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CHAPTER I

Statement of the Problem

The relation between therapist behavior and the outcome of counseling has been a subject of research for many years. However, the findings in this area of inquiry have been inconsistent (Schaffer, 1983, p. 656). While some researchers have suggested that nonspecific factors of therapist behavior are significant determinants of outcome, (Bergin & Lambert, 1978, pp. 303-319; Strupp & Bergin, 1978, pp. 18-90), others have suggested that client variables are the more important determinants of outcomes than are counselor variables (Bergin & Lambert, 1978, pp. 303-319; Gomes & Schwartz, 1978, pp. 1023-1035). Other research has presented evidence to support both conclusions that both client and counselor variables are equally significant determinants of outcome.

However, certain problems exist in the attempts at determining the results of the interaction of these variables, or even to conclude that
counseling is beneficial to the improvement of a client's condition (Smith & Glass, 1977, p. 752). The relative value of the therapeutic relationship has been the subject of dispute, and has provided an ongoing area of theoretical controversy among the various schools of counseling methods (Mahoney, & Arnkoff, 1978; Smith & Glass, 1977). Yet, reviews agree that more needs to be learned about which type of client benefits the most from among the many different methods of treatment. Orlinsky and Howard (1978) point out that there is very little information available regarding the client-counselor interaction.

It is evident that the counseling interview plays a valuable role in producing client change. More practical methods of discovering which elements of the counseling relationship are more fruitful in producing desired outcomes, or more specifically, which variables promote more change throughout the counselor-client interaction is needed.

A number of variables related to client change have already been identified in prior outcome studies. These include, for example, client expressiveness variables, therapist inhibitions, degree of involvement of client and therapist, therapist and client communicative behavior, client and therapist expectations, perceived empathy on the part of the client and the therapist, and the applications of appropriate therapeutic techniques to differing clients (Glass, 1977, p.752; Shaffer, 1983, p. 656). However, such studies have not isolated nor focused upon the behaviors of the counselor which may result in desired
client outcomes. Rather, prior studies tend to present contradictory findings, most likely because of a lack of attention to the behavior of the client and therapist while both were involved in a live therapy session (Shaffer, 1983, p. 656). One purpose of the present study is to focus attention to this point.

Evidence has been generated which suggests that client change is produced by verbal behavior in social conversations and counseling interviews. For example, Beres and Arlow have demonstrated that verbal interaction considerably influences measures of client and counselor empathy on both conscious and unconscious levels (Beres & Arlow, 1974, pp. 26-50). Other outcome studies have demonstrated that the counseling process resulted in an increase of positive self-references by clients and a decrease of negative self-references during the course of therapy. At the conclusion of therapy, clients verbalized more positive self-attitudes than negative ones (Taffle, 1955, p. 51; Greenspoon, 1955, p. 68). It was also found that the counselor’s verbal responses resulted in the client’s perception that the counselor was an empathetic person (Barkham, & Shapiro, 1986, p. 4). It appears obvious, then, that the counselor’s verbal behavior, as an important variable in the counseling process, does influence the client’s self-perception and, thus, influences the therapeutic outcome.

The counseling interview may be viewed as a means of achieving change in clients through verbal expressions between client and counselor (Matarazzo, 1965, p. 403). Counseling interviews range from highly structured, formal processes, to informal settings where structure is less emphasized. In this study, however, certain aspects of the counselor’s behavior are posited to be a primary cause of change
in the client. Thus, the present study focused on the quantity of the counselor’s verbal activity during actual therapy sessions, and the comparative effect that this aspect of the counselor’s behavior had on the outcome of the clients’ therapy over the course of short term treatment. The issues raised by longer periods of treatment are beyond the scope of this study; therefore, the boundaries of short-term therapy are limiting factors of this inquiry.

