationships;
4) To each develop a statement of personal assumptions, observations, and convictions about human growth and development, and the ways in which each of us, as a counselor, can facilitate that growth and development in ourselves and in our clients.

Course Requirements:
The stated requirements for a passing grade in this course are as follows:

1) Class attendance and participation. Since it is anticipated that a major portion of the participants' learning in this course will be derived from interaction with others in classroom experiences, it is imperative that all participants comply with this requirement (except in cases where a participant, using his/her judgment, feels that participation in a classroom experience might be personally deleterious). It has been my experience in the past, that compliance with this requirement tends to foster the development of a sense of personal investment in the course, which is an implicit aim.

2) Maintenance of a journal. The journal is intended to be a record of personal learnings in the course, and is not reviewed by the instructor, unless he is requested to do so by the student. Time is allotted during each class session for participants, if they choose, to make journal entries, and participants are strongly encouraged to make journal entries whenever and wherever it seems appropriate, both during and outside the class. The purpose of the journal is
twofold: first, it can be of invaluable assistance in completing the term assignment (see Course Requirement #5, below); and, second, it can be used as a reference for assessing learnings in the future.

3) **Readings.** Participants are expected to read the following articles:

*Berenson, B.G., and Carkhuff, R.R., "Introduction".*
*Eysynck, H.J., "The inefficacy of therapeutic processes with adults".*
*Levitt, E.E., "The undemonstrated effectiveness of therapeutic processes with children".*
*Bergin, A.E., "Negative results revisited".*
*James, R.G., "Counseling and counselor education: A personal perspective".*
*Rogers, C.R., "The conditions of change from a client-centered viewpoint".*
*Frank, J.D., "Modifications in the assumptive world".*
*Wideman, J.W., "Some convictions about counseling and counselor training".*
*Hobbs, N., "A new cosmology".*

*These articles are found in Berenson, B.G., and Carkhuff, R.R., *Sources of Gain in Counseling and Psychotherapy.*

The articles by Eysynck, Levitt, and Bergin are intended to make participants aware of some questions regarding the efficacy of counseling relationships. The articles by Berenson and Carkhuff, James, Rogers, Frank, Wideman, and Hobbs are intended to assist the students in completing their term assignment, by offering some examples of the ways in which others have addressed themselves to the issues involved in that assignment. This reading list may be expanded, if deemed appropriate by course participants.

4) **Written assignments.** Participants are asked to write a number of brief (3-5 pages) papers, in reaction to the readings and classroom experiences. These papers are intended to
inform the instructor of the participants' assessment of the relative value of the readings and activities; and are considered by the instructor as valuable information, to be used in considering modifications in the form and content of future offerings of the course. The papers are also intended to encourage the participants to explore, in writing, their own ideas and convictions about counseling and related issues, by reacting to the ideas and convictions of others, as expressed in the readings.

5) Term assignment. The term assignment is for each participant to formulate a statement in response to Course Aim #4, above: that is, a statement of personal assumptions, observations, and convictions about human growth and development, and the ways in which the individual participant, as a counselor, might facilitate that growth and development. There are two options given for the form the assignment may take: the first is a written statement (with a suggested length of 10-15 pages); the second is a formal interview with the instructor, to be based on and accompanied by a detailed outline of the topics to be covered in the interview. Participants are encouraged to suggest other formats for the term assignment, which would be more personally valuable.
Course Activities.

The following is a schedule of planned activities for each of the three-hour, weekly sessions of the course:

Session 1

a) Introductions. Each participant (including the instructor) is asked to form a dyad with someone s/he does not know in the class. In the dyads, partner A is instructed to introduce himself/herself to partner B (including in his/her introduction certain instructor-defined information: see Appendix A), while partner B is instructed to focus his/her energy on listening to partner A. The process is then reversed, with partner A listening to partner B's self-introduction. In the large group, each participant is then asked to introduce his/her partner to the rest of the group.

This task is intended to 1) allow participants to share their personal goals for the course; 2) allow participants to verbalize their career plans/goals; 3) give participants an opportunity to practice listening; 4) encourage participants to think of themselves as persons with experience in helping relationships; and 5) foster a sense of inclusion in the group.

b) Processing of introductions. At the conclusion of every task/activity, the group spends some time processing the experience: that is, sharing personal feelings, observations, and learnings. In processing this particular activity, past
groups have tended to focus on a number of issues/concerns: formation of the dyads (who chose a partner, and who waited to be chosen; on what bases were choices made; the fear of not being chosen; etc.); the difficulties involved in listening (external distractions, internal dialogue, etc.); the responsibility for reporting to the group, accurately and fairly, information given by the partner; the feeling of having the partner relay inaccurate or distorted information about you to the group; the possibility of using participants' knowledge and experience as resources in the learning process; the security of having made contact with at least one other person in the group; and many others.

c) **Course overview.** After having processed the introductory exercise, the group discusses the proposed aims, requirements, and activities for the course. The instructor emphasizes that these are **proposals** for the form and content of the course, which are subject to negotiation and change in response to the expressed needs of the participants (including the instructor).

d) **Assignment.** The assignment for Session 2 is to perform a brief written exercise, entitled "Exploring the concepts: counselor and counseling" (see Appendix B).

e) **Journal entry.** Participants are given time here, as at the end of every session, to make entries in their journals, if they so desire. At this time, also, the instructor reiterates the purpose of the journal (see Course Requirement #2, above), and again encourages participants to make
journal entries whenever ideas or learnings occur to them.

**Session 2**

a) Participants are asked to form dyads, then share the stories/fantasies they wrote in response to the exercise "Exploring the concepts: counselor and counseling." Participants are also asked to focus all their energy on listening when their partners are sharing their stories.

The intention here is to allow participants to share their creative writing in a minimally threatening environment (i.e., the dyad), and to encourage attentive listening.

b) In the large group, participants are then asked to extract from their stories, responses to each of the specific questions in the exercise.

For example, in considering question #1 in the exercise, a participant might respond that the counselor described in his/her story was a white male, 34 years old, with a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology, wearing a coat and tie, who charged $35/hour for his services. This information is listed on the blackboard, along with information contained in other participants' responses, with results not unlike the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Race*</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Appearance</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Ph.D. (Psych)</td>
<td>Coat/tie</td>
<td>$35/hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Coll. Soph.</td>
<td>Jeans/sweater</td>
<td>No fee**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>M.A. (Couns)</td>
<td>Suit</td>
<td>No fee**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Ph.D. (Psych)</td>
<td>Leisure suit</td>
<td>$75/hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>20's</td>
<td>B.A.</td>
<td>Slacks/knit shirt</td>
<td>Sliding**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Coll. Junior</td>
<td>Casual</td>
<td>No fee***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>30's</td>
<td>M.S.W.</td>
<td>Jeans/shirt</td>
<td>Sliding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*If indicated. **Salaried agency employee. ***Volunteer.
A similar process of eliciting and listing data is followed for the other questions: description of the client(s) (gender, age, educational background, physical appearance, and presenting problem); the setting; the client's reason for going to a counselor (rather than to a friend, family member, etc.); the process used by the client(s) in selecting this/these particular counselor(s); client(s) and counselor(s) goals; counselor(s) skills; and process for deciding if and when goals are reached.

c) Processing the data. After the responses to each question have been listed on the blackboard, group members are asked to make observations (which are recorded) about patterns and anomalies in the data. In the example cited above, a number of observations might be made: five of the seven counselors described were male; in all cases where race was specified, the counselors were white; there was only one counselor over the age of 34, and he was 50; the male counselors tended to have more advanced degrees than the females; in all cases, the counselor worked alone; and so on. Analogous observations might be made about data produced in response to the other questions, but I think this example will suffice.

d) Processing the exercise. After all the observations have been elicited and recorded, participants are asked to form groups of four, and in those groups, to perform two tasks: 1) produce a list of at least three things they learned from the day's activities; and 2) produce a list of at least three things (issues/concerns) raised by the day's activities,
which they would like to consider further as the course progresses.

e) Report out. The groups of four then report out their learnings and issues in the large group, where time is allotted for discussion.

