



8-1-1968

## The Relationship Between Training in Verbal Interaction Analysis and Selected Counseling Process Variables

Arthur J. Redding

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/theses>

---

### Recommended Citation

Redding, Arthur J., "The Relationship Between Training in Verbal Interaction Analysis and Selected Counseling Process Variables" (1968). *Theses and Dissertations*. 3713.  
<https://commons.und.edu/theses/3713>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses, Dissertations, and Senior Projects at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact [und.common@library.und.edu](mailto:und.common@library.und.edu).

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRAINING IN VERBAL INTERACTION  
ANALYSIS AND SELECTED COUNSELING PROCESS VARIABLES

by  
Arthur J. Redding

B.S. in Science, Mankato State College 1959  
M.A. in Educational Psychology and Guidance,  
Colorado State College 1962

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Faculty

of the

University of North Dakota

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the Degree of

Doctor of Education

Grand Forks, North Dakota

August  
1968

1968  
24

This dissertation submitted by Arthur J. Redding in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Education from the University of North Dakota is hereby approved by the Faculty Advisory Committee under whom the work has been done.

Peter T. Hountas  
Chairman

Richard D. Gray

Bertram Hedahl

Edward Kramer

A. L. Gray

William Johnson  
Dean of the Graduate School

Permission

Title THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN TRAINING IN VERBAL INTERACTION  
ANALYSIS AND SELECTED COUNSELING PROCESS VARIABLES

Department Counseling and Guidance

Degree Doctor of Education

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a graduate degree from the University of North Dakota, I agree that the Library of this University shall make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this dissertation for scholarly purposes may be granted by the professor who supervised my dissertation work or, in his absence, by the Chairman of the Department or the Dean of the College in which my dissertation work was done. It is understood that any copying or publication or other use of this dissertation or part thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to the University of North Dakota in any scholarly use which may be made of any material in my dissertation.

Signature

*Arthur J. Redding*

Date

*July 23, 1968*

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It is with deepest appreciation that the writer wishes to express his indebtedness to the many persons who have contributed to the success of this study.

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to his major advisor, Dr. Peter T. Hountras, for his encouragement, advice and professional guidance throughout the preparation of the manuscript.

The writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to Dr. Beulah Hedahl for her help, and encouragement as a member of his advisory committee.

The writer expresses his thanks to Dr. Richard Grosz for his advice and assistance as a member of his advisory committee.

The writer also acknowledges the aid and suggestions of the other members of his committee, Dr. Archie Gray and Dr. Edward Kraemer, for their help and encouragement.

A special debt of gratitude is extended to Mrs. Mary Scharf, Mr. Paul Tarasuk, and Mr. Calvin Vraa who served as judges and to Mr. Ernest Matuschka, who conducted the training in interaction analysis.

Finally, for her patience, understanding and assistance during the preparation of this dissertation, the writer wishes to express his sincere appreciation to his wife, Jan.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS . . . . .	x
ABSTRACT . . . . .	xi
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Background of the Problem	
Statement of the Problem	
Research Questions	
Delimitations of the Problem	
Limitations of the Problem	
Significance of the Study	
Definition of Terms	
Summary	
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	9
Interaction Analysis	
Initial Interview	
Counselor Personality	
Therapeutic Conditions	
III. DESIGN OF STUDY . . . . .	30
Source of Data	
Instruments	
Procedures	
Analysis of Data	
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA . . . . .	40
Research Question Number One	
Research Question Number Two	
Research Question Number Three	
Research Question Number Four	
Summary of Findings	

Chapter		
V.	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . . . . .	72
	Summary	
	Discussion	
	Conclusions	
	Implications	
	APPENDICES . . . . .	83
	LIST OF REFERENCES . . . . .	92

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Counseling Practicum Students Assigned to Each Experimental and Control Group . . . . .	36
2. Means and Standard Deviations for Each Judge's Ratings of the Counselor Variables of Empathy, Respect, and Genuineness . . . . .	41
3. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Between Judges on the Scale of Empathic Understanding . . . . .	41
4. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Between Judges on the Scale of Communication of Respect . . . . .	42
5. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients Between Judges on the Scale of Facilitative Genuineness . . . . .	42
6. Rate-Rerate Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficients . . . . .	43
7. Correlated $t$ -Test Analysis for Pre-Tape and Post-Tape Ratings for Empathic Understanding . . . . .	45
8. Analysis of Covariance for Experimental and Control Groups on Empathic Understanding Post-Tape Ratings Using Pre-Tape Ratings as a Covariate . . . . .	45
9. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to the Differences Among Treatment Means for the Analysis of Covariance for Empathic Understanding (K=6) . . . . .	46
10. Correlated $t$ -Test Analysis for Pre-Tape and Post-Tape Ratings for Respect . . . . .	48
11. Analysis of Covariance for Experimental and Control Groups on Post-Tape Ratings of Respect Using Pre-Tape Ratings as Covariate . . . . .	48
12. Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to the Differences Among Treatment Means for the Analysis of Covariance for Respect (K=6) . . . . .	49



13.	Means, Standard Deviation and Correlated $t$ -Ratio for Pre-Tape and Post-Tape Ratings of Facilitative Genuineness . . . . .	51
14.	Analysis of Covariance for Experimental and Control Groups on Post-Tape Rating of Facilitative Genuineness Using Pre-Tape Ratings as Covariate . . . . .	51
15.	Duncan Multiple Range Test Applied to the Differences Among Treatment Means for the Analysis of Covariance for Facilitative Genuineness ( $K=6$ ) . . . . .	52
16.	Means and Standard Deviations for Level of Regard on Client Form-Relationship Inventory . . . . .	54
17.	Analysis of Variance for Level of Regard on Client Form-Relationship Inventory . . . . .	54
18.	Means and Standard Deviations for Empathic Under- standing on Client Form-Relationship Inventory . . . . .	55
19.	Analysis of Variance for Empathic Understanding on Client Form-Relationship Inventory . . . . .	56
20.	Means and Standard Deviations for Congruence on Client Form-Relationship Inventory . . . . .	57
21.	Analysis of Variance for Congruence on Client Form-Relationship Inventory . . . . .	57
22.	Means and Standard Deviations for Unconditionality of Regard on Client Form-Relationship Inventory . . . . .	58
23.	Analysis of Variance for Unconditionality of Regard on Client Form-Relationship Inventory . . . . .	59
24.	Means and $t$ Values for High and Low Empathy Levels on Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire . . . . .	60
25.	Means and $t$ Values for High and Low Respect Levels on Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire . . . . .	62
26.	Means and $t$ Values for High and Low Genuineness Levels on Sixteen Personality Factor Question- naire . . . . .	63
27.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Client-Initiated Talk to Client-Response Talk Ratio . . . . .	65

28.	Analysis of Variance for Client-Initiated Talk to Client-Response Talk Ratio . . . . .	65
29.	Means and Standard Deviations for the Indirect to Direct Counselor Influence Ratio . . . . .	66
30.	Analysis of Variance for the Indirect to Direct Counselor Influence Ratio . . . . .	66
31.	Comparisons of the Pre-Tape and Post-Tape Ratings of the Client-Initiated Talk to Client-Response Talk Ratios . . . . .	67
32.	Comparisons of the Pre-Tape and Post-Tape Ratings of the Indirect to Direct Counselor Influence Ratio . . . . .	68

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Illustration	Page
1. Flanders Categories for Interaction Analysis . . . . .	12
2. Amidon Categories for Interaction Analysis . . . . .	13
3. Area of Matrix Analysis . . . . .	14

## ABSTRACT

### Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between training in verbal interaction analysis and selected counseling process variables. The counseling process variables were counselor personality traits and the therapeutic conditions of empathic understanding, respect, and genuineness.

### Procedure

The subjects in the study consisted of thirty beginning counseling practicum students enrolled in the Department of Counseling and Guidance at the University of North Dakota. The group was divided into three experimental groups and three control groups. The experimental groups received fourteen hours of training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon. The control groups met for free discussion for an equal period of time. Pre-training initial interview tapes and post-training initial interview tapes were rated on the Carkhuff Interpersonal Process Scales of empathic understanding, communication of respect and facilitative genuineness. All practicum students took the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire at the beginning of the semester. The Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory was administered to the clients after the last initial interview at the end of the semester. Analysis of covariance, analysis of variance, and t-test

statistical analysis procedures were used to test the significance of the relations among the groups.

### Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are listed as follows:

1. Training beginning practicum counselors in verbal interaction analysis does have merit for the purpose of helping the counselors attain higher levels of empathic understanding in interpersonal processes.
2. Training beginning practicum counselors in verbal interaction analysis does have merit for the purpose of helping the counselors attain higher levels of communication of respect.
3. Counselors with lower scores on the personality trait of threctia or adventuresomeness provided higher levels of empathic understanding, communication of respect and facilitative genuineness than the counselors with higher scores on this personality trait.
4. Counselors with lower scores on the personality trait of shrewdness provided higher levels of communication of respect and facilitative genuineness than counselors with lower scores on this personality trait.
5. Counselors with higher scores on self-sufficiency provided higher levels of communication of respect and facilitative genuineness than counselors with lower scores on this personality trait.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem

The counseling interview is a process of interaction between the counselor and the client. The goal of the counseling interview is to help the client clarify and understand his thinking and feelings about himself and others. In the past few years the nature of the counseling process has become of increased concern and importance to those who are interested in effective human relationships.

There appears to be an increasing emphasis upon the role and function of the counselor within the counseling interview. A comparison of the reviews of the literature by Callis (1963) and by Daane and McGreevy (1966) on the counseling process indicated a slight change in focus in the more recent studies. Earlier studies focused heavily on the client in the counseling process. Recent studies have been directed toward the interaction between the counselor and client, upon the relationship established between the counselor and the client, and upon the influence of counselor personality on the counseling relationship.

To enhance a therapeutic relationship it is vital that the counselor be aware of the interaction between himself and the client. The verbal communication between counselor and client is a fundamental component of this interaction. The most effective communication between

counselor and client is through verbal communication. Through this interaction the counseling relationship is established.

In a discussion of counselor and client communication Amidon (1965) described a methodology which may provide procedures by which counseling relationships and counseling processes can be investigated. The method which Amidon described is based upon the verbal interaction that occurs between the counselor and the client during the counseling session. This method has also been applied to the training of individuals who are involved in interactive relationships with other individuals. Hough and Amidon (1967), Hough and Ober (1967), and Moskowitz (1967), have used this method in the training of student teachers to become more aware of the verbal interaction between teachers and pupils.

Recently counselor educators, counselors, and psychotherapists have become increasingly concerned with the problem of counselor effectiveness in the counseling interview. There have been additional attempts to determine the most important elements of the interaction between the counselor and the client. It has been generally agreed upon that the relationship which is established between the counselor and the client is of greater importance than the counseling techniques employed by the counselor. There is also considerable agreement that a positive relationship exists between client growth in counseling and the quality of the relationship between counselor and client (Combs and Soper, 1963; Daane, 1955; Rogers, 1958; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967).

The personality of the counselor has been widely researched: Bandura, Lipsher, and Miller, 1960; Frank and Sweetland, 1962; Freedman, Antenen and Lister, 1967. However, these studies do not offer definite

26 lines

predictors of counselor effectiveness in the interview based upon specific counselor personality traits. Continued research on the effects of counselor personality upon the counseling relationship appeared to have merit.

In summary, this study pertained to three areas, namely, the interaction between the counselor and client, the relationship between the counselor and client, and the influence of the counselor's personality upon the counseling relationship.

#### Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between selected personality variables and the training of beginning counselors in verbal interaction analysis to the counselor-offered conditions of empathic understanding, respect, and facilitative genuineness, as determined by judges' ratings of tape recorded counseling interviews.

#### Research Questions

The following research questions were tested during this investigation:

1. Are there significant differences between the groups that received training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the counseling relationship as determined by judges?
2. Are there significant differences between the groups that received training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the counseling relationship as assessed by clients?



3. Are there significant differences between the male counselors rated high and the male counselors rated low, as rated on the last tape only, on counselor-offered conditions for the personality factors measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire?
4. Are there significant differences between the experimental groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the client-initiated talk to client response talk ratio?

#### Delimitation of the Problem

This study was concerned with thirty beginning graduate students (21 male and 9 female) in the Department of Counseling and Guidance at the University of North Dakota enrolled in an initial counseling practicum course during the Fall Semester of the 1967-1968 academic year.

#### Limitations of the Problem

1. It was assumed that the scales developed by Robert R. Carkhuff are valid and reliable instruments for measuring empathic understanding, respect, and facilitative genuineness.
2. It was assumed that the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring empathic understanding, level of regard, unconditionality of regard, and congruence.
3. It was assumed that the Verbal Interaction Analysis Technique as devised by Edmund Amidon is valid and

reliable for measuring the verbal interaction between counselor and client.

4. It was assumed that the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire is a valid and reliable instrument for measuring personality characteristics.

#### Significance of the Study

Counseling practicum experience is an important part of the total counseling program. Boy and Pine (1963) suggest that the counseling practicum is the most fundamental requirement through which a counselor may develop the skills and the understandings necessary for successful counselor functioning.

Truax and Carkhuff (1967) question current counselor training methods. They indicate that there is little evidence of the effectiveness of existing training methods. They suggest that the therapist-offered conditions of accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness should receive more emphasis during the training process.

The recent work dealing with the training of teachers in verbal interaction analysis indicates that this training may be appropriate for counselor training. Verbal interaction analysis training has proven effective not only in promoting more effective pupil-teacher communication, but also in helping the teachers become more accepting of pupils. It would seem that the training of beginning counselors in verbal interaction analysis could promote increased understanding by the counselor of the verbal communication process in the counseling session. Also, the training of counselors in verbal interaction analysis might help the counselor become more facilitating to the client in the counseling relationship. As yet, the relationship of

counselor training in verbal interaction analysis to the process variables of accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and genuineness has not been studied.