Research using human observers to encode social behavior has become increasingly popular (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Sackett, 1979; Sameroff, 1975). According to this proposition, understanding behavioral development and current behavioral phenomena proceeds by first describing typical behavioral repertoires. This description provides a baseline from which specific hypotheses are tested (Miller, 1977). Examples include describing interactions of parents with children and relating these early life social interactions to later life behavior, or assessing effects of childhood social interactions in the development of adult sex roles. Much of this observational work has focused on attempting to understand better the factors that may bring about change in outcomes as a result of the counseling process (Bergin & Lambert, 1978; Glass, 1977; Mahoney & Arnkoff, 1978; Marks, 1978). These studies have used human observers who code behaviors from live, film, audio or videotaped material. Test situations vary from laboratory to real world settings. Observational data has focused on patterns of behaviors (Altmann, 1965) occurring at the same time or for sequential chains up to some maximal chain length. Sequential analysis involves a prediction of future behavior from knowledge of current behavior (Sackett, 1980).
Research designs for collecting sequential data employ three basic types of behavior sampling strategies (Sackett, 1979). These are 1) a single behavior emitted successively by a number of potential interactors, 2) many behaviors emitted by a single individual, and 3) a target behavior emitted by a single individual followed by many behaviors of one or more other subjects. For this study, the design strategy selected is described in the chapter on methods.

The attempt was made to identify certain behavioral characteristics of the counselor which may produce predictable results in therapeutic outcomes following short term treatment. Specifically, this study examined proposed relationship between the quantity of counselors' verbalizations and the degree to which clients experience change during short term counseling. Also identified and measured were other qualitative characteristics of counselor personality as related to client outcomes.

It has been reported that by focusing on the communicative behavior of the therapist, clients are able to discern accurately the attitudes and feelings of their therapists (Butler, 1952, pp. 366-378; Ellis, 1955, p. 7; Snyder, 1946, p. 491) and that these perceived attitudes can affect the therapeutic outcome (Wolberg, 1954, p. 243). However, in prior outcome studies, little attention has been focused on what might be termed as the communicative style of the therapist (Langs, 1978, p. 563; Greenson, 1967, p. 468). For example, some research suggests that irrespective of the methods of counseling being employed, the only agent of client change throughout the therapeutic process is to be found in the counselor-client relationship itself (Truax, 1967, p. 21), which is to say that counselor-client behavior and interaction.
are so intimately interconnected that it is not possible to separate out the distinct variables which affect outcomes.

A specific goal of this research, then, is to investigate the variables of therapist behavior, interacting with clients, that effects outcomes.

Research Questions

This study raises questions regarding the effects of counselor verbal behavior upon measures of client change. It has been pointed out by researchers that there are numerous variables which influence counseling outcomes (Schaffer, 1983), though difficulties have existed in targeting them specifically for investigation. This study sought to explore whether or not, and to what extent, differences would be present in client outcomes, based upon the verbal behavior of counselors, referred to in this study as counselor interactive style.

Upon exposure to many counseling situations, it became apparent to the researcher that each counselor had her or his unique verbal habits in their approach to clients. Among these differences, various counselors spoke more during an interview while some spoke considerably less. The frequency at which counselors intervened verbally with their clients during therapy was also noticed and seemed to differentiate more verbally active counselors from those counselors who were less verbal. These observations raised questions about what impact this difference might have upon clients. Therefore, another goal of this study was to investigate how counseling outcomes would differ between the client populations of these two types of counselors.

Additional questions were raised regarding possible perceptual
differences made by observers of counselors and to what degree
counselor style determines the inferences drawn by observers about the
counselor’s personality

Null Hypothesis

This study tested the null hypothesis that no significant
differences in outcome can be shown between subjects participating in
therapy programs of different counseling interactive styles.

Limits

The following section discusses the limitations of this study and
specifically addresses 1) problems relating to the counselors and
raters, 2) problems relating to the clients, 3) problems with
diagnosis, and 4) problems of controls.

Problems Relating to the Counselors

A potential error existed in the observations made by the
counselors. Conclusions about client behavior may have been a
projection of the counselor’s ideas and values, subtly communicated to,
and fed back by, the client upon certain stimulation.