The purposes of the activities outlined above are as follows: 1) to make group members aware that we all have assumptions about counselors and counseling; 2) to make explicit some of those assumptions; 3) to consider some of the ways in which these assumptions might affect our ability to function in helping relationships; and 4) to raise issues which group members would like to pursue further in the course.

f) Assignment. The assignment for Session 3 is to read the "Introduction" in Berenson and Carkhuff, and to write a brief paper in response to that chapter.

g) Journal entry.

Session 3

a) Review assignment. Group members are asked to form dyads. In the dyads, they are asked to share their reactions to the introductory chapter in Berenson and Carkhuff, and to generate a list of three important learnings/points from the chapter. Dyads are then asked to form a group of six, by joining with two other dyads. The group of six hears reports from all the dyads, and decides the five most important learnings/points from the chapter.

b) Report out. The groups of six then report out their results in the large group.
c) **Discussion.** In the large group, participants are then asked to consider what goals for the course might be derived from the information reported out by the groups of six. (For example, if one of the important learnings generated by the group of six is that there is a central core of primary facilitative factors in counseling relationships, a goal might be to define those facilitative factors.) Group goals generated during this process are then compared to the original stated aims of the course, and the original aims are modified, if necessary.

The purpose of the exercises outlined above is to insure that course aims are in accordance with the stated needs of the participants.

d) "**Exploring the concept: client.**" Group members are asked to respond individually, in writing, to a series of questions, entitled "Exploring the concept: client" (See Appendix C).

e) **Small group discussion.** Group members are asked to form groups of four, and to discuss in those groups their responses to the questions in the exercise.

f) **Report out and discussion.** The groups of four are then asked to report out in the large group, where their responses are recorded and discussed.

The purpose of the activities outlined above is to have participants begin (or continue) to consider their assumptions about the client in the counseling relationship, in order to encourage the development of empathy for the client.
g) **Assignment.** The assignment for Session 4 is for each group member to describe, in writing, four separate occasions (one in the recent past, one during ages 15-18, one during ages 10-13, and one before the age of ten) on which s/he sought help with life problems from another individual or group of individuals.

h) **Journal entry.**

**Session 4**

a) **Self in need.** Each group member is asked to pick a partner with whom s/he would feel comfortable sharing the information contained in her/his written assignment.

In the dyads, partner A is asked to relate the most recent of her/his help-seeking incidents, while partner B listens. Partner B's task is to understand, as fully as possible, what it was like to be partner A during the incident described. Participants are asked to be particularly aware of their feelings, both when talking and when listening. The process is then reversed, with partner B talking and partner A listening. This procedure is repeated for each of the three remaining help-seeking incidents.

Both partners are then asked to recall/review the information related by partner A, in an attempt to identify any marked tendencies or patterns in her/his help-seeking behavior. (e.g., the relative ease with which s/he asked for help; the kinds of problems/concerns with which s/he had felt she needed help; the kind of person from whom s/he tended to seek help: male or female, older or younger, friend/relative or counselor;
etc.). Partner B's information is then processed in like fashion.

The purposes of this exercise are: 1) to begin to identify elements of a personal client-style; 2) to practice hearing not only the facts, but also the feelings associated with the facts; and 3) to encourage development of close relationships between group members — relationships in which a high level of facilitative conditions (i.e., empathy, respect, and authenticity) is perceived by both parties to be present.

b) Assignment. The assignment for Session 5 is for each member of the group to describe, in writing, four separate occasions (one in the recent past, one during ages 15-18, one during ages 10-13, and one before the age of ten) on which s/he was asked for help with life problems by another individual or group of individuals.

c) Journal entry.

Session 5

a) Self as helper. The procedure and purposes for this exercise are analogous to those described for the "Self in need" exercise in Session 4, the only difference being that here each participant is reviewing her/his history as a helper, and attempting to identify in that history, elements of a personal helping-style.

b) Factors in effective helping. Each participant is asked to review those help-seeking and helping incidents which s/he described in the "Self in need" and "Self as helper" exercises, and to identify those incidents which s/he feels resulted in
positive therapeutic change for the client. In the large group, participants are then asked to identify and list the dynamics they thought were in operation in those successful/effective helping incidents. (Past groups have identified, among others, the following dynamics: the client trusted the helper to maintain confidentiality, the helper really listened to the client, the helper was honest/sincere in relating to the client, there was a sense of mutual caring and respect, and the client did not feel that s/he was being judged by the helper.)

From the data generated during this group discussion, participants are asked to derive attitudes/attributes of the helper which they feel must be perceived by the client, if positive therapeutic change is to take place. (The client-perceived counselor attitudes identified by past groups have included: respect, support, love/caring, honesty/authenticity, acceptance/non-judgment, and understanding/empathy.)

The purpose of this exercise is to allow participants to derive, from their own experiences in helping relationships, a primary core of factors which facilitate positive therapeutic change.

c) **Assignment.** The assignment for Session 6 is to read the articles by Eysynck, Levitt, and Bergin, in Berenson and Carkhuff (see Course Requirement #3, p.3). A preliminary draft of the term assignment is also due by Session 6.

d) **Journal entry.**

**Session 6**

a) **Review assignment.** Participants are asked to form groups
of four; and in those groups to discuss the assigned readings, and generate a list of important learnings.

b) **Report out and discussion.** In the large group, the groups of four report out their learnings, and time is allotted for group discussion.

c) **Review of Sessions 1-5.** In the large group, participants are asked 1) to review and summarize the first five sessions of the course; 2) to assess their progress, individually and as a group, in relation to the stated aims of the course; and 3) to generate a list of issues/concerns raised during the first five sessions, which they would like to pursue further as the course progresses.

d) **Planning.** Also in the large group, participants are asked to reassess the proposed planned activities for the remainder of the course; and to propose changes in those activities, which might enhance their progress in relation to personal and group goals for the course.

The purpose of activities (c) and (d), outlined above, is to foster 1) a sense of progress in relation to the stated aims of the course, and 2) a sense of group ownership of the course.

e) **Assignments.** The assignments for Session 7 are: 1) to read James, "Counseling and counselor education: A personal perspective"; 2) to write a brief paper in response to that article; and 3) to schedule a personal conference with the instructor, to take place before Session 7, for the purpose of reviewing the preliminary draft of the term assignment.

f) **Journal entry.**
Session 7

a) **Introduction to practice counseling.** Participants are asked to form triads. The instructor then explains the practice counseling process, as follows:

1) Each triad will complete three practice counseling sessions during any given class period.