#### Definition of Terms

Verbal Interaction Analysis. Verbal interaction analysis is a method which can be used for classifying the verbal interaction that takes place between the counselor and the counselee. The analysis is designed to differentiate through a ten category system the broad divisions of counselor talk, client talk, and silence. Flanders (1960) originally designed verbal interaction analysis for classifying the verbal interaction that takes place between teachers and students. Amidon (1965) modified the system for use in analyzing verbal interaction between the counselor and the counselee.

Empathic Understanding. Empathic understanding is described by Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) as the process in which the counselor is able to respond frequently to the client's superficial feelings and his deeper feelings. A further definition of empathic understanding offered by Truax and Carkhuff (1967) includes the counselors ability to sense the client's internal frame of reference, to know the meaning of what the client is communicating and to be sensitive to the client's current feelings. Empathic understanding involves not only the counselor's ability to be sensitive to client feelings, but also the counselor's ability to communicate this empathic understanding to the client.

Respect. Respect means an unconditional acceptance of the client, by the counselor, as a separate person who is free to have his

own feelings and experiences. Respect for another individual is rooted in the feelings of respect that an individual has for himself (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). The counselor's respect for the client includes a feeling of intensive caring for the person. The counselor's feeling of respect for the client is nonpossessive; it allows the client to express his feelings and experiences without fear of evaluation from the counselor. The counselor who exhibits respect toward the client does not evaluate the client and does not communicate approval or disapproval to the client.

Genuineness. The ability of the counselor to be able to be himself in a free and deep manner without finding it necessary to hide his feelings. Truax and Carkhuff (1967, p. 69) define a high degree of self-congruence or genuineness as follows:

. . . A high level of self-congruence does not mean that the therapist must overtly express his feelings but only that he does not deny them. Thus, the therapist may be actively reflecting, interpreting, analyzing, or in other ways functioning as a therapist; but this functioning must be self-congruent, so that he is being himself in the moment rather than presenting a professional facade. Thus, the therapist's response must be sincere rather than phony; it must express his real feelings or being rather than defensiveness.

Indirect to Direct Counselor Influence Ratio. The indirect to direct counselor influence ratio is the ratio of the number of three second periods during which the counselor exerts indirect verbal influence upon the client to the number of three second periods during which the counselor exerts direct influence upon the client. In the Flanders Interaction Analysis System, the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio is the ratio of the total in categories one, two, three and four divided by the total in categories five, six and seven. Amidon

(1965, p. 53) defines the ID Ratio as follows:

. . . the total number of tallies in columns 1, 2, 3, and 4 is divided by the total number of tallies in columns 5, 6, and 7. This produces the ID Ratio, which is the ratio of indirect to direct counselor statements. An ID ratio of 1.0 means that for every indirect statement, there was one direct statement, an ID ratio of 2.0 that for every two indirect statements, there was one direct statement, and so forth

Client Initiated Talk to Client Response Talk Ratio. The client initiated talk to client response ratio is the ratio of the number of three second periods of client initiated talk to the number of three second periods during which the client is responding directly to the counselor. In the Flanders Interaction Analysis System the ratio is the number of category nine responses divided by the number of category eight responses. A ratio of 1.0 means that for every client initiated statement there was a client statement which was made in direct response to a counselor statement.

#### Summary

In Chapter I the investigator has presented a background for the present study. The statement of the problem, the research question, delimitation of the problem, limitations of the problem, definitions of special terms, and significance of the study were included.

In Chapter II is presented a review of the pertinent literature related to the present investigation.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of the professional literature pertinent to this study reveals several important contributions. The review of related literature that follows deals with interaction analysis, the initial interview, counselor personality, and therapeutic conditions.

#### Interaction Analysis

The application of verbal interaction analysis as an observational system has been a recent development. Flanders (1960) described a verbal interaction observational system that is designed to give an objective analysis of the verbal interaction between teacher and pupil in the classroom. This verbal interaction observational system was applied to the counseling relationship by Amidon (1965). He indicated that the verbal interaction observational system could be utilized to give an objective analysis of the role performed by the counselor during the counseling process. Furthermore, the verbal interaction observational system could be used by the counselor to assess immediately the type of verbal interaction that developed in the counseling session between the counselor and the counselee.

The system developed by Flanders is a means of categorizing consecutive verbal communication acts through a rating system. Flanders (1960) called this system for observing and rating the verbal interaction

between teacher and pupils "interaction analysis." There are two classification types for teacher statements; those teacher statements which dominate the classroom are "direct" statements and those teacher statements which elicit and encourage pupil participation are "indirect" statements. There are seven teacher-talk categories, two student-talk categories, and one silent category in the verbal interaction classification system. The teacher talk classification consists of four indirect influence and three direct influence categories. The student talk classification consists of a response and an initiation category (Flanders, 1960). The categories for Flanders Interaction Analysis are outlined in Illustration 1.

An adaptation of the Flanders System of Interaction Analysis was developed by Amidon (1965). The purpose of the classification system designed by Amidon was "to give an objective picture of the role played by the counselor during counseling" (Amidon 1965, p. 50).

The observational system as designed by Amidon (1965) differs slightly from that designed by Flanders (1960). Amidon changed Flanders designated categories of teacher talk and student talk to counselor talk and counselee talk. The ten interaction analysis categories are essentially the same in meaning. The categories for Flanders Interaction Analysis as modified by Amidon (1965) are outlined in Illustration 2.

For the application of the interaction observational analysis system to counseling the locations on the matrix are especially important. Amidon and Flanders (1963) and Amidon (1965) have emphasized the importance of the location of tallies on the matrix. Certain locations on the matrix appear to be of special importance. A summary of these tally concentration areas on the analysis matrix has

## ILLUSTRATION 1

## FLANDERS CATEGORIES FOR INTERACTION ANALYSIS

---

Indirect influence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Accepts feeling: accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the students in a nonthreatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting and recalling feelings are included.</li> <li>2. Praises or encourages: praises or encourages student action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, not at the expense of another individual, nodding head or saying "uh huh?" or "go on" are included.</li> <li>3. Accepts or uses ideas of student: clarifying, building, or developing ideas or suggestions by a student. As teacher brings more of his own ideas into play, shift to category five.</li> <li>4. Asks questions: asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a student answer.</li> </ol>
Teacher talk	<hr/> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>5. Lectures: giving facts or opinions about content or procedure; expressing his own idea; asking rhetorical questions.</li> </ol>
Direct influence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. Gives directions: directions, commands, or orders with which a student is expected to comply.</li> <li>7. Criticizes or justifies authority: statements, intended to change student behavior from non-acceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; stating why the teacher is doing what he is doing, extreme self-reference.</li> </ol> <hr/>
Student talk	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8. Student talk-response: talk by students in response to teacher. Teacher initiates the contact or solicits student statement.</li> <li>9. Student talk-initiation: talk by students, which they initiate. IF "calling on" student is only to indicate who make talk next, observer must decide whether student wanted to talk. If he did, use this category.</li> </ol> <hr/>
Other	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10. Silence or confusion: pauses, short periods of silence and periods of confusion in which communication cannot be understood by the observer.</li> </ol> <hr/>

Note: There is no scale implied by these numbers. Each number designates a particular kind of communication event, 1960.



## ILLUSTRATION 2

## AMIDON CATEGORIES FOR INTERACTION ANALYSIS

COUNSELOR INDIRECT INFLUENCE	1. <u>ACCEPTS FEELINGS</u> : accepts and clarifies the feeling tone of the students in a nonthreatening manner. Feelings may be positive or negative. Predicting or recalling feelings are included.
	2. <u>PRAISES OR ENCOURAGES</u> : praises or encourages student action or behavior. Jokes that release tension, not at the expense of another individual, nodding head, or saying "um hm?" or "go on" are included.
	3. <u>ACCEPTS OR USES IDEAS OF STUDENTS</u> : clarifies, builds or develops ideas or suggestions by a counselee. As counselor brings more of his own ideas into play, shifting to category five.
	4. <u>ASKS QUESTIONS</u> : asking a question about content or procedure with the intent that a counselee answer.
COUNSELOR DIRECT INFLUENCE	5. <u>GIVES INFORMATION OR OPINION</u> : gives information or opinions about content or procedures; expressing his own ideas, asking rhetorical questions.
	6. <u>GIVING DIRECTIONS</u> : directions, commands, or orders to which a counselee is expected to comply.
	7. <u>CRITICIZES OR JUSTIFIES AUTHORITY</u> : makes statements intended to change counselee behavior from nonacceptable to acceptable pattern; bawling someone out; states why the counselor doing what he is doing; extreme self-reference.
COUNSELEE	8. <u>COUNSELEE TALK--RESPONSE</u> : talk by counselee in response to counselor. Counselor initiates the contact or solicits counselee statement.
	9. <u>COUNSELEE--INITIATION</u> : talk by counselee which he initiates.
OTHER	10. <u>SILENCE</u> : pauses, short periods of silence or breaks in the interaction.

Note: There is no scale implied by these numbers. Each number designates a particular kind of communication event. (Amidon, 1965).

been outlined in Illustration 3. Area A on the matrix indicates counselor verbal emphasis upon ideas, information and opinion. This area is called the "content cross." Area B on the matrix indicates the counselor's acceptance of the counselee's ideas and feelings. This is the area on the matrix which indicates the counselors use of indirect verbal influence. Area C on the matrix indicates the use of direct influence by the counselor. Area D represents the way in which the counselor verbally interacts with the counselee. The verbal communication by the counselor to the counselee may be either direct or indirect. Area E indicates the indirect responses that the counselor makes to the counselee. Area F represents the direct responses that the counselor makes to counselee verbal communication (Amidon, 1965).

For the purpose of rating the interaction that takes place between the counselor and the counselee, several important limitations exist. First, the verbal interaction that takes place between counselor and counselee is the only type of interaction that is rated. Non-verbal interaction is not rated. Second, there is no way to designate the nature of the questions of the counselor. All questions of the counselor are rated in category number four, regardless of the nature or purpose of the question. Third, the categories for counselee talk are limited. The categories for counselor talk, categories one through seven, are fairly inclusive, but the two categories for counselor talk are limited to counselee initiated talk or counselee verbal responses to the counselor. (Amidon, 1965, pp. 55-56)

The usefulness of interaction analysis as a method of classifying the counselor-client verbal communications appear to have



merit. Even though there are limitations to the system, it appears that interaction analysis can be utilized for the counselor-client verbal communication classification.

The verbal interaction observational system has been utilized in ways other than in an objective analysis of verbal interaction. Several recent studies have reported changes in teacher attitudes using teacher interaction analysis observational techniques as a method of teacher training. At a symposium on Interaction Analysis, Amidon and Simon (1965) reported that training in interaction analysis does help the teacher gain insight into teaching and provides a tool which teachers can use to change their behavior in order to be increasingly effective in human relationships.

Zahn (1967) reported that student teachers trained with the use of interaction analysis as an instructional and supervisory technique tended to gain more positive teaching attitudes, particularly those student teachers with strong belief systems, than did student teachers who did not receive this training. In a study of attitudes and teaching patterns of student teachers and cooperating teachers, Moskowitz (1967) found that not only did student teachers trained in interaction analysis use more indirect communication patterns, but that their attitudes toward cooperating teachers trained in interaction analysis were significantly more positive than their attitudes toward cooperating teachers who were not trained in interaction analysis.

Hough and Amidon (1964) investigated the effect of experimental pre-service training in interaction analysis on the change in classroom behavior of school teachers. They developed a pre-service training course called "The Teacher-Learning Process" which consisted of a two

hour lecture and a two hour laboratory experience. The experimental group received two hours of instruction in learning theory and a two hour laboratory session in interaction analysis. The training in interaction analysis was designed primarily to help students gain a personal meaning in student teaching. The control group received two hours of lecture on learning theory during both the lecture period and the laboratory period but received no training in interaction analysis. The findings of the study indicated that the student teachers in the experimental group were rated as more effective teachers than the student teachers in the control group. It was also reported that the experimental group changed significantly on the pre-test to post-test scores on a survey of attitudes toward the teaching situation.

Hough and Amidon (1967) in a study of behavior changes using training in interaction analysis found that student teachers trained in interaction analysis changed their attitudes associated with student teaching. They found that student teachers trained in interaction analysis showed significantly more change during their student teaching experience in the direction of becoming more empathic in their relationships with pupils as measured by the Teacher Situation Reaction Test.

In a study designed to compare five methods of human-relations training for student teachers, Hough and Ober (1967) found that student teachers who had been trained in interaction analysis differed in their verbal behavior from those student teachers who had received other training. The authors assumed that the student teacher became more sensitively aware of his own teaching behavior during the verbal interaction process with students.

Simon (1967) studied the effects of training in interaction analysis on the teaching patterns of student teachers in favored and non-favored classes. In this study the experimental group was trained to categorize and interpret the teacher and student patterns of interaction through the use of the Flanders System of Interaction Analysis. The control group was taught learning theory and role played situations using principles of learning. The findings indicated that student teachers trained in interaction analysis used more praise, more extended indirect influence, less direct influence and less criticism than did the control group.

In a study designed to compare actual classroom teaching behavior between student teachers trained in interaction analysis and those who were not, Furst (1965) reported that the former were able to demonstrate greater use of accepting teaching behaviors and less use of rejecting teaching behaviors than the student teachers who were trained in the more traditional methods. Another finding of this study was that student teachers trained in the use of interaction analysis seemed to be more alert to and aware of the verbal interaction occurring in the teaching situation.

Lohman, Ober and Hough (1967) studied thirty student teachers who had training in interaction analysis and thirty student teachers who lacked such training to determine differences in teaching pattern. It was found that four to twelve months after training the teachers trained in interaction analysis used more indirect verbal behavior and less direct verbal behavior than teachers not trained in interaction analysis. From this study it appears that certain verbal behavior patterns developed through training in interaction analysis persist after training.