Repeatedly, the counselor is confronted with verbalizations from
clients which seem to validate specific beliefs espoused by the coun-
selor. Glover (1952) points out that "there is a tendency in the
training situation to perpetuate error." This error may have been
carried over to the client who was the recipient of the counselor’s
attitudes and values, regardless of the differences in the counselor’s
The counselor’s dedication to his particular counseling method was an important factor during the interview. If he showed any skepticism, it may have been interpreted by the client as unsureness or lack of belief in the counselor’s own interview method. The client’s expectation of help may have been influenced, thereby reducing faith in the counselor.

Counselor bias also extends to the selection of clients. Results may have been affected by a restricted sample, since counselors could not select clients who would respond best to their particular mode of treatment. Counselor perceptions also may have affected the diagnostic criteria for each client of different counselor treatment groups.

Problems Relating to the Clients

Although clients are not professional judges as to what may be occurring throughout the counseling process, they are qualified to testify regarding the effectiveness of the counseling effort. Clients may prove to be reluctant witnesses. Asking clients to submit to psychological studies, interviews with observers or research workers, and follow-up manipulations may negate the counseling process by limiting or otherwise affecting the verbal transactions between client and counselor.

The clients’ progress is often overshadowed by resistance. Convictions of what is desired from counseling may conflict with the objectives set forth by the counselor. For example, the client may feel that the counseling sessions have been successful, while the counselor may feel that the client is only moderately improved, since destructive
life patterns have not yet been altered or eliminated. Therefore, client perception regarding treatment may be difficult to obtain.

Problems of Diagnosis

Another factor that may have been a limitation of this research was that psychological diagnostic systems were in a state of change. Well trained practitioners examining similar client cases may have arrived at different diagnoses, despite research attempts to establish some unity among the diagnostic categories.

Clients were selected on the basis of being diagnostically determined as depressed due to this being a common problem reported in the initial phase of treatment. This also provided a more homogeneous population to be studied, and eliminated inappropriate comparisons among subjects and between treatment groups.

Problems Relating to the Sample

The method by which the population was selected and the limited number of subjects may have created a sampling bias in the evaluation of a counseling system (Gay, 1976, pp. 76-80). Many counselors may have screened clients, choosing for treatment only those whose problems were, in their opinion, best suited to the counselor’s methods and skills.

Another limiting factor may have been differences of cultural and subcultural backgrounds, educational backgrounds, socio-economic status, and gender of the persons comprising the sample. Client outcomes may be influenced to a marked degree by conditions regarding the social environment from which the client emerges and to which the
client must adapt after treatment is complete. Analyzing for these differences may help reduce error in generalizing outcome results beyond the sample to other populations.

Problems of Controls

The statistical analysis (Miller, 1954, pp. 130-137), and the use of the principles of randomization (Gay, 1970, pp. 69-70), did not resolve the problem that no matter how much the data was manipulated by devices at the researcher’s disposal, results would be dependent upon the skill and experience of the counselors. It has been fairly well established that competent counselors get approximately the same results, regard- less of their theoretical and methodological differences (Fiedler, 1950, pp. 239-245).

Definitions

Attitude: Attitude refers to a mental state of perception, organized through life experience, that exerts direct influence upon an individual’s personal belief system.

Counseling: When used in this study, counseling means the professional application of established principles of learning, motivation, perception, thinking and emotional relationships to problems of evaluation, behavior, and attitude adjustment. Counseling includes the use of these principles of learning with clients who have problems regarding self, family, or with interpersonal relationships.

Interactive Style: The characteristic, self-consistent mode of verbal behavior which counselors demonstrate throughout their
counseling process. High and Low Interactive styles refer to the frequency at which different counselors verbally interact during a given counseling session.

**Therapeutic Change:** In this study therapeutic change is operationally defined as the differences between pre- and post-test of client’s self-orientation before treatment and feelings regarding self-orientation after treatment.
CHAPTER II

Review of the Literature

Introduction

This chapter reviews the research literature in the areas of counseling and client change, and explores the theoretical ties between them. Research studies cited are relevant to the two primary constructs of this study, counseling outcomes and counselor-client attitudes and expectations.

This study focuses on certain differences between counselors' verbal behavior and their affects upon the outcomes of clients undergoing short term therapy, which differences were identified as the amount of talking exhibited by the counselor relative to the amount of talking exhibited by the client.