2) At the beginning of the first practice counseling session, triad members will decide which of them will be the counselor, which the client, and which the process observer.

3) The client will present a real-life, current, personal concern/problem to the counselor.

4) The counselor will work with the client, in an attempt to help the client communicate, explore, and resolve the concern/problem, as much as possible within the given time limit (usually 20 minutes).

5) The process observer will, during the practice counseling session, record her/his observations of salient client and counselor behavior; and will signal when there are two minutes remaining in the session, to allow the counselor an opportunity to attain some degree of closure.

6) When the time limit for the session has been reached, the process observer will ask the client if s/he is comfortable in allowing the session to end at that point; if not, the session will resume, and will not end until the client signifies that she is comfortable enough to stop.

7) When the process observer is satisfied that the session has ended, s/he and the client will share with the counselor
their perceptions, observations, and questions about her/his behaviors during the session (the instructor will offer suggested guidelines for constructive feedback).

8) After having heard feedback from the client and the process observer, the counselor will join them in discussing the session, until the time limit (usually 15 minutes) has been reached.

9) When the first practice counseling session has been completed and discussed, the members of the triad will exchange functions (the client becoming the process observer, etc.); so that, by the end of the third practice counseling session, each person will have functioned once as counselor, once as client, and once as process observer.

b) Practice counseling in triads. The triads are then asked to complete three practice counseling sessions, using the process outlined above. (Although triads vary in the amount of time needed to complete this task, the average is approximately two hours.)

There are a number of purposes for the practice counseling exercise described above:

1) It encourages and allows the participant, as counselor, to develop her/his feelings of empathy and respect for clients, to develop skills in communicating those feelings to clients, to develop listening skills, to develop facilitative interventions, and to learn to use judgment in the application of those skills and interventions.

2) It encourages and allows the participant, as client,
to actively appreciate the client's position in counseling relationships; to develop awareness of personal problems/concerns; to develop skills in communicating, exploring, and resolving those problems/concerns in counseling relationships; and to learn to give constructive feedback to counselors.

3) It encourages and allows the participant, as process observer, to develop skills in observing the dynamics of counseling relationships, and giving constructive feedback to counselors.

4) It encourages group members to perceive counseling as a human relationship, not unlike other relationships in which they have participated throughout their lives; and to understand that the effects of counseling, like the effects of other relationships, can fall on the continuum anywhere from very facilitative to very retarding.

5) It encourages the development of facilitative relationships between group members.

c) Assignment. The assignment for Session 8 is to read Rogers, "The conditions of change from a client-centered viewpoint," in Berenson and Carkhuff.

d) Videotaping practice counseling. Participants are asked to form dyads. Dyads are asked to make an appointment to meet with the instructor, during the week preceding Session 8. At the appointed time, the instructor, acting as process observer and camera operator, will videotape two practice counseling sessions, one with partner A counseling, and one with partner B counseling. This videotape will be saved; and, during Session 13, will be compared with a similar videotape made during
the week preceding Session 13.

e) Journal entry.

Session 8

a) Review assignment. In the large group, participants are asked to share their reactions to, learnings from, and questions about the article by Rogers.

b) Practice counseling in triads.

c) Discussion of issues/concerns. When the practice counseling sessions have been completed, participants are asked to present for discussion in the large group, issues/concerns about counseling. An appropriate format for discussing the issues/concerns raised is decided upon during each session. (In the past, group members have raised such issues/concerns as: strategies for protecting the client; methods of setting short- and long-term goals in counseling; the appropriateness of blacks counseling whites, and vice versa; and reasons for referring a client to another counselor.)

d) Assignment. The assignment for Session 9 is to read Frank, "Modifications in the assumptive world," in Berenson and Carkhuff.

e) Journal entry.

Session 9

a) Review assignment. In the large group, participants are asked to discuss the article by Frank.

b) Practice counseling in triads.

c) Discussion of issues/concerns.

d) Assignment. The assignment for Session 10 is to read

e) Journal entry.

Session 10

a) Review assignment. In the large group, participants are asked to discuss the article by Hobbs.

b) Practice counseling in triads.

c) Discussion of issues/concerns.

d) Assignment. The assignment for Session 11 is to read Wideman, "Some convictions about counseling and counselor training."

e) Journal entry.

Session 11

a) Review assignment. In the large group, participants are asked to discuss the article by Wideman.

b) Practice counseling in triads.

c) Discussion of issues/concerns.

d) Journal entry.

Session 12

a) Practice counseling in triads.

b) Discussion of issues/concerns.

c) Term assignment due.

d) Videotaping practice counseling. Dyads are asked to make an appointment to meet with the instructor during the week preceding Session 13, for the purpose of videotaping two practice counseling sessions: one with partner A counseling, and one with partner B counseling.
e) Journal entry.

**Session 13**

a) **Review and comparison of videotapes.** For Session 13, the group is divided into groups of six, and each group is scheduled to meet at a separate time, for a period of approximately four hours. During this session, each group of six reviews and compares the videotaped practice counseling sessions of each group member.

The purposes of this exercise are 1) to note improvements in each participant's counseling skills, and 2) to identify each group member's particular strengths and weaknesses as a counselor.

b) **Assignment.** The assignment for Session 14 is for each participant to write a letter to the instructor, outlining the participant's major learnings from the course. The letter will be mailed back to the participant, approximately six months after the completion of the course.

The purpose of this exercise is to maximize the participant's retention of material learned during the course.

c) Journal entry.

**Session 14**

The purpose of the final session is to foster a sense of closure in the course. The format for this session will be determined by the participants, probably during Session 12.
Additional Comments

1) Whenever possible, the instructor participates in the activities outlined in this course description.

2) On a number of occasions throughout the course, the instructor elicits from the participants both written and verbal statements of their personal and group goals for the course, and modifies course activities in response to their expressed needs and goals.

3) There are a number of activities incorporated in the course, which are not described in this paper. The majority of these are brief, and are primarily intended to promote relaxation and sensory awareness.
Appendix A

INTRODUCTION BY PARTNERS

In telling your partner about yourself, so that s/he may introduce you to the rest of the class participants, please include the following information:

1. What counseling experience do you have?

2. What career plans and goals have you formulated for yourself? What were one or two of the major influences in making a career choice?

3. How much counseling will be involved in the work you plan to do?

4. What do you enjoy, or expect to enjoy most about working as a counselor or human services practitioner?

5. What are your goals for this course?

6. What else is important for class participants to know about you as a counselor or potential counselor?
Appendix B

EXPLORING THE CONCEPTS: COUNSELOR AND COUNSELING

Write a brief (3-5 pages) story/fantasy about a counseling situation, as you think it might happen in real life.

In your story/fantasy, please include the following items:

1) A description of the counselor(s): physical appearance, educational background, clothing, fee scale, etc.

2) A description of the client(s).

3) A description of the setting.