Hough and Amidon (1965) hypothesized that the learning of interaction analysis would help student teachers to assess the behavior of pupils more accurately and to understand their own responses to pupil behavior. A second hypothesis was that the skilled training in behavioral control that is related to the learning of interaction analysis helps the teacher develop skills to implement what he knows in a facilitative manner. The findings indicated that those students who were trained in interaction analysis and who were most open in the belief-disbelief system, as measured by a Rokeach Dogmatism Scale, were able to change significantly in the desired direction as measured by the Teaching Situation Reaction Test.

There have been several studies which have involved the training of teachers in the techniques of interaction analysis. Flanders (1963) conducted a project in which fifty-one teachers were trained in interaction analysis for a minimum of thirty hours. He found that the teacher's preferred style of teaching and the methods used by the teacher influenced the progress made by the teacher during the training period.

In a study to identify the verbal behavior patterns of teachers who were rated as superior by school administrators, Amidon and Giammatteo (1967) found the superior teachers to differ in several ways from the teachers not rated as superior in their verbal behavior patterns. The superior teachers used more acceptance of student feelings and acceptance of student ideas than the non superior teachers. The teachers rated as superior used less lecture, direction-giving and criticism than the other teachers. The students initiated statements fifty-two per cent of the time in the classes of superior teachers whereas students

initiated statements forty per cent of the time in the classes of non-superior teachers. In a project in human relations training Bowers and Soar (1961) conducted training involving fifty-four elementary school pupils. They trained twenty-five elementary teachers in the experimental group in role participation, identification of teacher roles and practicing the skills required by the teacher roles. The control group of twenty-nine elementary teachers participated in activities designed to control for the Hawthorne effect. Findings of the study indicated that the teachers who gained most from the training had personality patterns as measured by the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory which correlated highest with teaching effectiveness.

It appears that verbal interaction analysis may be applicable to counseling in two ways: first, as a method of counselor training; second, as a method of analyzing the counselor-client verbal interaction.

#### Initial Interview

The task of the counselor during the initial interview may vary to some extent from his task and function in following counseling sessions. The manner in which the counselor builds the counseling relationship and provides the necessary therapeutic conditions for the client is demonstrated in the initial counseling session.

The problems for the counselor which are presented in the initial interview are described by Porter (1950, p. 88) who wrote:

The beginning interview presents certain problems to the counselor that are in part different from subsequent interviews. It is likely that the beginning interview will be more demanding of the counselor for several reasons. The counselor and client are new to each other and the relationship which is established at the outset will color a great deal of what follows. The counselor



must be prepared to adapt himself to the mode of expression the client develops; the counselor is not going into the interview with a set routine. It is in the first interview that the client will begin to reveal himself. The counselor's reactions are correspondingly important. Errors in understanding the client may result in his hasty withdrawal. And usually it is in this interview that the client decides whether the counseling relationship is the method which he will use in his attempts to work out his difficulties.

In a discussion of the importance of the initial interview to the counseling process Tyler (1956) outlined three major objectives for the counselor during the first counseling period. The first and most important of these objectives is to establish a proper relationship between the client and the counselor. The second major objective for the counselor is to identify the psychological realities. However, the counselor can accomplish this only after a good counseling relationship has been established. The third objective is to structure the counseling session for the client. The second and third objectives, however, can be accomplished only if a proper counseling relationship is established between the counselor and the client during the initial interview. Voiland, Grundelach and Corner (1947) have also indicated that it is extremely important that the counselor develop high level sensitivity to the client's problem and the client's reaction to his problem.

Truax and Carkhuff (1967) indicated that deep involvement between the counselor and the client can be attained during the first interview even though true counseling or therapy develops over a longer period of time. According to these investigators, the goal of the counselor in the initial counseling session is to develop a good relationship with the client and to promote conditions which could facilitate client self-exploration.

Alexik and Carkhuff (1967), and Berenson, Mitchell and Moravee (1967) have indicated that it is possible for high level of facilitative conditions to be offered by the counselor during the initial session. These studies indicate that it is possible for the counselor to operate at high levels of empathy, respect and genuineness during the first counseling session.

### Counselor Personality

The personality of the counselor and its relationship to client growth in counseling has long been of importance in counseling. Several important studies have indicated the influence of counselor personality upon the way in which the counselor communicates with the client. The work of Combs and Soper (1959) and Fiedler (1950) suggested that effective relationships between counselor and client depend upon the attitudes to which the counselor adheres, the way in which he perceives himself, and the way in which he perceives his client. In a study of the relationship between counselor personality traits and the counselor's ability to communicate, Brams (1961) found that tolerance for ambiguity was the only personality characteristic of counselor trainees which was related to their ability to communicate with clients.

In a discussion of the personal qualifications necessary for personal counseling, Rogers (1942, p. 254) stated:

The person who is quite obtuse to the reactions of others, who does not realize that his remarks have caused another pleasure or distress, who does not sense the hostility or friendliness which exists between himself and others or between two of his acquaintances, is not likely to become a satisfactory counselor. There is no doubt that this quality can be developed, but unless an individual has a considerable degree of this social sensitivity, it is

doubtful that counseling is his most promising field of effort. On the other hand, the individual who is naturally observant of the reactions of others, who can pick out of a schoolroom group the unhappy child, who can sense the personal antagonism which underlies casual argument, who is alert to the differences in actions which show that one parent has a comfortable relationship with his child, another a relationship full of tensions--such a person has a good natural foundation upon which to build counseling skills.

In a fairly recent study, Frank and Sweetland (1962) indicated that the counselor's personality is an important factor in how he communicates with the client because the client responds to the counselor in a way which is influenced by the counselor's responses. Grater (1964) found that the majority of clients preferred counselors who exhibit a high degree of affect and feeling.

The ability to provide a climate for counseling and therapy has been considered by many investigators as an essential element in counselor effectiveness. Combs and Soper (1963) indicated that the methods and techniques used by the counselor are not as important as how well he uses himself as an instrument for interacting with the client. The development of the relationship is to a large degree dependent upon the nature of the counselor's attitudes and the ways in which he perceives himself, his task, and his purposes.

In a study in which counselor personality and counselor-client personality was related to counseling success Bare (1967) found that certain counselor characteristics were related to counseling success. The characteristics of high original thinking, high vigor, low ascendency, low order needs and low achievement needs seemed to be important to counselor empathy and counselor facilitativeness in the counseling interview.

Two studies (Ashby, Ford, Guerney, and Guerney, 1957; Fiedler and Senior, 1952) investigated the relationship of a large number of therapist personality variables to measures of the quality of the therapeutic relationship. Positive findings were not reported more often than would be expected by chance.

In a study which investigated a number of correlates of personality and empathic ability, Bergin and Solomon (1963) found negative relationships with test indicators of personality disturbance using the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory Scales of Psychasthenia and Depression. They found positive relationships between measures of accurate empathy and measures of personal strength as measured by the scales of Dominance and Change on the Edwards Personal Preference Scales. Negative relationships were found between measurements of accurate empathy and cognitive orientation as measured by the Order and Intraception scales. There was also a positive correlation between empathic skill and autonomy.

Miller (1965) used a multiple-regression analysis in a study designed to determine the relationship of the personality characteristics of the counselor to helping behavior of the counselor as perceived by the client. The experimental sample in this study consisted of thirty-three male residence hall advisors. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire was used to assess certain personality traits. To determine the helping behavior of the residence hall advisors, a Helping-Behavior Rating Scale was administered to a sample of 495 male students for the purpose of rating the experimental group of residence advisors. The findings indicated that the traits of surgency, super-ego strength, and emotional stability were significant at the .05 level, as they related

to the perceived helping-behavior criterion. The multiple regression coefficient of .75 using nine independent variables was significant at the .05 level. The nine personality traits were: Schizothemia, General Intelligence, Ego Strength, Surgency, Super-Ego Strength, Threctia, Praxernia, Poor Self-Sentiment Formation, and Low Ergic Tension.

#### Therapeutic Conditions

Over a decade ago Rogers (1957) identified six conditions which he thought were necessary in order to achieve success in counseling. Among the six conditions were three characteristics of the counselor. These were: (a) the degree of empathic understanding of the client which was communicated by the counselor; (b) the degree of unconditional positive regard communicated by the counselor toward the client; and (c) the degree to which the counselor's responses match his own personal feelings, or the degree to which the counselor is genuine.

In recent years research has begun to focus heavily upon the counselor's characteristics in the counseling relationship. The conditions which the counselor or therapist offers to the client during counseling seem to be basic to the process of counseling. Rogers (1961) indicated that it is the quality of the interpersonal relationship between the counselor and the client which is the most significant element in determining the effectiveness of counseling. The quality of the counseling relationship is based to a large degree upon the therapeutic conditions which the counselor is able to offer to the client and the way in which the client is able to perceive these conditions.

There has been and continues to be interest in the conditions upon which a relationship is founded and how these conditions are communicated from the counselor to the client. Perez (1965, p. 40) indicated that communication is essential to effective counseling. He stated:

. . . communication is the very essence of counseling. Quite simply, the counselor's ability to understand the counselee's words (to be communicated to), his behavior (and thereby emotions), and in turn, his ability to communicate himself as a person (warmth, tolerance, respect and sincerity) is the foundation upon which the whole structure of effective counseling is built.

Rogers (1962) has held to the belief that in all interpersonal relationships it is the quality of the relationship which promotes development and growth. He indicated that the quality of the relationship is more important than knowledge, training, counseling techniques or counseling orientation. It is the relationship, whether brief or continuing which is vital in the growth process of the counselee. The qualities which an individual brings to a relationship which promote development and growth are congruence, empathy, positive regard and unconditionality of regard. In counseling it is vital for the counselor to communicate to the client these qualities of the relationship.

The technique of the counselor for development of the relationship has been studied by several researchers. Snyder (1957) found that both the success of counseling and the type of counseling relationship were a function of the techniques employed by the counselor. Fiedler (1953) indicated that the technique the counselor uses serves to help him feel more secure in the counseling relationship, but it is the relationship itself which is the most important variable in successful therapy. Wrenn (1959) indicated that perhaps it is the situation rather than

theoretical position that promotes counselee growth. He analyzed written responses from fifty-four counselors to standard counseling situations which were designed to maximize the theoretical differences. He found no significant relationship between the responses of the counselors to the counseling situations and their professed theoretical orientation.

Recently, there have been many studies which have related the quality of therapist offered conditions to success in counseling. Truax (1961) found that the conditions of accurate empathy, unconditional positive regard and genuineness were significantly related to client interpersonal exploration. He indicated that the client who is involved in successful psychotherapy is involved in a process of intrapersonal exploration. The client seeks to understand his values, motives, beliefs and actions. The therapist in this relationship attempts to facilitate this process.

Holder, Carkhuff and Berenson (1967) studied the differential effects of the manipulation of the facilitative conditions offered by the counselor upon high and low functioning clients. In this study an experienced counselor offered high levels of facilitative conditions during the first and last thirds of the interview and low levels of facilitative conditions during the middle third of the interview. It was found that the depth of self-exploration of low-level functioning clients was significantly related to the level of the facilitative conditions offered by the counselor. Overall it appeared that the high functioning clients made better use of the counseling process than the low-level functioning clients.

Berenson (1968) found that high-functioning therapists (those therapists functioning over 2.50 on the dimensions measuring empathy, respect, and genuineness) had a much greater proportion of high self-exploring clients than did low-functioning therapists. This finding indicates that high level therapists help the client to move toward deeper levels of self-exploration than do the low-functioning therapists.

Truax (1963) studied the effects of therapist levels of:

(a) accurate empathic understanding of the client; (b) unconditional positive warmth for the client; and (c) genuineness. The comparison of therapist levels using a matched control group design indicated that high-level functioning therapists offered conditions which were related to patient improvement. Also, it was determined that low levels of therapist-offered conditions were related to client deterioration. The study indicated that the offering of facilitative conditions is not only related to client growth and improvement, but that the lack of these conditions may lead to client deterioration.

Two studies (Barrett-Lennard, 1962; and Van der Veen, 1965) in which the Relationship Inventory was used confirmed that there was a positive relationship between patient progress and the way in which the patient perceived the therapist on the dimensions of empathic understanding, level of regard, unconditionality of regard, and congruence.

The degree to which counselors can be separated on the facilitative conditions has been studied by several authors in recent years. Truax (1963) focused upon the three therapist characteristics of



accurate empathy, therapist genuineness, and nonpossessive warmth, and indicated that the outcome of therapy is positively related to the levels of these conditions which are offered by the therapist. He found that therapist or counselors who were able to establish a therapeutic relationship could be differentiated from therapists who were unable to establish a therapeutic relationship.

In a study involving NDEA Institute Counselors, Demos (1964) found that counselors who were regarded as most successful on a variety of criteria were rated significantly higher on empathy, positive regard, and respect than were counselors rated least successful.

In a study which compared facilitative functioning between graduate psychology students, senior psychology students and beginning college students Carkhuff, Piaget and Pierce (1967) found that graduate students in clinical and counseling psychology functioned significantly higher than senior psychology students or beginning college students on interpersonal skills. Whereas the counseling and clinical psychology students functioned at the level of approximately 2.30 overall on the Carkhuff Scales, the senior psychology students functioned at an average of 1.90 and the beginning college students at an average of 1.50 on the same scales. The authors suggest that the college experience helps individuals function at somewhat higher levels of interpersonal functioning.

In summary, it would appear from recent research studies that the facilitative conditions of empathic understanding, unconditional positive regard and genuineness are important ingredients in human relationships. For counselors, it is important that these facilitative conditions be communicated to the client during the counseling process.

Chapter III presents the essential elements of the research design for the present investigation.