Outcome measures focused on the Time and Support Ratio Scales, and ten subscales of the Personal Orientation Inventory. The Time and Support Scales cover two major areas important in personal development and interpersonal interaction (Shostrom, 1974). The support scale was designed to measure whether an individual's behavior is characteristically "self" oriented or "other" directed. Self-oriented individuals are motivated by internal principles and values, while "other" directed persons are motivated by environment or external pressures such as peer groups (Shostrom, 1974).
The Time Scale measures the degree to which an individual lives in the present, as contrasted with the past or future. The Time Competent person lives in the present with awareness of the here and now. The Time Incompetent person lives in the past with guilts and regrets, or in the future with idealized goals, expectations, predictions and fears (Shostrom, 1974).

Additionally, a panel of raters evaluated each counselor for particular personality characteristics which were measured by an eleven scale Semantic Differential. There are several possible theoretical relationships between the Time and Support scores on the P.O.I. scales and the Semantic Differential. Both of these instruments are designed to assess particular personality characteristics of clients and counselors. Further research may be needed in exploring the correlations between scores achieved by clients on the pre- and post-P.O.I., and counselor’s ratings on the Semantic Differential.

While the P.O.I. measures an individual’s level of functioning relative to certain areas of interpersonal interaction, the Semantic Differential is oriented toward scoring specific behavioral traits observed throughout interpersonal interaction. There may be a statistical relationship between these two measures. It is possible that an individual may score poorly on the Time and Support scales, yet demonstrate behavior which suggests otherwise. It may also be conceivable that an individual demonstrates undesirable interaction behavior, as measured on the Semantic Differential, though score Time and Support competent on the P.O.I. Outcomes achieved by clients on the P.O.I. pre- and post-tests, and counselors’ scores on the Semantic Differential may correlate with each other.
There are also possible implications regarding the mutual selections made by counselors and clients as to who they prefer to choose for a counseling relationship. High scoring clients on the P.O.I. may select only counselors capable of demonstrating desirable interaction behavior as measured on the Semantic Differential. Counseling outcomes may also be influenced by either the similarities or differences achieved by counselors and clients on these two instruments.

Although there were a variety of difficulties in measuring the outcomes of counseling and client therapeutic change, this study was concerned with 1) identifying qualitative differences in verbal behavior among counselors, 2) developing criteria to assess client change as effected by the verbal behavior of the therapist, and 3) discovering differences among counselors in verbal behavior which may promote a desired outcome.

The literature review will cover the theoretical areas of counseling and attitude change, and some of the more important factors affecting these elements of interaction. Three models of attitude change theory are presented which have been influential in the literature regarding cognitive consistency and interpersonal communication.

Since resistance to change is an essential problem encountered throughout the counseling process, some resistance tactics, called alternatives to attitude change, are presented. Factors which have been observed to promote attitude change are also mentioned. These may be of importance in determining client-counselor selection. Research studies also reviewed are concerned with the development of meaningful criteria with which to evaluate outcomes as well as the efficacy of
counseling. Theory and research regarding communication interactions and the counseling process are discussed, as are prior outcome studies and the limitations of research designs in evaluating counseling effects.

Attitude Change

Hovland and Janis (1959) suggested a model of attitude change. Hovland and Janis theorized that a communicator who is attempting to convince others to adopt a position must produce a message designed to persuade the listener that his position is correct. Of particular concern are the issues of the attack, the source, the message, and the environment (Hovland, Janis, and Kelly, 1953).

The attitude change situation has been described by these writers as one in which the individual is confronted with a communication that espouses a position discrepant from his own. Under such circumstances, tension is produced by the discrepancy between the attitude held by the listener and the attitude expressed in the message. This tension-producing discrepancy has been variously referred to as conflict, incongruity, imbalance, or inconsistency. In such a situation there is strong pressure for the listener to resolve the tension by adopting the position of the message.

Most of the research since Hovland, et al., has focused on two main areas of concern. The first focus is on the strengthening of attitudes held regarding others, while the second focus is on changing the direction of self-attitudes to which people adhere (McGuire, 1966).