4) The reason the client(s) sought out the services of a counselor (or counselors).

5) The process used by the client(s) in selecting this/these particular counselor(s).

6) The goals (desired outcomes) of this counseling situation for client(s) and counselor(s).

7) The special skills the counselor(s) will employ in trying to reach those goals.

8) The process for deciding if and when the goals are reached.
Appendix C

EXPLORING THE CONCEPT: CLIENT

1. What events might precipitate a person's decision to seek help with life problems?

2. For what reasons might a person seek help from a counselor, rather than from a friend/acquaintance?

3. For what reasons might a person seek help from a friend/acquaintance, rather than from a counselor?

4. For what reasons might a person be referred to a counselor? By whom?

5. For what reasons, and in what situations might a person be sent to a counselor? By whom?

6. If you were to decide to seek help from a counselor, what might be your state of mind and body at the initial interview? What might be the source of those feelings?

7. Describe the client's function in the counseling relationship.
APPENDIX B

Course Description:

"Theory and Practice in Interviewing"
TOPIC I: HELPING AS A CREATIVE ACT

Objectives: Counseling, interviewing, and therapy are hampered, we believe, with too many people who know the "correct" way of helping another human being. In this brief introduction, we hope to share an alternative view which defines helping as a very personal, unique, and creative act. Ultimately, we seek each individual defining her or his approach to helping and interviewing.

Jan. 25 Is there a "right" approach to helping? What is your likely style of helping? How does the person fit in your helping process?


Rogers, BECOMING A PERSON, pages 3-27.

Perls, IN AND OUT OF THE GARBAGE PAIL, get a good start

Comment: Rosenthal's article may be most important piece you will read this term. It says simply and clearly that helping relationships must be honest and have some form of continuity. You will enjoy Rogers talking about himself and our friend Fritz will give you enjoyment.

Jan. 27 The Creative Helper: Synetics Examined.

Simek, "The Theory of the Creative Process Underlying Synetics Method,"(mimeo)


Comment: This session is designed to introduce you to systematic approaches to creativity. Our past education has taught us that we are less creative than we really are. Loosen up and become more of yourself.

TOPIC II: THE SKILLS OF HELPING AND INTERVIEWING

Objectives: The interview has been considered a mystical artform. While not denying the effectiveness and artistry of many helpers, this mysticism underlying helping has kept helping as an artificially scarce resource. Effective helping can be defined in single skills which can easily be taught. More importantly, knowledge of these skills will enable you to define what expert helpers are doing and decide whether or not you want to include their skills in your repertoire. By the end of this session you will be able to score and rate interviewer behavior quite precisely. This ability is an important beginning for any helper.

Feb. 1 Attending Behavior: A Central Skill of Helping

Ivey and Gluckstern, BASIC ATTENDING SKILLS, 7-15 (mimeo)

Comment: A simple class session, but it is amazing how important these simple variables are in locating what is going on in a helping session. We'll do a mini-workshop demonstration.

Feb. 3 Skills of Listening and Attending

Ivey and Authier, MICROCOUNSELING: INNOVATIONS IN INTERVIEWING TRAINING (2nd Editio., in press, due out Summer 1977), Chapter 4 "Attending Skills in the Helping Process." Mimeo

Comment: Most likely we will see some videotapes of interviews in which the attending skills are illustrated. You will find that non-directive (e.g., Rogers) uses these skills heavily and that a helplers use them to varying degrees.

Feb. 8 Skills of Interpersonal Influence

Ivey and Authier, Chapter 5 "Beyond Attending: Skills of Interpersonal Influence." Mimeo

Comment: We have failed to recognize that helping is a process of influencing others whether we wish to or not. The emphasis here will be on recognizing honestly that we do determine what happens to others. Needless to say, this leaves us all with the crucial value question... what is to be the direction of our influence?

Feb. 10 Issues of Quality in the Interview

Ivey and Authier, Chapter 6 "The Quality of Helping: Microtraining and the Construct of Empathy." Mimeo

Comment: Some crucial issues without which an effective interview cannot be held.

Feb. 15 Integrating Microtraining Skills in a Single Interview

Ivey and Gluckstern, BASIC INFLUENCING SKILLS, 161-180,183-1

Comment: We will see a demonstration interview and you will later have a chance to score and rate that interview. This interview presents some interesting points, but is designed primarily for instructional purposes and will give you skills to evaluate alternative theoretical approach to helping. The scoring of the interview is due Feb. 24.
TOPIC III: CROSS-CULTURAL ISSUES IN HELPING

Objectives: Thus far we have examined helping within a predominantly white-middle-socio-economic context. And, the vast literature in helping comes from this highly biased view of the world. In this section we plan to present some basic ideas about helping which suggest that effective work with people must consider cultural dimensions as well.

Feb. 17 What are the objectives of helping? How do they relate to cultural issues?

Ivey and Authier, Chapter 9, "Toward Culturally Relevant Processes and Goals for Helpers and Helpes." Mimeo

Comment: What does Mary Hartman have to say to this issue. We'll take a look at the breakdown scene from last year and see. We will also see some demonstration tapes on what can go wrong when helpers from different backgrounds get together.

Feb. 22 NO CLASS - this is a "Monday"
Feb. 24 Visiting lecturer - Bailey Jackson "Black Identity Theory"


Mar. 1 Bailey Jackson, continued

Comment: We lack frameworks for realizing that we are not all the same. You will find this an exciting presentation - equal in importance to the Rosenthal paper. Unless we consider helping as a cultural act, we are failing to see the total picture.

TOPIC IV: ALTERNATIVE HELPING APPROACHES FOR THE INDIVIDUAL

Objectives: We will examine several approaches to helping, all of them considered basic and essential for the broad-based helper. Remember, they are all middle-socio-economic theories and must be viewed with caution with perhaps some major exceptions. By the end of this section you should know what skills various helpers use and have a general map of the professional helping "territory."

Mar. 3 Carl Rogers and Non-Directive Client-Centered Helping


Mar. 8 Carl Rogers - A Modern Helper.


Comment: It is our belief that Rogers provides the most solid foundation for the helping profession in terms of theory and example. His optimistic view of humankind is wonderful. We will see him on film and consider some of his more recent views on the helping process and education.

Mar. 10 Albert Ellis and Rational-Emotive-Therapy

Corey, "Rational-Emotive-Therapy" from his book THEORY AND PRACTICE OF COUNSELING AND PSYCHOTHERAPY, 142-156. Mimeo

Comment: You will see Ellis on film. This person is currently the hottest therapist going and more and more people are tuning in to his approaches.

Mar. 15 Fritz Perls and Gestalt Therapy


Comment: Al Ivey's favorite therapist toward whom he feels very mixed feelings. You'll enjoy seeing Fritz work.

Mar. 17 Guest Lecturer - Miguel Rivera, "A Radical Critique of Gestalt Therapy."

Readings: To be announced.

Comment: It is now time to start examining the political perspectives of the helping processes. Some argue that helping is a political act and that present helping theories exist to maintain the status quo.