## CHAPTER III

### DESIGN OF STUDY

#### Source of Data

The subjects used in the study consisted of thirty beginning counseling practicum students enrolled in the Department of Counseling and Guidance at the University of North Dakota. There were twenty-one male and nine female students in the sample. At the outset, the students were divided into two groups of fifteen students each. The two groups, one the experimental group and the other the control group, were matched on the Miller Analogies Test. The experimental groups received the regular counseling practicum training plus fourteen hours of verbal interaction analysis training. The control groups received fourteen hours of free discussion along with counseling practicum training. The specific procedures employed in assigning counseling practicum students are described in more detail in a subsequent portion of this chapter.

#### Instruments

Four instruments, the three Carkhuff Scales for the measurement of Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes, The Communication of Respect in Interpersonal Processes, and Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal Processes; the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory; the Verbal Interaction Analysis Scales; and the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire were the primary sources of data for this study.

### Carkhuff Interpersonal Process Scales

The scales for the measurement of Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes, The Communication of Respect in Interpersonal Processes, and Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal Process were derived by Robert R. Carkhuff from scales previously designed for the measurement of the process variables of accurate empathy, nonpossessive warmth, and therapist genuineness or self-congruence. (For a description of the scales, see Appendices A, B and C.)

Each of the scales is a five point scale. For all of the scales, level three is defined as the level at which the counselor is minimally facilitative in the interpersonal process.

The scale for the measurement of Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes is a five stage scale which measures the degree to which the therapist is accurately aware of and correctly responds to the client's current feelings. The counselor functioning at level three of this scale expresses a communicative response to the client which is essentially interchangeable with the responses of the client, both in affect and meaning. If the counselor functions below the three level he detracts from the expressions of the client. Above the three level the counselor's responses help the client move to a deeper level so that the client may express feelings which he was previously unable to express.

The scale for the measurement of The Communication of Respect in Interpersonal Processes measures the degree to which the therapist is able to communicate warmth for the client without restricting the client's freedom as an individual. It is a five point scale on which

minimal counselor facilitativeness is a rating of three. At the three level, the counselor communicates to the client a positive respect and concern for the client's feelings. The counselor who provides a lack of respect or negative regard for the client is below the three level. The counselor who is at level four or above on the scale is communicating to the client a deep respect and caring for the client.

The scale for the measurement of Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal Processes is a five stage scale which measures the degree to which the therapist is able to be freely and deeply himself in the relationship. Level three indicates that the counselor's responses to the client are in agreement with what he feels, or at least that the counselor does not deny his feelings. Below level three the counselor communicates something other than what he is feeling. The counselor's communication at this level is not genuine. At levels above three, what the counselor verbalizes to the client is highly congruent with what the counselor is feeling at the moment.

Reliability--The reliability of the scales has been assessed in many studies. The method used is to correlate different judges' ratings on the scales for the same counseling interviews. A review of the more current studies indicated the reliabilities on the scales developed by Carkhuff for inter-rater reliabilities ranged between .57 and .93. The test-retest reliability ranged from .84 to .99.

More specifically, the ranges for the rate-rater reliabilities on the facilitative condition were as follows: Empathy, .90 to .99; Respect, .84 to .99; Genuineness, .85 to .97. The ranges of intercorrelations between raters for these studies were as follows: Empathy, .73

to .96; Respect, .81 to .99; Genuineness, .57 to .93 (Alexik and Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff and Alexik, 1967; Carkhuff, Kratochvil, and Friel, 1968; Martin, Carkhuff, and Berenson, 1968).

The scales were derived from scales which, in general, were reliable. Truax and Carkhuff (1967, pp. 44-45) list reliability coefficients for twenty-eight studies which involved different types of counselor and client populations. The reliability for the Accurate Empathy Scale varied from .43 to .95. The reliability for the Nonpossessive Warmth Scale varied from .48 to .95. The reliability for the Genuineness Scale varied from .25 to .95. In general, the reliabilities obtained were moderate to high whether the measurement was used in group or individual counseling or therapeutic settings.

Validity--Truax (1961) indicated that the scales from which the Carkhuff Scales were developed have correlated .18 to .34 with other measures used to assess similar aspects of the counseling relationship. Significance at the .05 level was obtained for all validity coefficients.

#### Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory

The Relationship Inventory, Form OS-M-HS (Barrett-Lennard, 1962) as revised by F. Van der Veen, is based upon Rogers' (1957) necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. This instrument was used to measure the client perception of the quality of the counseling relationship. The total score on the Inventory is a combination of the conditions of Level of Regard, Empathic Understanding, Congruence and Unconditional Regard. The client indicates his perception of the relationship by selecting the degree to which he agrees or disagrees with the seventy-two statements about the counselor. The seventy

two statements include eighteen statements each for level of regard, empathic understanding, congruence and unconditional regard. Each statement is scored according to a six-point scale, in which plus three means strong agreement with the statement and minus three means strong disagreement with the statement. Each of the four dimensions are scored on a continuum which ranges from plus fifty-four to minus fifty-four. According to this method of scoring plus fifty-four indicates that the client perceives his counselor at the highest point on the dimension measured while a minus fifty-four indicates that the client perceives his counselor at the lowest point on the dimension measured.

Reliability--The Relationship Inventory has been reliable on the various scales from .82 to .96. The reliability for the total inventory has varied from .70 to .85 (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

Validity--The Relationship Inventory has been assessed to have content validity as determined by five professional counselors who served as judges (Barrett-Lennard, 1962).

#### Verbal Interaction Analysis Scale

The Verbal Interaction Analysis Scale as modified by Amidon (1965) was used to determine the counselor-client verbal interaction.

Reliability--The reliability of the interaction analysis scales has been demonstrated to range from .87 to .92. A Scott Coefficient of .85 or above is a satisfactory level of performance (Flanders, 1960).

#### Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire

The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire (16PF) by Raymond B. Cattell and Herbert B. Eber (1962) comprises measures of

sixteen primary personality traits and four broad second-order factors. The number of items contributing to the sixteen personality factors varies from ten to thirteen. The personality factors measured by the (16PF) have been derived from basic factor analytic research. Each of the primary factors is essentially independent of the other fifteen primary factors. The rationale, description of scales and studies of reliability and validity are presented in detail in the Manual.

Reliability--Correlations of test-retest studies range from .60 on factor N, shrewdness versus naivete, to .93 on factor H, parmia versus threctia. The reliability correlations for test-retest methods appear to be as high as those generally found in the measurement of personality. The 16PF equivalence coefficients of Forms A and B with 230 male college students for the first and second order factors ranged from .34, factor Q3, high self-sentiment, to .76 Factor H, parmia versus threctia. The authors state that lower value on factor B (intelligence) may be due to the narrow range of intelligence in the college group.

Validity--The validity coefficients of individual scales were derived from an average of the validities of forms A and B. The direct validities (A and B) for the factors range from .74 for factor G, character of superego strength versus lack of rigid internal standards, and factor M, autia versus praxernia to .92 for factor H, parmia versus threctia. The authors indicate that concrete validity cannot meaningfully be assessed with a multiple-purpose test because the test itself relates to a large number of different criteria.



Procedures

The counseling practicum students in the control group were assigned randomly to one of three groups. The practicum students in the experimental group were also assigned randomly to one of three groups. The three control groups and three experimental groups were then assigned randomly to one of three practicum supervisors so that each supervisor was randomly assigned a control group and an experimental group. Table 1 shows the size of each group and the number of female and male practicum students assigned to the groups.

TABLE 1

NUMBER OF COUNSELING PRACTICUM STUDENTS ASSIGNED TO EACH  
EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUP

Supervisor	Female	Male	Total
<b>Control Groups:</b>			
A	2	3	5
B		5	5
C	2	3	5
<b>Experimental Groups:</b>			
A	2	3	5
B		4	4
C	<u>3</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6</u>
<b>Total</b>	9	21	30

The counseling practicum students assigned to the three experimental groups and the three control groups taped their first counseling session and their final counseling session. The three experimental groups provided fifteen tapes of counseling sessions prior to training in verbal interaction analysis and fifteen taped counseling sessions after training in verbal interaction analysis. The three control groups provided fifteen tapes of the first counseling session and fourteen tapes of the last counseling sessions. The control groups, however, received no training in verbal interaction analysis. There was a total of fifty-nine usable taped counseling sessions from the experimental and the control groups.

A five-minute segment from each third of every tape was randomly selected from the fifty-nine tapes. Thus, a total of one hundred and seventy-seven five-minute segments of tape were rated independently by three trained doctoral students in Counseling and Guidance. The judges employed the scales of Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes, The Communication of Respect in Interpersonal Processes, and Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal Processes in the rating. The judges were trained in the use of the Carkhuff Scales prior to rating the tapes. Training sessions continued until a minimum Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient of .70 was attained between all judges.

#### Analysis of Data

Since all of the data obtained in this investigation were of the interval type, parametric statistics were used. The level of significance demanded for rejecting the null hypothesis was .05. Higher significant levels were reported where attained.

The statistical techniques employed in this investigation included the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient, analysis of covariance, the analysis of variance, and the t-ratio. The IBM Computer facilities of the University of North Dakota were employed for processing of the data.

#### Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient

The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient (Ferguson, 1966, p. 111) was used to determine the inter-rater reliability between the judges on each interpersonal process variable. The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was also used to ascertain the rate-rater reliability for each judge on each of the interpersonal process variables.

#### Analysis of Covariance

The analysis of covariance was used to test the differences between the groups receiving training in verbal interaction analysis and the control groups in the counseling relationship as determined by judges. The analysis of covariance statistical technique was used to insure that the results obtained could be attributed within the limits of error to the treatment variables of empathic understanding, communication of respect and facilitative genuineness. The formulas for the calculation of analysis of covariance are described by Winer (1962, pp. 589-594). The Duncan Multiple Range Test devised by Duncan (1955) for unequal numbers in each group as described by Kramer (1956) was applied to those scales on which a significant difference was found to determine where the significance lay. The Multiple Range Test was applied to the adjusted treatment means (Lindquist, 1953, p. 327).

### Analysis of Variance

A simple one way analysis of variance (Edwards, 1960, pp. 118-123) was used to determine the differences between the groups receiving training in verbal interaction analysis and the control groups in the counseling relationship as determined by clients. Also a simple one-way analysis of variance was used to determine the differences between the experimental groups receiving training in verbal interaction analysis and the control groups in the client-initiated talk to client response ratio, and the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio.

### Fisher t-Test

The t-test for testing the difference between two means for independent samples was used to determine the differences between the male counselors rated high on the counselor-offered facilitative conditions and the male counselors rated low on the counselor-offered facilitative conditions on the personality factors measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. The formula for calculating the t-test is described by Ferguson (1966, pp. 167-169).

The t-ratio for testing the difference between two means for correlated samples was used to test the differences between the pre-tape ratings and the post-tape ratings on the groups which received training in interaction analysis and the groups that received no training. (Ferguson, 1966, pp. 169-171).

Chapter III has presented the source of data, the instruments used, and the statistical procedures employed in the investigation. In Chapter IV are presented the analyses of the data.

## CHAPTER IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

The order of the research questions in Chapter I is followed in the analysis and presentation of data in this chapter. The research questions have been transformed into null hypotheses for the purposes of testing the significance of differences found. An hypothesis has been proposed for each variable contained in a given question. Tables summarizing the data concerning the specific hypotheses tested are included in the discussion.

#### Research Question Number One

The first research question asked if significant differences existed between the groups that received training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the counseling relationship as determined by judges.

In order to test this research question, it was necessary to assess the inter-judge reliability between judges, and the rate-rerate reliability for each judge. The three judges rated the pre-tapes and the post-tapes for both the experimental and control groups. The scales used for the rating of the interpersonal processes were the following Carkhuff Scales: Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes; The Communication of Respect in Interpersonal Processes; and Facilitative Genuineness of Interpersonal Processes.

The inter-reliability among judges' ratings for the scale of empathic understanding was obtained using the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient. The means and standard deviations for each of the three judge's ratings on each scale are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EACH JUDGE'S RATINGS OF THE COUNSELOR VARIABLES OF EMPATHY, RESPECT, AND GENUINENESS

Variable	Judge A		Judge B		Judge C	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Empathy	2.25	.73	2.27	.68	2.18	.71
Respect	2.45	.57	2.53	.55	2.51	.55
Genuineness	2.42	.57	2.55	.54	2.49	.64

The inter-rater reliability coefficients for empathic understanding are shown in Table 3. The intercorrelations between the judges ranged from .75 to .80.

TABLE 3

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN JUDGES ON THE SCALE OF EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING

Judge	B	C
A	.75**	.80**
B		.80**

\*\*Significant at the .01 level (df = 175).

Table 4 indicates the inter-rater intercorrelations between the three judges on the scale of communication of respect in interpersonal processes. The intercorrelations between judges on this scale ranged from .76 to .83.

TABLE 4

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN JUDGES  
ON THE SCALE OF COMMUNICATION OF RESPECT

Judge	B	C
A	.76**	.83**
B		.80**

\*\*Significant at the .01 level (df = 175).

The inter-rater reliability for the scale of facilitative genuineness is shown in Table 5. The range of correlations is from .72 to .78. In all cases, the intercorrelations among the judges were significant at the .01 level of significance for each scale.

TABLE 5

PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS BETWEEN JUDGES  
ON THE SCALE OF FACILITATIVE GENUINENESS

Judge	B	C
A	.72**	.78**
B		.78**

\*\*Significant at the .01 level (df = 175).

The rate-rerate reliabilities for each judge were computed from a randomly selected sample of nine five-minute segments. The segments were rated independently by each of the three judges two weeks after the 177 five-minute segments had been rated. The Pearson product-moment rate-rerate correlations for the three judges are shown in Table 6.

TABLE 6

## RATE-RERATE PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION COEFFICIENTS

Variable	Judge A	Judge B	Judge C
Empathy	.89**	.86**	.88**
Respect	.89**	.91**	.92**
Genuineness	.79**	.93**	.76**

\*\*Significant at .01 level (df = 7).