Furthermore, according to McGuire, a number of variables related to attitude change have been isolated. These include 1) feedback
information that is available to persons, 2) the range of experiences available to them, 3) their personal needs and self-attitudes, 4) the degree to which others share their needs and attitudes, and 5) their group affiliations. McGuire found that attitudes held by individuals change not only toward positions for which experts' supporting statements have been presented, but also on related issues not specifically referred to in the initial messages. In a study when an attitude questionnaire was administered one week after the treatment, the amount of attitude change was greater. Thus, there seemed to be a "sleeper" effect in regard to attitude change (McGuire, 1961).

Other research has discovered ways of increasing attitude change. For example, if an individual’s attitudes are changed in the direction advocated by the message, the discomfort experienced by the listener is reduced. Since inconsistency is the source of the discomfort, reducing the inconsistency reduces the discomfort. Theorists contend that the existence of inconsistency is uncomfortable, that it acts as a drive much like hunger, and that the subject does what can be done to reduce this discomfort. Waterman (1969), Pallack (1970), and Pallack and Pittman (1972) have demonstrated that a drive is aroused in individuals to reduce discomfort. These studies have shown that attitudes do have moderate to strong relationships with relevant behaviors. This evidence is important in supporting the idea that attitudes affect behavior. Thus, tensions arising from inconsistency produce behavior or outcomes that correspond with attitudes.

This is however, only one alternative. Throughout the discussion of the factors affecting the amount of attitude change in such a situation, it is important to keep in mind that subjects have open to
them a variety of ways of resolving the discomfort. The emphasis on so-called alternative modes of resolution is one of the important contributions of Carl Hovland's model of attitude change, and of the cognitive consistency models (Hovland, Janis & Kelly, 1953).

One of the assumptions generally made about the various modes of resolution is that they tend to be additive in their effect. To the extent that one of them is used in a given situation, the others need not be used. There is a certain amount of discomfort to be reduced or resolved in an attitude change situation; any mode of resolution, if used successfully, would reduce some of that discomfort. The individual who rejects the communicator is less likely to change his opinion or distort the communication and the individual who changes his opinion is less likely to reject the communicator.

From the communicator's perspective a primary objective is to maximize the likelihood that the target will change attitudes as a mode of resolution and to minimize or even eliminate the need for alternative modes of resolution. Therefore, a critical factor in any attitude-change situation is whether or not alternative modes of resolution are present and, if they are, the extent to which they are used.

However, the relationship between discrepancy and amount of change is not altogether so easy to predict. While it may be true that there is more discomfort with greater discrepancy, this does not always produce more change. One relevant proposition is that the greater the perceived inconsistency between message and attitudes, the more difficult it seems to be for the individual to change attitudes; it is much easier to discredit the communicator or the message. Thus, the most extreme discrepancies often result in a radical reduction in the
credibility of the message. This most interesting relationship between message and receiver has been broadly investigated (Freedman, 1964; Bochner and Insko, 1966; Rhine and Severance, 1970; Eagly and Telaak, 1972). From the point of view of the communicator, a major problem is to maximize the likelihood that the subject will choose attitude change as the mode of discomfort resolution, and to minimize or eliminate the use of alternate modes of resolution. Therefore, a critical factor in the attitude change situation is whether or not alternative modes of resolution are present and, if they are, the extent to which they are used. The following discussion briefly describes some important alternatives and factors which an individual can use rather than change attitudes.

Alternatives to Attitude Change

Refuting the Arguments

Individuals can attempt to refute the arguments contained in the discrepant communication. They can engage in a debate with the content of the communication and attempt to demonstrate to themselves that their own position has more merit than the others. This debate can be implicit or explicit, verbal or nonverbal, perhaps even conscious or unconscious. They can argue against the discrepant communication, produce evidence to support their own position, show how the other side is illogical or inconsistent, and in general do anything they can to weaken the impact of the communication. To the extent that they are able to refute these arguments, the discomfort should be reduced.
Rejecting the Arguments

Rather than trying to refute the arguments on logical grounds or weakening them by attacking their source, individuals are able to reject arguments for no apparent reason.

Derogating the Source

Someone who is faced with a discrepant communication can reduce the tension by deciding that the source of the communication is unreliable or negative in some other way, and thus can re-establish the balance.