Mar. 22 - 24 NO CLASS - VACATION WEEK
Mar. 29 R.D. Laing and the Politics of Therapy

Laing, THE POLITICS OF EXPERIENCE

Comment: Magnificent thinking. You will sense that we are moving far too fast about now.... Remember our original objective was and remains to provide a map of the territory in the belief that you will go farther with issues that interest you most.
Mar. 31 Radical therapy and radical psychiatry
Steiner, READINGS IN RADICAL PSYCHIATRY, 1-70.
Comment: Another field of growing interest and
prominence. We will seek to have one or more
therapists and helpers of an alternative orientation
share their ideas with us.

Apr. 5 Psychodynamic Approaches - Freud and the Unconscious
Freud, INTRODUCTORY LECTURES, just as much as you can read
Haley, "The Art of Psychoanalysis," from STRATEGIES OF
PSYCHOTHERAPY, 192-201. Mimeo
Comment: Most likely we will do some demonstration
work with dreams and free association and consider
the practical applications of psychoanalysis for
personal development. Have a dream before class and bring it.

Apr. 7 Transactional Analysis
Corey, "Transactional Analysis" from THEORY AND
PRACTICE IN COUNSELING AND PSYCHOTHERAPY, Brooks/
Steiner, READINGS IN RADICAL PSYCHIATRY, 70-120.
Comment: If Corey's book had come out earlier, it
would have been a text in this course. I think you
may want to order the text for your library on your
own and I give it a strong endorsement. T.A. is,
of course, a very solid practical demystification
of psychoanalytic theory. Corey on reserve in library.

Apr. 12 Behavioral Approaches to Helping
Ivey and Authier, Chapter 7 "Microtraining Skills Used
By Counselors and Therapists of Differing Theoretical
Orientations." 16-20.
Wolpe and Lazarus, BEHAVIOR THERAPY TECHNIQUES,
"Assertive Training." 38-33.

Apr. 14 Behavioral Approaches - Continued
Comment: The helping approach with the clearest
statements demonstrating effectiveness. Anyone who
seriously wants to be a helper will have to consider
this approach. We strongly recommend purchase of
Nolpe's latest edition of BEHAVIOR THERAPY TECHNIQUES.

TOPIC V: GROUP APPROACHES

Objectives: Interviewing and helping need not always occur
in a one-to-one situation. Group approaches can be equally
or more effective. We will examine some of these ideas
and hope that you will go on to work in T-groups and similar
exercises on your own. Watch HAPPS Office (3-3613) for
information on group programs.

Apr. 19 Cohn's Theme-Centered-Group Interaction
Cohn, "Theme-Centered-Group Interaction," JOURNAL OF
GROUP PSYCHOANALYSIS AND PROCESS. Winter, 1969-70,
19-36. Mimeo
Comment: This will be primarily an experiential
session with an opportunity to test out a very
clear and direct approach to human relations training
with applications to many settings.

Apr. 21 Alternative group approaches in helping
Rogers, "The Process of the Encounter Group," from
CARL ROGERS ON ENCOUNTER GROUPS, 14-42, Mimeo
Comment: At this time, we hope to show a film
demonstration an encounter group in action.

Apr. 26 Family Approaches to Helping
Ivey and Authier, Chapter 7, "Microtraining Skills
Used by Counselors and Therapists of Differing Theoretical
Comment: Another fast-growing approach and the
probably wave of the future. Watch this area.
We'll have some films to watch or videotapes.

TOPIC VI. APPLICATIONS OF HELPING IN SOME ALTERNATIVE SETTINGS

Apr. 28 Johnny Carson and Barbara Walters and the Interview
for "Show and Tell"
Comment: Watch Carson and Walters in action in an
interview and classify their behaviors. We'll watch
them in action in class and see if any of their
behavior can be determined.

May 3 Community Approaches to Helping
Steiner, READINGS IN RADICAL THERAPY, 120-183.
Comment: Individual or family action without
consideration on the community and social environment
may be considered a farce.
May 5  Psychosynthesis, EST, ARICE, Primal Scream, Reality Therapy, et al.

Comment: There is a lot of material we won't have time to look at. But let's at least recognize some of the important things we are missing.

May 10 Integration and Summary: How many helping responses can you create?

Comment: We'll present some videotape examples and you can see what, if anything, has changed in your behavior.

Books for the Course

1. The selection of mimeo readings for which there is a late fee of $5. Cards must be to us by February 1 as that is the day the readings will be passed out en masse.

2. Carl Rogers, BECOMING A PERSON, Houghton-Mifflin, 1961. We think anyone seriously interested in helping should have a copy of this classic work. It is a foundation stone of current day helping.


5. Sigmund Freud, INTRODUCTORY LECTURES TO PSYCHOANALYSIS. Available again in inexpensive paperback. Only 50 copies of this book were ordered. We recommend it for your library and for this course.

6. Claude Steiner, READINGS IN RADICAL PSYCHIATRY, Grove Press, 1975. We will be looking at this book from several points of view. Scholarly in its own way, it reads well, and will challenge us all with new ideas.

GRADING AND EXAMINATION PRACTICES

This is a pass-fail course for undergraduates, B.D.I.C. students, U.W.N. students, and C.A.G.S. and doctoral students. Only masters candidates who are regularly admitted can have a grade. We are sorry, we have checked this out carefully. So we assume you are not going to go for a grade unless you are both an admitted masters student and you notify us in writing.

However, this has advantages as a course which focuses on the helping process is probably better off not having to evaluate and rate people in terms of any criteria. Grades and helping somehow don't seem to fit together.

So, how do we set up evaluation for this course? Basically, we are interested in competency and you demonstrating that you have something you can take away from this course. There are two basic competencies which all students must meet:

1. Ability to score and rate a helping interview and evaluate its effectiveness from your own subjective point of view.

This competency is primarily associated with Topic II: The Skills of Helping and Interviewing. You will be given a transcript of a tape and other students with whom you will check your ratings and subjective comments. You will then decide on your final ratings for the interview with two other students and the three of you will submit one final rating series.

The point is that: 1) you want to by yourself rate the interview; 2) meet with others to see how they rated it; and 3) work with them to develop a joint consensus. To this is to be added a short (maximum two typewritten pages) personal evaluation of the interview to be attached for each member of the triad. We are also asking you to rate the subjective comments of the two other people in your triad and comment on the margins of their papers.

This competency will be assigned on or about February 3 and must be completed and turned in by February 24. No late papers can be accepted due to the size of the course.

2. Ability to develop a plan of treatment for helping a client according to written case data. This plan will be along the lines of a single helping theory (e.g., non-directive, radical therapy, T.A., etc.).

Specific guidelines for this key assignment will come later. Triads of students will work together on the same case, each taking a different theoretical approach. Once again, commentary of the papers from respective members of the triad will be important. You will also demonstrate your ability to critique helping from your own point of view (e.g., if you decide to handle the case from a psychodynamic point of view, you will also criticize or support the work of the other members of the triad). This will be clarified sooner or around March 17. This paper will be due no later than April 26.
One additional competency area must be completed by undergraduates and two by graduate students. Graduate students must do the first item and select any one other of the remainder. Undergraduates can select one of their own choosing with no restrictions. **Due May 5.**

3. Ability to conduct an interview of a helping nature (real or role-played) with another individual and to rate, score, and analyze subjectively one's own behavior. A maximum of 15 minutes of the interview should be recorded and transcribed word for word and then rated. Is your behavior in accord with your theory?