The rate-rerate reliabilities for the three judges ranged from .86 to .89 for empathy; .89 to .92 for respect; and .76 to .93 for genuineness. These reliability correlation coefficients were all significant at the .01 level.

To test the research question, tape ratings were recorded on the scales of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and facilitative genuineness. Three five-minute segments from each of twenty-nine pre-tapes and twenty-nine post-tapes were rated.

Correlated t-tests were computed to determine change on the scales of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and



facilitative genuineness between the pre-tape and the post-tape ratings on each of the three scales. Analysis of covariance was computed to test the significance of the differences between the six group means on each of the scales of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and facilitative genuineness. In this analysis the pre-tape ratings were employed as the covariate.

Null hypotheses were tested for the variables of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and facilitative genuineness.

#### Null Hypothesis No. 1.

There will be no significant differences between the groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups on empathic understanding as determined by judges.

The results of the correlated t-test analysis for the pre-tape and the post-tape ratings of empathic understanding are given in Table 7. Significant differences were found at the .001 level for two of the three experimental groups that were trained in interaction analysis. In the control groups a significant difference was found for one control group at the .001 level and for another control group at the .05 level. In each case the groups changed from less empathic understanding in interpersonal processes to more empathic understanding in interpersonal processes.

The results of the analysis of covariance for empathic understanding are presented in Table 8. The results of this analysis indicated significant differences between the groups on empathic understanding in interpersonal processes.

TABLE 7

CORRELATED  $t$ -TEST ANALYSIS FOR PRE-TAPE AND POST-TAPE RATINGS  
FOR EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING

Treatment	N	Pre-Tape		Post-Tape		Correlated $t$ -ratio
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Experimental Groups						
Supervisor A	45	1.91	.67	2.46	.64	3.76**
Supervisor B	36	2.08	.97	2.72	.82	3.87**
Supervisor C	54	2.07	.59	2.05	.54	.17
Control Groups						
Supervisor A	45	1.91	.74	2.44	.67	3.78**
Supervisor B	45	2.40	.53	2.15	.68	.24
Supervisor C	36	2.13	.43	2.27	.60	1.78*

\*Significant at the .05 level, one-tailed test.

\*\*Significant at the .01 level, one-tailed test.

TABLE 8

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS ON  
EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING POST-TAPE RATINGS USING PRE-TAPE  
RATINGS AS A COVARIATE

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between	5	18.11	3.62	8.68**
Within	254	105.91	.42	
Total	259			

\*\*Significant at .01 level.

The Multiple Range Test was applied to determine the significance of differences among the groups. The results of this analysis are reported in Table 9. The information contained in the table indicates that

TABLE 9

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST APPLIED TO THE DIFFERENCES AMONG TREATMENT MEANS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING (K=6)

Adjusted Means	(1) C <sub>2</sub> 2.086	(2) B <sub>1</sub> 2.088 (45)	(3) C <sub>1</sub> 2.272 (36)	(4) A <sub>2</sub> 2.611 (45)	(5) A <sub>1</sub> 2.624 (45)	(6) B <sub>2</sub> 2.721 (36)	(7) Shortest Significant Ranges
C <sub>2</sub> 2.086		.01	1.22	3.67	3.77	4.17	R <sub>2</sub> = 1.81
B <sub>1</sub> 2.088			1.16	3.51	3.60	4.00	R <sub>3</sub> = 1.91
C <sub>1</sub> 2.272				2.14	2.22	2.69	R <sub>4</sub> = 1.96
A <sub>2</sub> 2.611					.09	.69	R <sub>4</sub> = 2.02
A <sub>1</sub> 2.624						.61	R <sub>6</sub> = 2.05

  

C <sub>2</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>	C <sub>1</sub>	<u>A<sub>2</sub></u>	<u>A<sub>1</sub></u>	<u>B<sub>2</sub></u>
----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------------	----------------------	----------------------

Note: A<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>1</sub>, C<sub>1</sub>, refer to the control groups.

A<sub>2</sub>, B<sub>2</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>, refer to the experimental groups.

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different at the .05 level.

Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different at the .05 level.

two of the experimental groups (A<sub>2</sub> and B<sub>2</sub>) were significantly different from two control groups (B<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>1</sub>), whereas one control group (A<sub>1</sub>) was significantly different from one experimental group (C<sub>2</sub>). Therefore, the hypothesis of no difference was rejected. In the light of these

findings there is some indication that the groups trained in interaction analysis were rated significantly higher on empathic understanding by judges than were the control groups. These findings, however, were not consistent with experimental group (C<sub>2</sub>) and control group (A<sub>1</sub>). It should be noted also that the groups (C<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>2</sub>) and the groups (A<sub>1</sub> and A<sub>2</sub>) did not differ significantly, whereas, the groups (B<sub>1</sub> and B<sub>2</sub>) did differ significantly. This finding may indicate that the supervisor influence upon the practicum counselor is important in helping the student to increased levels of empathic understanding.

#### Null Hypothesis No. 2

There will be no significant differences between the groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups on communication of respect as determined by judges.

The results of the correlated t-test for the pre-tape and post-tape ratings on respect in interpersonal processes are shown in Table 10. The results indicated that all three of the groups that received training in verbal interaction analysis differed significantly at the .01 level on respect, whereas only one of the groups that did not receive training differed significantly at the .05 level. It should be noted, moreover, that the three experimental groups and one control group changed in the direction of increased respect by the counselors toward the client.

The analysis of covariance for respect is shown in Table 11. The significant F-ratio indicated significant differences between the groups on counselor respect toward the client in interpersonal processes.

TABLE 10

CORRELATED t TEST ANALYSIS FOR PRE-TAPE AND POST-TAPE RATINGS FOR RESPECT

Treatment	N	Pre-Tape		Post-Tape		Correlated <u>t</u> -ratio
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Experimental Groups						
Supervisor A	45	2.28	.45	2.62	.48	3.31**
Supervisor B	36	2.55	.60	2.91	.64	3.61**
Supervisor C	54	2.22	.52	2.50	.50	3.26**
Control Groups						
Supervisor A	45	2.00	1.30	2.55	.61	2.45*
Supervisor B	45	2.55	.50	2.55	.58	.44
Supervisor C	36	2.33	.52	2.44	.50	1.05

\*Significant at .05 level, one-tailed test.

\*\*Significant at .01 level, one-tailed test.

TABLE 11

## ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS ON POST-TAPE RATINGS OF RESPECT USING PRE-TAPE RATINGS AS COVARIATE

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between	5	3.65	.73	3.04*
Within	254	61.04	.24	
Total	259			

\*Significant at the .05 level.

To determine which of the differences between these means were significant, the Multiple Range Test was used. The results of this analysis are found in Table 12. These findings show that one of the

TABLE 12

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST APPLIED TO THE DIFFERENCES AMONG TREATMENT MEANS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR RESPECT (K=6)

Adjusted Means	(1) B <sub>1</sub> 2.49 (45)	(2) C <sub>1</sub> 2.50 (36)	(3) C <sub>2</sub> 2.59 (54)	(4) A <sub>1</sub> 2.60 (45)	(5) A <sub>2</sub> 2.75 (45)	(6) B <sub>2</sub> 2.83 (36)	(7) Shortest Significant Ranges
B <sub>1</sub> 2.49		.06	.70	.74	1.74	2.15	R <sub>2</sub> = 1.37
C <sub>1</sub> 2.50			.59	.16	1.58	1.98	R <sub>3</sub> = 1.44
C <sub>2</sub> 2.59				.07	1.12	1.58	R <sub>4</sub> = 1.49
A <sub>1</sub> 2.60					1.01	1.45	R <sub>5</sub> = 1.53
A <sub>2</sub> 2.75						.50	R <sub>6</sub> = 1.55

  

B <sub>1</sub>	C <sub>1</sub>	C <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>1</sub>	<u>A<sub>2</sub></u>	<u>B<sub>2</sub></u>
----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------------	----------------------

Note: A<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>1</sub>, C<sub>1</sub>, refer to the control groups.  
 A<sub>2</sub>, B<sub>2</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>, refer to the experimental groups.  
 Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.  
 Any two means underscored by the same line are not significantly different.

experimental groups (B<sub>2</sub>) differed significantly from the three control groups. A second experimental group (A<sub>2</sub>) differed significantly from two of the control groups (B<sub>1</sub> and C<sub>1</sub>). Two of the experimental groups, therefore, did differ significantly from the control groups, however,

the third experimental did not differ significantly from the control groups. Since significant differences were found, the null hypothesis of no difference was rejected. It would appear that for the two experimental groups ( $A_2$  and  $B_2$ ) the training in interaction analysis did help the practicum counselors increase their level of respect for their clients. It should be noted, moreover, that in the case of each supervisor the experimental groups differed from the control groups in the direction of increased level of respect in interpersonal processes.

#### Null Hypothesis No. 3

There will be no significant differences between the groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups on facilitative genuineness as determined by judges.

The t-ratio for facilitative genuineness is presented in Table 13. Two of the experimental groups and one of the control groups differed significantly in providing increased facilitative genuineness in interpersonal processes. The analysis of covariance for facilitative genuineness shown in Table 14 indicated significant differences between the groups for this variable.

In order to test for these differences among the means the Multiple Range Test was employed. The results of this test are reported in Table 15. It can be noted that the experimental group ( $A_2$ ) differs significantly from both experimental group ( $C_2$ ) and control group ( $B_1$ ). Experimental group ( $B_2$ ) and experimental group ( $C_2$ ) also differ significantly. The findings, therefore, for facilitative genuineness in interpersonal processes are inconclusive with

TABLE 13

MEANS, STANDARD DEVIATION AND CORRELATED  $t$ -RATIO FOR PRE-TAPE AND POST-TAPE RATINGS OF FACILITATIVE GENUINENESS

Treatment	N	Pre-Tape		Post-Tape		Correlated $t$ -ratio
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Experimental Groups						
Supervisor A	45	2.28	.45	2.62	.47	3.96**
Supervisor B	36	2.55	.60	2.77	.63	1.85*
Supervisor C	54	2.22	.56	2.42	.30	.92
Control Groups						
Supervisor A	45	2.51	.65	2.57	.61	.48
Supervisor B	45	2.55	.50	2.55	.58	.44
Supervisor C	36	2.30	.45	2.50	.50	1.96*

\*Significant at .05 level, one-tailed test.

\*\*Significant at .01 level, one-tailed test.

TABLE 14

ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS ON POST-TAPE RATING OF FACILITATIVE GENUINENESS USING PRE-TAPE RATINGS AS COVARIATE

Source of Variance	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Between	5	4.31	.86	2.88*
Within	254	76.16	.30	
Total	259			

\*Significant at .05 level.



TABLE 15

DUNCAN MULTIPLE RANGE TEST APPLIED TO THE DIFFERENCES AMONG  
TREATMENT MEANS FOR THE ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE FOR  
FACILITATIVE GENUINENESS (K=6)

Adjusted Means	(1) C <sub>2</sub> 2.40 (54)	(2) B <sub>1</sub> 2.49 (45)	(3) C <sub>1</sub> 2.51 (36)	(4) A <sub>1</sub> 2.61 (45)	(5) B <sub>2</sub> 2.72 (36)	(6) A <sub>2</sub> 2.76 (45)	(7) Shortest Significant Ranges
C <sub>2</sub> 2.40		.63	.72	1.47	2.10	2.52	R <sub>2</sub> = 1.53
B <sub>1</sub> 2.49			.13	.80	1.45	1.81	R <sub>3</sub> = 1.61
C <sub>1</sub> 2.51				.63	1.26	1.58	R <sub>4</sub> = 1.66
A <sub>1</sub> 2.61					.69	1.01	R <sub>5</sub> = 1.71
B <sub>2</sub> 2.72						.25	R <sub>6</sub> = 1.73

  

C <sub>2</sub>	B <sub>1</sub>	C <sub>1</sub>	A <sub>1</sub>	B <sub>2</sub>	A <sub>2</sub>

Note: A<sub>1</sub>, B<sub>1</sub>, C<sub>1</sub>, refer to the control groups.

A<sub>2</sub>, B<sub>2</sub>, C<sub>2</sub>, refer to the experimental groups.

Any two means not underscored by the same line are significantly different.

Any two means underscored by the score line are not significantly different.

respect to the effects of training in interaction analysis. Therefore, the hypothesis of no difference was retained.

The findings of the analysis indicated significant differences between the groups receiving training in verbal interaction analysis and the control groups on the process variables of empathic understanding and communication of respect. It appears, therefore, that training beginning practicum counselors in Flanders' verbal interaction

analysis as modified by Amidon does help beginning counselors attain higher levels of empathic understanding and communication of respect.

#### Research Question Number Two

The second research question asked if significant differences existed between the groups that received training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the counseling relationship as determined by clients.

To answer this research question, each client was requested to complete the Client Form of the Relationship Inventory upon the termination of the last counseling interview. An analysis of variance was run on the scores for level of regard, empathic understanding, congruence and unconditionality of regard on the Client Form of the Relationship Inventory to determine the differences, if any, among the six groups. Null hypotheses were tested for the variables of level of regard, empathic understanding, congruence and unconditionality of regard.

#### Null Hypothesis No. 1

There will be no significant differences between the groups that received training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups on level of regard as assessed by clients.

The means and standard deviations for the experimental groups and the control groups for the level of regard are shown in Table 16. The results of the comparison of means indicated that the experimental groups were perceived by the clients to be somewhat higher on the level of regard scale than the control groups.

TABLE 16

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR LEVEL OF REGARD ON  
CLIENT FORM-RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Variable	Mean	SD
Experimental Group A	33.79	9.52
Experimental Group B	41.75	11.03
Experimental Group C	36.79	21.58
Control Group A	32.60	13.54
Control Group B	31.00	11.33
Control Group C	30.75	13.94

The results of the analysis of variance for client ratings of counselor level of regard are shown in Table 17.