4. Ability to write a quality 10-page paper in which one area of the course is explored in more depth. Have the topic approved **in writing** by Al or Lynn.

5. Participation in a microcounseling skills workshop. Very likely after the Easter break, you will have the opportunity for a one-day workshop in some areas of microcounseling skills. This would give you a chance to see yourself on videotape.

6. Participate in Roger James' research project. This will be an interesting opportunity. You will conduct an interview under Roger's supervision, receive feedback. Some testing may be involved. The procedure is very similar to #3 above, but your feedback will be more individual and systematic.

7. Negotiate another possibility according to your own unique interests and needs. Have the plan approved **in writing** by Al or Lynn.

**PLUS... ONE OTHER INDIVIDUAL FROM THE COURSE SHOULD REVIEW YOUR WORK BEFORE YOUR REPORT, PAPER, OR ANALYTIC INTERVIEW IS TURNED IN. THEIR COMMENTS SHOULD BE APPENDED TO YOUR PAPER.**

This is a large course, the triads, the checking of your work by others is a plan to bring some personal touches to the course. With the constant moving to new theories of helping, it may be easy for the person to get lost. That is why Al and Lynn have office hours. These hours are for you... come in and see us.

**SOME PERSONAL THOUGHTS ABOUT THIS COURSE AND SOME COURSE CONVENTIONS**

While we are going to make every effort to cover as many alternative approaches to helping as possible, we do have some important beliefs which we would like to share with you.

First, we fear that much of helping has a long history of sexist, racist, and economic-social elitism. There is no way that we can fully rid ourselves of this dimension of U.S. culture. We will do our best, but this course, almost by definition, will fall into cultural traps. We'll do our best. Help us by creative use of our language, challenge us with your ideas and differences. This course must not become fixed; we need you to help keep us stable and develop and change.

As such, we request that students not use the sexist "he" or "her" in reports and use appropriate language and terms when discussing groups different from your own. While we will not impose this on you, Al would appreciate you not using the word "American" when referring to citizens of the U.S. He is engaged in a small personal crusade in the belief that "American" implies a group of people who live beyond the boundaries of their country whereas the words "U.S.," "U.S. citizen," and "U.S. culture" refer to a group of people living within a single national state. Helping is a linguistic act... help us use helping language.

Next, this is a very large group of people. We have some ideas for breaking down into small groups and giving people a sense of belonging. We'll be using evaluation forms and asking you from time to time to react to our lectures, films, and presentations. If you have any ideas to help make the course more meaningful to you, speak up soon and see if we can meet your needs. The Office Hours are "for real." Use them. Join us for lunch if you feel so inclined.

Yet, frankly there are things we cannot do. This course will not deal in depth, it will not make you a working helper. It is a primarily cognitive experience which, we hope, will interest you in going further. Do not think of this as a course which makes you a helper in any professional or paraprofessional (lay) sense. We have too many ineffective would-be therapists and helpers already. Hold off.

We don't deal with children in this course, we don't deal adequately with special populations (aging, middle-aged, differing socio-economic groups), we deal in a general way with helping and are trusting you to go further. It is a relatively standard introductory course, but we think our ideas are a little more precise than you'll find most places. We like our precision, but it has the major disadvantage of making some people think they are ready to help too soon. Again, this is an introductory course, not a professional seminar.

Keep in touch, we need you and your advice. Take care!
APPENDIX C

Personality Orientation Inventory
PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

EVERETT L. SHOSTROM, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS

This inventory consists of pairs of numbered statements. Read each statement and decide which of the two paired statements most consistently applies to you.

You are to mark your answers on the answer sheet you have. Look at the example of the answer sheet shown at the right. If the first statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "a". (See Example Item 1 at right.) If the second statement of the pair is TRUE or MOSTLY TRUE as applied to you, blacken between the lines in the column headed "b". (See Example Item 2 at right.) If neither statement applies to you, or if they refer to something you don't know about, make no answer on the answer sheet. Remember to give YOUR OWN opinion of yourself and do not leave any blank spaces if you can avoid it.

In marking your answers on the answer sheet, be sure that the number of the statement agrees with the number on the answer sheet. Make your marks heavy and black. Erase completely any answer you wish to change. Do not make any marks in this booklet.

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

Before you begin the inventory, be sure you put your name, your sex, your age, and the other information called for in the space provided on the answer sheet.

NOW OPEN THE BOOKLET AND START WITH QUESTION 1.
1. a. I am bound by the principle of fairness.
   b. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.
2. a. When a friend does me a favor, I feel that I must return it.
   b. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.
3. a. I feel I must always tell the truth.
   b. I do not always tell the truth.
4. a. No matter how hard I try, my feelings are often hurt.
   b. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.
5. a. I feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
   b. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
6. a. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
   b. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.
7. a. I am afraid to be myself.
   b. I am not afraid to be myself.
8. a. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
   b. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
9. a. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
   b. I do not feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
10. a. I live by values which are in agreement with others.
    b. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.
11. a. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
    b. I am not concerned with self-improvement at all times.
12. a. I feel guilty when I am selfish.
    b. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.
13. a. I have no objection to getting angry.
    b. Anger is something I try to avoid.
14. a. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
    b. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.
15. a. I put others' interests before my own.
    b. I do not put others' interests before my own.
16. a. I sometimes feel embarrassed by compliments.
    b. I am not embarrassed by compliments.
17. a. I believe it is important to accept others as they are.
    b. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.
18. a. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
    b. I don't put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
19. a. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.
    b. I have a right to expect the other person to appreciate what I give.
20. a. My moral values are dictated by society.
    b. My moral values are self-determined.
21. a. I do what others expect of me.
    b. I feel free to not do what others expect of me.
22. a. I accept my weaknesses.
    b. I don't accept my weaknesses.
23. a. In order to grow emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.
    b. In order to grow emotionally, it is not necessary to know why I act as I do.
24. a. Sometimes I am cross when I am not feeling well.
    b. I am hardly ever cross.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
25. a. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.
   b. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.

26. a. I am afraid of making mistakes.
   b. I am not afraid of making mistakes.

27. a. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
   b. I do not trust the decisions I make spontaneously.

   b. My feelings of self-worth do not depend on how much I accomplish.

29. a. I fear failure.
   b. I don't fear failure.

30. a. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.
   b. My moral values are not determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.

31. a. It is possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.
   b. It is not possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.

32. a. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.
   b. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.

33. a. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
   b. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.

34. a. Children should realize that they do not have the same rights and privileges as adults.
   b. It is not important to make an issue of rights and privileges.

35. a. I can "stick my neck out" in my relations with others.
   b. I avoid "sticking my neck out" in my relations with others.

36. a. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is opposed to interest in others.
   b. I believe the pursuit of self-interest is not opposed to interest in others.

37. a. I find that I have rejected many of the moral values I was taught.
   b. I have not rejected any of the moral values I was taught.

38. a. I live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.
   b. I do not live in terms of my wants, likes, dislikes and values.

39. a. I trust my ability to size up a situation.
   b. I do not trust my ability to size up a situation.

40. a. I believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.
   b. I do not believe I have an innate capacity to cope with life.

41. a. I must justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.
   b. I need not justify my actions in the pursuit of my own interests.

42. a. I am bothered by fears of being inadequate.
   b. I am not bothered by fears of being inadequate.

43. a. I believe that man is essentially good and can be trusted.
   b. I believe that man is essentially evil and cannot be trusted.

44. a. I live by the rules and standards of society.
   b. I do not always need to live by the rules and standards of society.

45. a. I am bound by my duties and obligations to others.
   b. I am not bound by my duties and obligations to others.

46. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.
   b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.
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47. a. There are times when just being silent is the best way I can express my feelings.
    b. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.

48. a. I often feel it necessary to defend my past actions.
    b. I do not feel it necessary to defend my past actions.

49. a. I like everyone I know.
    b. I do not like everyone I know.

50. a. Criticism threatens my self-esteem.
    b. Criticism does not threaten my self-esteem.

51. a. I believe that knowledge of what is right makes people act right.
    b. I do not believe that knowledge of what is right necessarily makes people act right.

52. a. I am afraid to be angry at those I love.
    b. I feel free to be angry at those I love.

53. a. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
    b. My basic responsibility is to be aware of others' needs.

54. a. Impressing others is most important.
    b. Expressing myself is most important.

55. a. To feel right, I need always to please others.
    b. I can feel right without always having to please others.

56. a. I will risk a friendship in order to say or do what I believe is right.
    b. I will not risk a friendship just to say or do what is right.

57. a. I feel bound to keep the promises I make.
    b. I do not always feel bound to keep the promises I make.

58. a. I must avoid sorrow at all costs.
    b. It is not necessary for me to avoid sorrow.

59. a. I strive always to predict what will happen in the future.
    b. I do not feel it necessary always to predict what will happen in the future.

60. a. It is important that others accept my point of view.
    b. It is not necessary for others to accept my point of view.

61. a. I only feel free to express warm feelings to my friends.
    b. I feel free to express both warm and hostile feelings to my friends.

62. a. There are many times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.
    b. There are very few times when it is more important to express feelings than to carefully evaluate the situation.

63. a. I welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.
    b. I do not welcome criticism as an opportunity for growth.

64. a. Appearances are all-important.
    b. Appearances are not terribly important.

65. a. I hardly ever gossip.
    b. I gossip a little at times.

66. a. I feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.
    b. I do not feel free to reveal my weaknesses among friends.

67. a. I should always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.
    b. I need not always assume responsibility for other people's feelings.

68. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
    b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
69. a. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.
   b. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.

70. a. I hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.
   b. I do not hesitate to show my weaknesses among strangers.

71. a. I will continue to grow only by setting my sights on a high-level, socially approved goal.
   b. I will continue to grow best by being myself.

72. a. I accept inconsistencies within myself.
   b. I cannot accept inconsistencies within myself.

73. a. Man is naturally cooperative.
   b. Man is naturally antagonistic.

74. a. I don't mind laughing at a dirty joke.
   b. I hardly ever laugh at a dirty joke.

75. a. Happiness is a by-product in human relationships.
   b. Happiness is an end in human relationships.

76. a. I only feel free to show friendly feelings to strangers.
   b. I feel free to show both friendly and unfriendly feelings to strangers.

77. a. I try to be sincere but I sometimes fail.
   b. I try to be sincere and I am sincere.

78. a. Self-interest is natural.
   b. Self-interest is unnatural.

79. a. A neutral party can measure a happy relationship by observation.
   b. A neutral party cannot measure a happy relationship by observation.

80. a. For me, work and play are the same.
   b. For me, work and play are opposites.

81. a. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.
   b. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.

82. a. I have feelings of resentment about things that are past.
   b. I do not have feelings of resentment about things that are past.

83. a. I like only masculine men and feminine women.
   b. I like men and women who show masculinity as well as femininity.

84. a. I actively attempt to avoid embarrassment whenever I can.
   b. I do not actively attempt to avoid embarrassment.

85. a. I blame my parents for a lot of my troubles.
   b. I do not blame my parents for my troubles.

86. a. I feel that a person should be silly only at the right time and place.
   b. I can be silly when I feel like it.

87. a. People should always repent their wrong-doings.
   b. People need not always repent their wrong-doings.

88. a. I worry about the future.
   b. I do not worry about the future.

89. a. Kindness and ruthlessness must be opposites.
   b. Kindness and ruthlessness need not be opposites.

90. a. I prefer to save good things for future use.
   b. I prefer to use good things now.

91. a. People should always control their anger.
   b. People should express honestly-felt anger.
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92. a. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensual.
   b. The truly spiritual man is never sensual.

93. a. I am able to express my feelings even when they sometimes result in undesirable consequences.
   b. I am unable to express my feelings if they are likely to result in undesirable consequences.

94. a. I am often ashamed of some of the emotions that I feel bubbling up within me.
   b. I do not feel ashamed of my emotions.

95. a. I have had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.
   b. I have never had mysterious or ecstatic experiences.

96. a. I am orthodoxly religious.
   b. I am not orthodoxly religious.

97. a. I am completely free of guilt.
   b. I am not free of guilt.

98. a. I have a problem in fusing sex and love.
   b. I have no problem in fusing sex and love.

99. a. I enjoy detachment and privacy.
   b. I do not enjoy detachment and privacy.

100. a. I feel dedicated to my work.
     b. I do not feel dedicated to my work.

101. a. I can express affection regardless of whether it is returned.
     b. I cannot express affection unless I am sure it will be returned.

102. a. Living for the future is as important as living for the moment.
     b. Only living for the moment is important.

103. a. It is better to be yourself.
     b. It is better to be popular.

104. a. Wishing and imagining can be bad.
     b. Wishing and imagining are always good.

105. a. I spend more time preparing to live.
     b. I spend more time actually living.

106. a. I am loved because I give love.
     b. I am loved because I am lovable.

107. a. When I really love myself, everybody will love me.
     b. When I really love myself, there will still be those who won't love me.

108. a. I can let other people control me.
     b. I can let other people control me if I am sure they will not continue to control me.

109. a. As they are, people sometimes annoy me.
     b. As they are, people do not annoy me.

110. a. Living for the future gives my life its primary meaning.
     b. Only when living for the future ties into living for the present does my life have meaning.

111. a. I follow diligently the motto, "Don't waste your time."
     b. I do not feel bound by the motto, "Don't waste your time."

112. a. What I have been in the past dictates the kind of person I will be.
     b. What I have been in the past does not necessarily dictate the kind of person I will be.

113. a. It is important to me how I live in the here and now.
     b. It is of little importance to me how I live in the here and now.

114. a. I have had an experience where life seemed just perfect.
     b. I have never had an experience where life seemed just perfect.

115. a. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to be good.
     b. Evil is an intrinsic part of human nature which fights good.
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116. a. A person can completely change his essential nature.
   b. A person can never change his essential nature.

117. a. I am afraid to be tender.
   b. I am not afraid to be tender.

118. a. I am assertive and affirming.
   b. I am not assertive and affirming.