TABLE 17

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR LEVEL OF REGARD ON CLIENT FORM-  
RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	F
Treatments	5	373.80	74.80	.372(NS)
Within Groups	22	4420.31	200.92	
Total	27			

The non-significant F-ratio for the analysis of variance for level of regard indicated that there was no difference between the groups receiving training in interaction analysis and the groups not

receiving training in interaction analysis. Therefore, the hypothesis of no difference was retained.

#### Null Hypothesis No. 2

There will be no significant differences between the groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups on empathic understanding as assessed by clients.

The means and standard deviations for counselor empathic understanding as perceived by clients for experimental and control groups are reported in Table 18.

TABLE 18

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING ON  
CLIENT FORM-RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Variable	Mean	SD
Experimental Groups		
Supervisor A	27.60	88.77
Supervisor B	24.25	66.02
Supervisor C	31.00	16.90
Control Groups		
Supervisor A	23.79	13.97
Supervisor B	25.40	10.71
Supervisor C	25.50	15.43

The results of the analysis of variance are indicated in Table 19. It is readily apparent that no significant difference was found on empathic understanding. The null hypothesis, therefore, was retained.

TABLE 19

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING ON  
CLIENT FORM-RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Treatments	5	202.80	40.56	.252(NS)
Within Groups	22	3544.16	161.10	
Total	27			

Null Hypothesis No. 3

There will be no significant differences between the groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups on congruence as assessed by clients.

The client perception of congruence as indicated by the Client-Form Relationship Inventory is shown in Table 20 to be higher for the three groups which received training in interaction analysis.

The results in Table 21 indicated a non-significant F-ratio for the level of congruence as perceived by the clients. Stated somewhat differently, there was no difference at the .05 level of significance between the groups receiving training in interaction analysis and the groups not receiving training in interaction analysis. The null hypothesis, therefore, was retained.

TABLE 20

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR CONGRUENCE ON  
CLIENT FORM-RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Variable	Mean	SD
Experimental Groups		
Supervisor A	34.19	11.65
Supervisor B	31.00	15.90
Supervisor C	33.00	23.04
Control Groups		
Supervisor A	30.00	13.56
Supervisor B	29.80	11.43
Supervisor C	26.75	15.52

TABLE 21

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CONGRUENCE ON CLIENT FORM-  
RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio
Treatments	5	155.50	31.10	.126(NS)
Within Groups	22	5406.35	255.74	
Total	27			

Null Hypothesis No. 4

There will be no significant differences between the groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified

by Amidon and the control groups on unconditionality of regard as assessed by clients.

The data reported in Table 22 reveal that no readily identifiable trend in the means for the experimental and control groups is evident.

TABLE 22  
MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR UNCONDITIONALITY OF REGARD  
ON CLIENT FORM-RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Variable	Mean	SD
Experimental Group A	22.20	11.92
Experimental Group B	17.75	14.75
Experimental Group C	27.60	15.60
Control Group A	25.80	17.03
Control Group B	24.00	13.43
Control Group C	19.00	11.95

The analysis of variance for the level of regard of the counselor is shown in Table 23. The non-significant F-ratio for the unconditionality of regard as perceived by the clients indicated that there was no difference between the experimental groups and the control groups, therefore, the hypothesis of no differences was retained.

The results of the analysis indicated no significant differences perceived by clients between the groups that received training in interaction analysis and the groups that did not receive training in interaction analysis. In summary, these findings indicated that the clients did not assess differences between the practicum counselors who received training in interaction analysis and the practicum counselors who did

TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR UNCONDITIONALITY OF REGARD ON  
CLIENT FORM-RELATIONSHIP INVENTORY

Source of Variation	df	s	ms	F
Treatments	5	323.16	64.63	.315(NS)
Without Groups	22	4505.56	204.80	
Total	27			

not receive training in interaction analysis on level of regard, empathic understanding, congruence, and unconditionality of regard.

Research Question Number Three

The third research question asked if significant differences existed between the male counselors rated high and the male counselors rated low, as rated on the last tape only, on counselor-offered conditions for the personality factors measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

To test this hypothesis the male group of counselors were divided into a "high" group and a "low" group on each of the interpersonal process variables of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and facilitative genuineness as rated by judges. The high group was identified as the upper twenty-five per cent on each of the interpersonal process variables. The same individuals were high on each of the three variables. The low group was identified as the lower twenty-five per cent on each of the interpersonal process variables. Null hypotheses



were tested for the variables of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and facilitative genuineness.

#### Null Hypothesis No. 1

There will be no significant differences between the male counselors rated high and the male counselors rated low, as rated on the last tape only, on empathic understanding for the personality factors measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

The measures of personality factors were obtained through the administration of the Cattell Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

In Table 24 the mean scores for high and low levels of counselor

TABLE 24

MEANS AND  $t$  VALUES FOR HIGH AND LOW EMPATHY LEVELS ON  
SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

	Empathy Level (Judges Ratings)		$t$
	High Empathy	Low Empathy	
	Mean (N=5)	Mean (N=5)	
<b>PERSONALITY FACTORS</b>			
Cyclothymia	7.60	7.20	0.351
Intellectual awareness	7.20	7.20	0.000
Ego strength	7.20	5.60	0.974
Dominance	4.00	5.00	0.816
Enthusiasm	5.20	5.60	0.632
Super-ego strength	5.80	6.80	1.313
Adventuresomeness	4.80	7.40	2.479*
Sensitivity	6.00	5.80	0.156
Suspiciousness	4.00	4.80	0.574
Unconventionality	5.00	5.80	0.749
Shrewdness	4.00	5.40	1.000
Guilt proneness	4.20	5.80	0.834
Radicalism	7.20	6.20	1.313
Self sufficiency	5.20	4.40	1.265
High self sentiment	7.00	5.60	0.828
High ergic tension	3.20	5.40	1.391

\*Significant at the .05 level (df = 8), two-tailed test.

empathy are shown for each of the personality variables, along with the associated  $t$  values.

One difference appeared on the sixteen personality factors between the counselors rated high on the empathic understanding scale and those rated low on the scale. More empathic understanding counselors were less adventuresome, therefore they were more disposed to be restrained and shy in their interpersonal relationships rather than socially bold and uninhibited.

#### Null Hypothesis No. 2

There will be no significant differences between the male counselors rated high and the male counselors rated low, as rated on the last tape only, on communication of respect, for the personality factors measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

Three of the sixteen personality factors measured differentiated between counselors rated high on respect and counselors rated low on respect. The means and  $t$  values for this variable are shown in Table 25. The counselors highest in respect toward the clients were less adventuresome and more restrained and shy; less shrewd and more trusting and adaptable; and more self-sufficient and resourceful than the counselors who were rated as exhibiting low respect toward their clients. Since a significant difference did exist on three personality traits the hypothesis of no difference was rejected.

TABLE 25

MEANS AND  $t$  VALUES FOR HIGH AND LOW RESPECT LEVELS ON  
SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Variable	Respect Level (Judges Ratings)		$t$
	High Respect	Low Respect	
	Mean (N=5)	Mean (N=5)	
PERSONALITY FACTORS			
Cyclothymia	7.60	7.20	0.351
Intellectual awareness	7.20	7.20	0.000
Ego strength	7.20	6.00	0.700
Dominance	4.00	4.80	0.691
Enthusiasm	5.20	5.80	0.973
Super-ego strength	5.80	6.80	1.313
Adventuresomeness	4.80	8.20	3.850**
Sensitivity	6.00	6.00	0.000
Suspiciousness	4.00	4.00	0.000
Unconventionality	5.00	5.60	0.647
Shrewdness	4.00	6.20	1.976*
Guilt proneness	4.20	4.60	0.191
Radicalism	7.20	6.60	0.632
Self sufficiency	5.20	3.40	2.324**
High self sentiment	7.00	6.60	0.279
High ergic tension	3.20	4.40	0.809

\*Significant at .05 level (df = 8), two-tailed test.

\*\*Significant at .01 level (df = 8), two-tailed test.

#### Null Hypothesis No. 3

There will be no significant differences between the male counselors rated high and the male counselors rated low, as rated on the last tape only, on facilitative genuineness, for the personality factors measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire.

Three of the sixteen personality factors differentiated between counselors rated high on genuineness and those rated low on genuineness. The data in Table 26 indicate that counselors rated high on genuineness

were less adventuresome and more restrained and shy; less shrewd and more trusting and adaptable; and more self-sufficient and more resourceful. Since significant differences between the groups existed on three personality factors, the hypothesis of no difference was rejected.

TABLE 26

MEANS AND  $t$  VALUES FOR HIGH AND LOW GENUINENESS LEVELS  
ON SIXTEEN PERSONALITY FACTOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Variable	Genuineness Level (Judges Ratings)		$t$
	High Genuineness	Low Genuineness	
	Mean (N=5)	Mean (N=5)	
PERSONALITY FACTORS			
Cyclothymia	7.60	7.20	0.351
Intellectual awareness	7.20	7.20	0.000
Ego strength	7.20	6.00	0.700
Dominance	4.00	4.80	0.691
Enthusiasm	5.20	5.80	0.973
Super-ego strength	5.80	6.80	1.313
Adventuresomeness	4.80	8.20	3.850**
Sensitivity	6.00	6.00	0.000
Suspiciousness	4.00	4.00	0.000
Unconventionality	5.00	5.60	0.647
Shrewdness	4.00	6.20	1.976*
Guilt proneness	4.20	4.60	0.191
Radicalism	7.20	6.60	0.632
Self sufficiency	5.20	3.40	2.324**
High self sentiment	7.00	6.60	0.279
High ergic tension	3.20	4.40	0.809

\*Significant at .05 level (df = 8), two-tailed test.

\*\*Significant at .01 level (df = 8), two-tailed test.

In summary, there were significant differences on the personality variables of adventuresomeness, shrewdness, and self-sufficiency between the counselors rated high and the counselors rated low in respect, and facilitative genuineness. A significant difference was also found on

the personality variable of adventuresomeness between counselors rated high and counselors rated low in empathic understanding.

#### Research Question Number Four

The fourth research question asked if significant differences existed between the groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the client-initiated talk to client-response talk ratio, and the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio.

To test this hypothesis the client-initiated talk to client response talk ratio and the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio was calculated for each practicum counselor in both the experimental groups and the control groups. Null hypotheses were tested for client-initiated talk to client-response talk ratio, and the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio.

#### Null Hypothesis No. 1

There will be no significant differences between the groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in client-initiated talk to client-response talk ratio.

The means and standard deviations for the post-tape ratings for the client-initiated talk to client-response talk ratio are shown in Table 27. The analysis of variance was used to ascertain whether differences existed between the experimental groups and the control groups. This analysis is shown in Table 28. The F-ratio indicated a non-significant difference between the groups on the client-

initiated talk to client-response talk ratio, therefore, the hypothesis of no difference was retained.

TABLE 27

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE CLIENT-INITIATED  
TALK TO CLIENT-RESPONSE TALK RATIO

Variable	Mean	SD
Experimental Group A	14.77	24.02
Experimental Group B	7.02	5.84
Experimental Group C	6.27	4.97
Control Group A	4.16	2.89
Control Group B	2.54	11.02
Control Group C	1.33	.23

TABLE 28

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR CLIENT-INITIATED TALK TO  
CLIENT-RESPONSE TALK RATIO

Source of Variation	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio
Treatments	5	574.96	114.99	.99(NS)
Within Groups	24	2761.85	115.08	
Total	29			

Null Hypothesis No. 2

There will be no significant differences between the groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio.

The means and standard deviations for the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio are shown in Table 29. In each instance the means for the experimental groups were higher. An analysis of variance test was performed to ascertain whether the obtained differences were significant. The results reported in Table 30 indicate that the obtained differences were not significant. Therefore, the hypothesis of no difference was retained.

TABLE 29

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE INDIRECT TO DIRECT  
COUNSELOR INFLUENCE RATIO

Variable	Means	SD
Experimental Group A	19.68	20.15
Experimental Group B	15.47	19.18
Experimental Group C	12.31	12.92
Control Group A	5.58	8.66
Control Group B	7.52	12.41
Control Group C	5.78	5.55

TABLE 30

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE INDIRECT TO DIRECT COUNSELOR  
INFLUENCE RATIO

Source of Variation	df	ss	ms	F
Treatments	5	810.31	162.06	.845(NS)
Within Groups	24	4602.53	191.77	
Total	29			

A further analysis was performed on the data to determine if any change occurred in the client-initiated talk to client-response talk ratio and the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio before training and after training for both the experimental groups and the control groups. The  $t$ -test was computed to determine differences between pre-training and post-training.

The results of the  $t$ -test comparison for the client-initiated talk to client-response talk ratios are reported in Table 31. The

TABLE 31

COMPARISONS OF THE PRE-TAPE AND POST-TAPE RATINGS OF THE  
CLIENT-INITIATED TALK TO CLIENT-RESPONSE TALK RATIOS

Groups	df	Pre-Tape		Post-Tape		$t$
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Experimental Group A	8	.55	.40	14.77	24.79	1.28
Experimental Group B	6	2.16	1.91	7.03	5.84	1.58
Experimental Group C	10	.96	.54	6.28	4.97	2.60*
Control Group A	8	10.64	14.06	4.16	2.89	1.00
Control Group B	8	6.52	10.36	2.54	3.32	.81
Control Group C	8	2.63	.41	1.33	.47	5.00*

\*Significant at the .05 level, two-tailed test.

results indicate that each of the groups that received training in interaction analysis changed in the direction of allowing more client-initiated responses. The experimental group C changed significantly at the .05 level; experimental group B changed at the .10 level; and experimental group A changed at the .15 level of significance. One of the three control groups (C) changed significantly at the .05 level



in the direction of allowing the client less client-initiated talk and more client-response talk.

The  $t$ -test was also employed to determine differences between pre-training and post-training on the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio. The results of this test are shown in Table 32.

TABLE 32  
COMPARISONS OF THE PRE-TAPE AND POST-TAPE RATINGS OF THE  
INDIRECT TO DIRECT COUNSELOR INFLUENCE RATIO

Groups	df	Pre-Tape		Post-Tape		$t$
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	
Experimental Group A	8	8.37	11.64	19.68	20.15	1.13
Experimental Group B	6	2.54	1.59	15.47	19.18	1.50
Experimental Group C	10	4.23	6.08	12.31	12.92	1.34
Control Group A	8	15.49	24.14	5.58	8.66	.87
Control Group B	8	2.29	3.01	7.52	12.41	2.88*
Control Group C	8	8.33	11.20	5.78	5.55	.45

\*Significant at the .05 level, two-tailed test.

The three experimental groups changed in the direction of less direct counselor verbal influence and more indirect counselor influence, but this change was not significant for any of the experimental groups at the .05 level of significance. Control group B changed significantly at the .05 level in the direction of less counselor direct influence to more counselor indirect verbal influence upon the client.

In view of these findings it would appear that the training in interaction analysis did help the counselors become more able in allowing the clients to initiate and to carry on discussion. The type of

verbal influence exerted by the counselor upon the client, either direct or indirect, was not different for the groups receiving training in interaction analysis and the groups not receiving the training.

#### Summary of Findings

The findings of the present study are listed below in the order in which the hypotheses were presented.

1. There was a significant difference between two of the groups that received training in interaction analysis and two of the groups that received no training in interaction analysis on level of empathic understanding.
2. There was a significant difference between two of the groups that received training in interaction analysis and two of the groups that received no training in interaction analysis on level of respect.
3. There was no significant difference between the experimental groups and the control groups on level of facilitative genuineness.
4. There was a significant change on the empathic understanding scale for two experimental groups and two control groups.
5. There was a significant change on the level of respect scale for two experimental groups and two control groups.
6. There was a significant change on the facilitative genuineness scale for two experimental groups and one control group.

7. There was no significant difference between the experimental groups and control groups for counselor level of regard as perceived by clients.
8. There was no significant difference between the experimental groups and the control groups for counselor empathic understanding as perceived by clients.
9. There was no significant difference between the groups that received training in interaction analysis and the groups that received no training for counselor congruence as perceived by clients.
10. There was no significant difference between the experimental groups and the control groups for the unconditionality of regard of the counselors as perceived by the clients.
11. There was a significant difference on the personality variable of adventuresomeness between the group judged as high on empathy and the group judged as low on empathy.
12. There was a significant difference on the personality variables of adventuresomeness, shrewdness, and self-sufficiency between the group judged as high on respect and the group judged as low on respect.
13. There was a significant difference on the personality variable of adventuresomeness, shrewdness, and self-sufficiency between the group judged as high on facilitative genuineness and the group judged as low on facilitative genuineness.

14. There was no significant difference between the experimental groups and the control groups on the client-initiated talk to client-response talk ratio.
15. There was no significant difference between the experimental groups and the control groups in the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio.
16. There was a significant change for one experimental group and a significant trend in the other experimental groups toward allowing the client more client-initiated talk in the counseling relationship.
17. There was a significant change in one control group toward allowing the client less client-initiated talk and more client response talk.
18. There was no significant change for the experimental groups on the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio, however there was a trend toward more counselor indirect influence.

Chapter V presents a summary of the investigation, the conclusions which emerged, a discussion of the findings, and implications for further research.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

#### Summary

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between selected personality variables and the training of beginning counselors in verbal interaction analysis to the counselor-offered conditions of empathic understanding, respect, and facilitative genuineness. Previous research had indicated that the training of teachers in interaction analysis helped teachers to become more aware of the verbal interaction between teachers and pupils. Teachers trained in interaction analysis have increased their effectiveness in interpersonal relationships and have become more empathic toward their pupils. The training of counselors in verbal interaction analysis had not been attempted in previous research. The four research questions presented for investigation were as follows:

1. Are there significant differences between the groups that received training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the counseling relationship as determined by judges?
2. Are there significant differences between the groups that received training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the counseling relationship as assessed by clients?

3. Are there significant differences between the male counselors rated high and the male counselors rated low, as rated on the last tape only, on counselor-offered conditions for the personality factors measured by the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire?
4. Are there significant differences between the experimental groups receiving training in Flanders' verbal interaction analysis as modified by Amidon and the control groups in the client-initiated talk to client response talk ratio?

The subjects used in the study were thirty beginning counseling practicum students enrolled in the Department of Counseling and Guidance at the University of North Dakota in Grand Forks, North Dakota. There were twenty-one male counselors and nine female counselors in the sample.

Three experimental groups and the three control groups were randomly selected from the total experimental group and control group which were matched on the Miller Analogies Test. The three experimental groups received the regular counseling practicum training plus fourteen hours of verbal interaction analysis training. The three control groups received the regular counseling practicum training only.

All of the counselors were administered the Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire at the beginning of the semester and prior to any treatment conditions for the experimental group. This was done to determine personality differences between counselors rated high and those counselors rated low on conditions of empathic understanding, respect, and facilitative genuineness. At the end of the semester each counselor asked a client scheduled for an initial interview to take the Client Form of the Relationship Inventory. This was done to determine the differences between the groups receiving training in interaction analysis and the

groups not receiving this training as determined by clients' on the variables of level of regard, empathic understanding, congruence, and unconditionality of regard.

The pre-training tapes and post-training tapes of the interviews were rated by three professional counselors. The rating was completed on the dimensions of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and facilitative genuineness as measured by the Carkhuff Scales for Interpersonal Processes. The analysis was done on three randomly selected five-minute segments from each of thirty pre-training tapes and twenty-nine post-training tapes.

The statistics which were employed in this study were Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient, analysis of covariance, analysis of variance, Duncan's Multiple Range Test and Fischer's t-test. The .05 level of significance was required for each analysis.

#### Discussion

The training of beginning counselors in verbal interaction analysis appeared to be useful in helping beginning practicum counselors become more facilitating in interpersonal processes. The significant differences between two of the experimental groups and two of the control groups on empathic understanding and communication of respect indicated that on these two variables the training did help promote an increased level of functioning. Also since two of the three experimental groups changed significantly from pre-training to post-training on tape ratings for each of the scales of empathic understanding, communication of respect and facilitative genuineness, it would appear that training in

interaction analysis did help the beginning counselor practicum students offer higher levels of these conditions.

Although Hough and Amidon (1967) were concerned with the behavior of student teachers, it is interesting to note that the findings of this study on practicum counselors are in agreement with their findings. They concluded that student teachers trained in interaction analysis showed significantly more change in the direction of becoming more empathic in their relationships with pupils during their student teaching experience. The findings of this study indicate that beginning counseling practicum students trained in interaction analysis changed significantly in the direction of becoming more empathic in their relationships with their clients. These findings indicate that for promoting higher levels of empathic understanding in interpersonal processes, training in interaction analysis may be useful.

The analysis on communication of respect indicated a significant change for all three of the experimental groups between pre-training and post-training. Also, one of the experimental groups differed significantly from all three of the control groups, and another experimental group differed significantly from two control groups. These findings for counseling practicum students are in agreement with the findings of Moskowitz (1967) and Zahn (1967). They found that student teachers trained in interaction analysis were significantly more positive in their attitudes toward cooperating teachers and students than student teachers not trained in interaction analysis. The counseling practicum groups in this study that received training did change significantly in the direction of providing higher levels of respect in interpersonal processes. From



this finding it would appear that the training of beginning practicum counselors in interaction analysis may be helpful in promoting higher levels of counselor respect.

The analysis for the level of facilitative genuineness in interpersonal processes indicated no significant differences between the groups that received training in interaction analysis and the groups that did not receive training in interaction analysis. It seems that in light of the findings of this study, training in interaction analysis did not promote increased levels of counselor awareness of personal experience, nor did the training improve greatly the counselor's ability to communicate genuineness to the client. It should be noted, however, that all of the groups that received training and all of the groups that did not receive training in interaction analysis did achieve higher levels of functioning on facilitative genuineness in interpersonal processes. This finding tends to indicate that the practicum training experiences did help all the beginning counselors (experimental and control) increase the level of genuineness that they communicated to their clients during the interpersonal process.

The findings of no significant differences on level of regard, empathic understanding, congruence, and unconditionality of regard indicated that clients as a group did not perceive the counselors in the practicum groups differently. In contrast, the judges did rate the groups significantly different on the interpersonal process variables of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and facilitative genuineness. Stated in another way, the judges rated the groups differently, whereas the clients did not rate the groups

differently. It seems evident from these findings that the rating of tapes was a more useful method of measuring differences between the practicum groups on the process variables than was the client questionnaire method. These findings are in agreement with the findings of Truax (1966) in regard to the usefulness of using the questionnaire approach to measuring counselor behavior. The questionnaire method, although more economical, appears to be less useful than the tape-rating method for assessment of counselor behavior.

The finding that certain counselor personality traits are significantly related to the counselor-offered conditions in the interpersonal process agree with the findings of Brams (1961), Frank and Sweetland (1962), and Bergin and Solomon (1963). The results of this study were similar on one personality trait to the study done by Miller (1965). Miller found that a negatively weighted beta coefficient on factor H, threctia or adventuresomeness correlated positively with the helping behavior of counselors as perceived by clients. The findings in the present study indicated that there was a significant difference between the groups rated high by judges and the groups rated low, for the factor of threctia or adventuresomeness on the three interpersonal process variables of empathic understanding, communication of respect and facilitative genuineness.

The findings that a lower score on factor N (shrewdness) indicated a higher degree of respect and facilitative genuineness imply that the counselor who reacts in a rather unpretentious manner and is easily pleased and content with what develops in the interview, may be able to provide higher levels on these two conditions. By contrast, the counselor who has an unsentimental, highly intellectual and possibly cynical

approach to interpersonal situations provides lower levels of these conditions for the client. This finding tends to lend support to Rogers' hypothesis (1962) that a counselor who is congruent and genuine, without a facade, in the interpersonal relationship does react in a natural and spontaneous manner and is able to provide the core relationship variables to clients.

Another finding of interest is that the counselors who provided the highest levels of respect and facilitative genuineness were more self-sufficient and resourceful. In contrast, counselors who provided the lowest levels of these conditions were more dependent on the group. Stated somewhat differently, the counselor who provides the highest levels on the interpersonal process variables is accustomed to making his own decisions and acting upon these decisions. He is not dominant in interpersonal relationships, but depends upon himself to resolve the problems that face him.

The findings of this study tend to support to some degree the suggestion of Combs and Soper (1959) and Fiedler (1950) that effective relationships between counselor and client depend upon the attitudes to which the counselor adheres and the way in which the counselor perceives himself. In other words, there are certain factors about the counselors personality which tend to be facilitative in the counseling relationship.

The finding that no significant differences were found among the groups for client-initiated talk to client-response talk ratio indicated that training in interaction analysis did not make a significant difference in producing more client self-initiated talk. A trend

did occur, however, for the counselors who received training in interaction analysis to allow the clients to express themselves more fully through self-initiated discussion rather than through responses to the counselor.

Another interesting comparison is that the groups that indicated a trend toward allowing more client-initiated discussion also provided high levels of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and facilitative genuineness. In contrast, the group that did not change in allowing more client-initiated talk also indicated little change in providing increased levels of empathic understanding, communication of respect, and facilitative genuineness. This finding may indicate a relationship between client-initiated talk and the interpersonal process variables. The findings of Truax (1963) have indicated a relationship between client depth of self-exploration and the level of the facilitative conditions provided by the counselor. The findings of this study indicate to some extent that the amount of client self-expression allowed by the counselor is also related to the levels of facilitative conditions provided by the counselor.

The finding of no significant differences among the groups for indirect to direct counselor influence indicated that training in interaction analysis did not make a significant difference in type of counselor verbal influence upon the client. It is interesting to note that the two groups that changed significantly on all three scales of empathic understanding, communication of respect and facilitative genuineness also had the highest ID ratio on the post tapes. It may be that counselors who offer the client the greatest opportunity for self-initiated talk, also provide high levels of facilitative conditions.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are based on statistically significant differences found and are listed as follows:

1. Training beginning practicum counselors in verbal interaction analysis does have merit for the purpose of helping the counselors attain higher levels of empathic understanding in interpersonal processes.
2. Training beginning practicum counselors in verbal interaction analysis does have merit for the purpose of helping the counselors attain higher levels of communication of respect.
3. Counselors with lower scores on the personality trait of threctia or adventuresomeness provided higher levels of empathic understanding, communication of respect and facilitative genuineness than the counselors with higher scores on this personality trait.
4. Counselors with lower scores on the personality trait of shrewdness provided higher levels of communication of respect and facilitative genuineness than counselors with lower scores on this personality trait.
5. Counselors with higher scores on self-sufficiency provided higher levels of communication of respect and facilitative genuineness than counselors with lower scores on this personality trait.

Implications

There are several implications which can be suggested from this study which would be helpful for future research in the area of counselor training, as follows:

1. There was no attempt in the present research study to delineate any differences, either by counselor or by groups of counselors, in the types of problems discussed in the interviews. Further research is needed to determine if differences in type of problem does affect the levels of counselor-offered conditions of empathy, respect, and genuineness. Also, further research is needed to determine if differences in type of problem have an effect upon the communication patterns between counselor and client.
2. The evidence presented in this study indicates that training in interaction analysis could be useful to help beginning counselors increase their levels of facilitation in the interpersonal process. Perhaps a longer training period with a greater emphasis upon an analysis of the counseling process through the use of interaction analysis techniques would provide a more positive indication of the usefulness of interaction analysis training for beginning practicum counselors.
3. The present study indicates that there is merit in training beginning counselors in interaction analysis for the purpose of providing higher levels of facilitativeness in

interpersonal processes. It may be, however, that training beginning counselors with the interpersonal process scales would be more valuable training for the beginning counselors. In any case, further research is needed to help determine the effects of this training upon the counselor's function in the counseling process.