119. a. Women should be trusting and yielding.
   b. Women should not be trusting and yielding.

120. a. I see myself as others see me.
   b. I do not see myself as others see me.

121. a. It is a good idea to think about your greatest potential.
   b. A person who thinks about his greatest potential gets conceited.

122. a. Men should be assertive and affirming.
   b. Men should not be assertive and affirming.

123. a. I am able to risk being myself.
   b. I am not able to risk being myself.

124. a. I feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.
   b. I do not feel the need to be doing something significant all of the time.

125. a. I suffer from memories.
   b. I do not suffer from memories.

126. a. Men and women must be both yielding and assertive.
   b. Men and women must not be both yielding and assertive.

127. a. I like to participate actively in intense discussions.
   b. I do not like to participate actively in intense discussions.

128. a. I am self-sufficient.
   b. I am not self-sufficient.

129. a. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
   b. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.

130. a. I always play fair.
   b. Sometimes I cheat a little.

131. a. Sometimes I feel so angry I want to destroy or hurt others.
   b. I never feel so angry that I want to destroy or hurt others.

132. a. I feel certain and secure in my relationships with others.
   b. I feel uncertain and insecure in my relationships with others.

133. a. I like to withdraw temporarily from others.
   b. I do not like to withdraw temporarily from others.

134. a. I can accept my mistakes.
   b. I cannot accept my mistakes.

135. a. I find some people who are stupid and uninteresting.
   b. I never find any people who are stupid and uninteresting.

136. a. I regret my past.
   b. I do not regret my past.

137. a. Being myself is helpful to others.
   b. Just being myself is not helpful to others.

138. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstatic or bliss.
   b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of bliss.
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139. a. People have an instinct for evil.
    b. People do not have an instinct for evil.

140. a. For me, the future usually seems hopeful.
    b. For me, the future often seems hopeless.

141. a. People are both good and evil.
    b. People are not both good and evil.

142. a. My past is a stepping stone for the future.
    b. My past is a handicap to my future.

143. a. "Killing time" is a problem for me.
    b. "Killing time" is not a problem for me.

144. a. For me, past, present and future is in meaningful continuity.
    b. For me, the present is an island, unrelated to the past and future.

145. a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.
    b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.

146. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.
    b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.

147. a. People are basically good.
    b. People are not basically good.

148. a. Honesty is always the best policy.
    b. There are times when honesty is not the best policy.

149. a. I can feel comfortable with less than a perfect performance.
    b. I feel uncomfortable with anything less than a perfect performance.

150. a. I can overcome any obstacles as long as I believe in myself.
    b. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.
APPENDIX D

Scales for Assessment of Interpersonal Functioning
SCALE I
EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES;
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the first person either do not attend to or detract significantly from the verbal and behavioral expressions of the second person(s) in that they communicate significantly less of the second person's feelings than the second person has communicated himself.

EXAMPLES: The first person communicates no awareness of even the most obvious, expressed surface feelings of the second person. The first person may be bored or uninterested or simply operating from a preconceived frame of reference which totally excludes that of the other person(s).

In summary, the first person does everything but express that he is listening, understanding, or being sensitive to even the feelings of the other person in such a way as to detract significantly from the communications of the second person.

Level 2

While the first person responds to the expressed feelings of the second person(s), he does so in such a way that he subtracts noticeable affect from the communications of the second person.

EXAMPLES: The first person may communicate some awareness of obvious surface feelings of the second person, but his communications drain off a level of the affect and distort the level of meaning. The first person may communicate his own ideas of what may be going on, but these are not congruent with the expressions of the second person.

In summary, the first person tends to respond to other than what the second person is expressing or indicating.

Level 3

The expressions of the first person in response to the expressed feelings of the second person(s) are essentially interchangeable with those of the second person in that they express essentially the same affect and meaning.

EXAMPLE: The first person responds with accurate understanding of the surface feelings of the second person but may not respond to or may misinterpret the deeper feelings.

In summary, the first person is responding so as to neither subtract from nor add to the expressions of the second person; but he does not respond accurately to how that person really feels beneath the surface feelings. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

The responses of the first person add noticeably to the expressions of the second person(s) in such a way as to express feelings a level deeper than the second person was able to express himself.

EXAMPLE: The facilitator communicates his understanding of the expressions of the second person at a level deeper than they were expressed, and thus enables the second person to experience and/or express feelings he was unable to express previously.

In summary, the facilitator's responses add deeper feeling and meaning to the expressions of the second person.

Level 5

The first person's responses add significantly to the feeling and meaning of the expressions of the second person(s) in such a way as to (1) accurately express feelings levels below what the person himself was able to express or (2) in the event of on going deep self-exploration on the second person's part, to be fully with him in his deepest moments.

EXAMPLES: The facilitator responds with accuracy to all of the person's deeper as well as surface feelings. He is "together" with the second person or "tuned in" on his wave length. The facilitator and the other person might proceed together to explore previously unexplored areas of human existence.

In summary, the facilitator is responding with a full awareness of who the other person is and a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of his deepest feelings.
SCALE 2
THE COMMUNICATION OF RESPECT IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES:
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

The verbal and behavioral expressions of the first person communicate a clear lack of respect (or negative regard) for the second person(s).

EXAMPLE: The first person communicates to the second person that the second person's feelings and experiences are not worthy of consideration or that the second person is not capable of acting constructively. The first person may become the sole focus of evaluation.

In summary, in many ways the first person communicates a total lack of respect for the feelings, experiences, and potentials of the second person.

Level 2

The first person responds to the second person in such a way as to communicate little respect for the feelings, experiences, and potentials of the second person.

EXAMPLE: The first person may respond mechanically or passively or ignore many of the feelings of the second person.

In summary, in many ways the first person displays a lack of respect or concern for the second person's feelings, experiences, and potentials.

Level 3

The first person communicates a positive respect and concern for the second person's feelings, experiences, and potentials.

EXAMPLE: The first person communicates respect and concern for the second person's ability to express himself and to deal constructively with his life situation.

In summary, in many ways the first person communicates that who the second person is and what he does matter to the first person. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

The facilitator clearly communicates a very deep respect and concern for the second person.

EXAMPLE: The facilitator's responses enable the second person to feel free to be himself and to experience being valued as an individual.

In summary, the facilitator communicates a very deep caring for the feelings, experiences, and potentials of the second person.

Level 5

The facilitator communicates the very deepest respect for the second person's worth as a person and his potentials as a free individual.

EXAMPLE: The facilitator cares very deeply for the human potentials of the second person.

In summary, the facilitator is committed to the value of the other person as a human being.
SCALE 3
FACILITATIVE GENUINENESS IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES:
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

**Level 1**

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

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

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

**Level 2**

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

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

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

**Level 3**

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

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

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

**Level 4**

The facilitator presents some positive cues indicating a genuine response (whether positive or negative) in a nondestructive manner to the second person(s).

**EXAMPLE:** The facilitator's expressions are congruent with his feelings, although he may be somewhat hesitant about expressing them fully.

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

**Level 5**

The facilitator is freely and deeply himself in a nonexploitative relationship with the second person(s).

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

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