4. No significant differences were found in the present study between the groups trained in interaction analysis and the groups not trained in interaction analysis for the indirect to direct counselor influence ratio or the client-initiated talk to the client-response talk ratio. No attempt was made, however, to discover relationships between the communication patterns for the counselor-client relationship and the interpersonal process variables. Further research in this area may help define the relationship between verbal communication between counselor-client and the process interaction between counselor-client.
5. No attempt was made in this study to determine the relationship of specific categories in verbal interaction analysis to the process variables. Further research in this area might reveal the importance of specific communication categories to the counseling process.

APPENDIX A

283151



Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes

A Scale for Measurement<sup>1</sup>

Robert R. Carkhuff

State University of New York at Buffalo

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 disinterested or simply operating from a preconceived frame of reference which totally excludes that of the other person(s).

In summary, the first person does everything but 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 effect 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.

The 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 expression 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 which 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 ongoing 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 wavelength. 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 most deep feelings.

<sup>1</sup>The present scale "Empathic understanding in interpersonal processes" has been derived in part from "A scale for the measurement of accurate empathy" by C. B. Traux which has been validated in extensive process and outcome research on counseling and psychotherapy (summarized in Traux and Carkhuff, 1967) and in part from an earlier version which has been validated in extensive process and outcome research on counseling and psychotherapy (summarized in Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). In addition, similar measures of similar constructs have received extensive support in the literature of counseling and therapy and education. The present scale was written to apply to all interpersonal processes and represent a systematic attempt to reduce the ambiguity and increase the reliability of the scale. In the process many important delineations and additions have been made, including in particular the change to a systematic focus upon the additive, subtractive or interchangeable aspects of the levels of communication of understanding. For comparative purposes, Level 1 of the present scale is approximately equal to Stage 1 of the Traux scale. The remaining levels are approximately correspondent: Level 2 and Stages 2 and 3 of the earlier version; Level 3 and Stages 4 and 5; Level 4 and Stages 6 and 7; Level 5 and Stages 8 and 9. The levels of the present scale are approximately equal to the levels of the earlier version of this scale.

APPENDIX B

The Communication of Respect in Interpersonal Processes

A Scale for Measurement<sup>1</sup>

Robert R. Carkhuff

State University of New York at Buffalo

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 and 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 matters 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 enables 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.

<sup>1</sup>The present scale, "Respect or Positive Regard in Interpersonal Processes," has been derived in part from "A Tentative scale for the measurement of unconditional positive regard" by C. B. Truax which has been validated in extensive process and outcome research on counseling and psychotherapy (summarized in Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) and in part from an earlier version which has been validated in extensive process and outcome research on counseling and psychotherapy (summarized in Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). In addition, similar measures of similar constructs have received extensive support in the literature of counseling and therapy and education. The present scale was written to apply to all interpersonal processes and represents a systematic attempt to reduce the ambiguity and increase the reliability of the scale. In the process many important delineations and additions have been made. For comparative purposes, the levels of the present scale are approximately equal to the stages of both the earlier scales, although the systematic emphasis upon the positive regard rather than upon unconditionality represents a pronounced divergence of emphasis and the systematic deemphasis of concern for advice-giving and directionality, both of which may or may not communicate high levels as well as low levels of respect.

APPENDIX C

Facilitative Genuineness in Interpersonal Processes

A Scale for Measurement<sup>1</sup>

Robert R. Carkhuff

Level 1

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

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

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

Level 2

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

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

In summary, the first person is usually responding according to his prescribed "role" rather than to express what he personally feels or means and when 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 which do not seem insincere but which do not reflect any real involvement either. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

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

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

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

#### Level 5

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

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

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

<sup>1</sup>The present scale, "Facilitative genuineness in interpersonal process" has been derived in part from "A tentative scale for the measurement of therapist genuineness or self-congruence" by C. B. Truax which has been validated in extensive process and outcome research on counseling and psychotherapy (summarized in Truax and Carkhuff, 1967) and in part from an earlier version which has been similarly validated (summarized in Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967). In addition, similar measures of similar constructs have received support in the literature of counseling and therapy and education. The present scale was written to apply to all interpersonal processes and represents a systematic attempt to reduce the ambiguity and increase the reliability of the scale. In the process, many important delineations and additions have been made. For comparative purposes, the levels of the present scale are approximately equal to the stages of the earlier scale, although the systematic emphasis upon the constructive employment of negative reactions represents a pronounced divergence of emphasis.



LIST OF REFERENCES

#### LIST OF REFERENCES

- Alexik, M., & Carkhuff, R. R. The effects of the manipulation of client depth of self-exploration upon high and low functioning counselors. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1967, 23, 212-215.
- Amidon, E. J. A technique for analyzing counselor-counselee interaction. Adams, J. F. (Ed.) Counseling and guidance: A summary view. New York: Macmillan Company, 1965, 50-56.
- Amidon, E. J., & Flanders, N. A. The role of the teacher in the classroom. Minneapolis: Paul S. Amidon and Associates, Inc., 1963.
- Amidon, E. J., & Giammateo, M. The verbal behavior of superior elementary teachers. In Amidon, E. J., & Hough, J. B. (Ed.) Interaction analysis: Theory, research and application. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967, 186-188.
- Amidon, E. J., & Simon, A. Implication for teacher education of interaction analysis research in student teaching. Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1965.
- Ashley, J. D., Ford, D. H., Guernsey, B. G., Jr., & Guernsey, L. Effects on clients of a reflective and a leading type of psychotherapy. Psychological Monographs, 1957, 71, (24, Whole No. 453).
- Bare, C. E. Relationship of counselor personality and counselor-client personality similarity to selected counseling success criteria. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 419-425.
- Bandura, A., Lipsher, D. H., & Miller, P. E. Psychotherapists approach avoidance reactions to patients expressions of hostility. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1960, 24, 1-8.
- Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. Psychological Monographs, 1962, 76, No. 43.

- Berenson, B. G. Level of therapist functioning, patient depth of self-exploration, and type of confrontation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 136-139.
- Berenson, B. G., & Carkhuff, R. R. Sources of gain in counseling and psychotherapy: Readings and commentary. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Berenson, B. G., Mitchell, K. M., & Moravee, J. A. Level of therapist functioning, patient depth of self-exploration, and type of confrontation. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 136-139.
- Bergin, A. E., & Solomon, S. Personality and performance correlates of empathic understanding in psychotherapy. American Psychologist, 1963, 18, 393.
- Bowers, N. D., & Soar, R. S. Studies of human relations in the teaching learning process; Final Report: evaluation of laboratory human relations training for classroom teachers. Cooperative research project No. 469, U.S. Office of Education, 1961.
- Boy, A. V., & Pine, G. J. Client-centered counseling in the secondary school. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963.
- Brams, J. M. Counselor characteristics and effective communication in counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1961, 8, 25-30.
- Callis, R. Counseling. Review of Education Research, 1963, 33, 179-187.
- Carkhuff, R. R., & Alexik, M. Effect of client depth of self-exploration upon high-and low-functioning counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 350-355.
- Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. Beyond counseling and therapy. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- Carkhuff, R. R., Kratochvil, D., & Friel, T. Effects of professional training: Communication and discrimination of facilitative conditions. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 58-74.
- Carkhuff, R. R., Piaget, G., & Pierce, R. The development of skills in interpersonal functioning. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1968, 1, 102-106.
- Cattell, P. B., & Eber, H. W. The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire. Champaign, Ill.: Institute of Personality and Ability Testing, 1962.

- Combs, A. W., & Soper, D. W. The self, its derivative terms and research. In Kuenzli, A. (Ed.) The phenomenological problem. New York: Harper, 1959, 31-48.
- Combs, A. W., & Soper, D. W. The perceptual organization of effective counselors. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 222-226.
- Daane, C. J. A study of emphatic ability and related variables among trained and practicing counselors. Dissertation Abstract, 1955, 11, 2096.
- Daane, C. J., & McGreevy, P. C. The counseling process and function. Review of Educational Research, 1966, 34, 264-273.
- Demos, G. D. The application of certain principles of client-centered therapy to short-term vocational-educational counseling. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 280-294.
- Duncan, D. B. Multiple range and multiple F tests. Biometrics, 1955, 11, 1-42.
- Edwards, A. L. Experimental design in psychological research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966.
- Ferguson, G. A. Statistical analysis in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966.
- Fiedler, F. E. Quantitative studies on the role of therapist's feelings toward their patients. Mowrer, O. H. (Ed.) Psychotherapy: Theory and research. New York: Ronald Press, 1953.
- Fiedler, F. E. The concept of an ideal therapeutic relationship. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1950, 14, 239-245.
- Fiedler, F. E., & Senior, Kate. An exploratory study of unconscious feeling reactions in 15 patient-therapist pairs. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1952, 47, 446-453.
- Flanders, N. A. Teacher behavior and in-service programs. Educational Leadership, 1963, 21, 25-29.
- Flanders, N. A. Interaction analysis in the classroom. Minneapolis: College of Education, University of Minnesota, 1960.
- Frank, G. H., & Sweetland, A. A study of the process of psychotherapy: The verbal interaction. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 135-138.

- Freedman, S. A., Antenen, W. W., & Lister, J. J. Counselor behavior and personality characteristics. Counselor Education and Supervision, 1967, 7, 26-30.
- Furst, N. The effects of training in interaction analysis on the behavior of student teachers in secondary schools. Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1965.
- Grater, H. H. Client preferences for affective or cognitive counselor characteristics and first interview behavior. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1964, 11, 248-250.
- Holder, T., Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. The differential effects of the manipulation of therapeutic conditions upon high and low functioning clients. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 63-66.
- Hough, J. B., & Amidon, E. J. Behavioral change in pre-service teacher training: An experimental study. Philadelphia: College of Education, Temple University, 1964.
- Hough, J. B., & Amidon, E. J. Behavioral change in student teachers. In Amidon, E. J., & Hough, J. B. (Eds.) Interaction analysis: Theory, research and application. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967, 307-314.
- Hough, J. B., & Amidon, E. J. The relationship of personality structure and training in interaction analysis to attitude change during student teaching. Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, 1965.
- Hough, J. B., & Ober, R. The effect of training in interaction analysis on the verbal teaching behavior of pre-service teachers. In Amidon, E. J., & Hough, J. B. (Eds.) Interaction analysis: Theory, research and application. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967, 329-345.
- Kramer, C. Y. Extension of multiple range tests to group means with unequal numbers of replications. Biometrics, 1956, 12, 307-310.
- Lindquist, E. F. Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1953.
- Lohman, E. E., Ober, R., & Hough, J. B. A study of the effects of pre-service training in interaction analysis on the verbal behavior of student teachers. In Amidon, E. J., & Hough, J. B. (Eds.) Interaction analysis: Theory, research and application. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967, 346-359.

- Martin, J. C., Carkhuff, R. R., & Berenson, B. G. Process variables in counseling and psychotherapy: A study of counseling and friendship. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1966, 13, 441-446.
- Miller, T. K. Characteristics of perceived helpers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1965, 43, 687-691.
- Moskowitz, G. The attitudes and teaching patterns of cooperating teachers and student teachers trained in interaction analysis. In Amidon, E. J., & Hough, J. B. (Eds.) Interaction Analysis: Theory, research and application. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967, 271-282.
- Perez, J. F. Counseling: Theory and practice. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1965.
- Piaget, G., Berenson, B. G., & Carkhuff, R. R. The differential effects of the manipulation of therapeutic conditions by high and low functioning counselors upon high and low functioning clients. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1967, 31, 481-486.
- Porter, E. H. An introduction to therapeutic counseling. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1950.
- Rogers, C. R. Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1942.
- Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person: A therapist's view of psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
- Rogers, C. R. The characteristics of a helping relationship. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 1958, 37, 6-16.
- Rogers, C. R. The interpersonal relationship: The core of guidance. Harvard Educational Review, 1962, 32, 416-429.
- Rogers, C. R. The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1957, 21, 95-103.
- Simon, A. The effects of training in interaction analysis on the teacher patterns of student teachers in favored and non-favored classes. Paper read at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, 1967.
- Snyder, W. U. The psychotherapy research program at the Pennsylvania State University. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1957, 4, 9-14.

- Truax, C. B. The process of group psychotherapy: Relationships between hypothesized therapeutic conditions and interpersonal exploration. Psychological Monographs, 1961, 75, (Whole No. 511).
- Truax, C. B. Effective ingredients in psychotherapy: An approach to unraveling the patient-therapist interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1963, 10, 256-263.
- Truax, C. B. Therapist empathy, warmth, and genuineness and patient personality change in group psychotherapy: A comparison between interaction unit measures, time sample measures, patient perception measures. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 1966, 22, 225-229.
- Truax, C. B., & Carkhuff, R. R. Toward effective counseling and psychotherapy: Training and practice. Chicago: Aldine, 1967.
- Van der Veen, F. Effects of the therapist and the patient on each other's therapeutic behavior. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1965, 29, 19-26.
- Voiland, A. L., Grundelach, M. L., & Corner, M. Developing insight in initial interviews. New York: Family Service Association of America, 1947.
- Winer, B. J. Statistical principles in experimental design. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.
- Wrenn, R. L. Counselor orientation: Theoretical or situational? Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1959, 6, 116-120.
- Zahn, R. D. The use of interaction analysis in supervising student teachers. In Amidon, E. J., & Hough, J. B. (Eds.) Interaction analysis: Theory, research and application. Palo Alto: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1967.