Distorting the Message

Another type of resolution is to distort or alter the perception of the communication so as to reduce the inconsistency between the message and the attitude. The listener may even exaggerate the extremity of the communication so as to make it appear ridiculous.

Hovland has suggested that the distortion of a message follows certain rules. When a discrepant position is quite close to that of an individual, he perceives it as closer than it actually is. When it is quite far away, he perceives it as farther away than it is. These two processes are called assimilation and contrast (Hovland, 1953).

Both kinds of misperceptions should reduce the tension in an attitude-change situation. Assimilating the discrepant position makes it seem closer than it actually is. This reduces the amount of discrepancy and, accordingly, the amount of discomfort. The opposite tendency, exaggerating the discrepancy of an already distant communication, makes the communication so extreme that it loses its credibility. Thus, both assimilation and contrast are effective means of
Factors Affecting Attitude Change

Although there are many variables that affect attitude change, they can all be described in terms of two general factors: trust in the persuasive message and the strength of the message itself. If the receiver does not perceive the message or its source to be relatively credible, then the message is not likely to change any attitudes. Similarly, if the message strength is not enough to produce a change, nor inconsistent enough to produce the necessary tension, there simply will not be a change. In order to produce an attitude change, a message must be trusted.

Conversely, the more trustworthy the source and the message, the more likely the target is to accept what the communicator says and the more likely it is that attitudes will change.

The Source of the Communication

One of the most straightforward and reliable findings is that the greater the prestige of the communicator, the more attitude change is produced. Prestige refers primarily to how expertly the communicator is perceived to be in the area of concern and how much he is respected by the individual receiving the communication.

This effect of prestige was demonstrated in a study by Hovland and Weiss (1952). Their findings indicated that communications attributed to high-prestige sources produced more change than those from low-prestige sources.
A similar effect is produced when the target thinks the communicator does not intend for him to hear the communication. People tend to be more influenced when they accidentally overhear a persuasive communication than when it is directed at them (Walster & Festinger, 1962; Brock & Beckner, 1965). This effect also seems to be due to the perceived credibility of the communicator. If he knows people are listening, he may try to convince them and may not be entirely honest. If he does not know anyone is within earshot, it is less likely that he is being dishonest. People are more likely to believe the message in the latter case and are therefore more likely to be convinced.

Liking

A communicator who is trusted is more difficult to reject, and the message should produce more attitude change. According to Kelman (1961), liking produces attitude change because people try to identify with a liked communicator, and thus tend to adopt whatever attitudes, tastes, or modes of behavior he does. His reasons or arguments for his attitudes are not very important. On the other hand, expertness produces attitude change because people pay more attention to an expert's arguments, and consider them more seriously, than they do a nonexpert's arguments.

Mills and Harvey (1972) tested this theory by varying the timing of information about the communicators: Some subjects were told of the communicators' attractiveness before reading the message, and others learned about the communicators only after reading the message. Mills and Harvey reasoned that the attractive source would produce attitude change in either case, because all the subject needed to know was the
communicators' opinions in order to identify with them and accept their positions. On the other hand, learning after the message that the communicator was an expert would do no good, because the opportunity to scrutinize and consider their arguments more carefully would have been lost by that time. Their hypotheses were supported. The attractive communicators were equally effective in producing attitude change whether they were described before or after the message, but the expert communicators produced attitude change only when they were described before the subjects read the message. Thus, in terms of both increased liking and shared perspectives, the greater the similarity between the source and recipient of a discrepant communication, the more attitude change is produced.

There are two important reasons why reference groups are so effective at producing attitude change and creating attitudes. If people value a group, it is a high prestige, highly credible, highly esteemed source of communication. When the group says something, each member tends to trust it and believe the message. In addition, because they consider themselves members of the group, they tend to evaluate themselves in comparison with it. In essence, the group serves as the standard for their own behavior and attitudes. They evaluate the group highly and want to be similar to the other members.

The balance model would support this concept. If someone is similar to another on many dimensions and agrees on most things but disagrees on one issue, some imbalance is produced by the disagreement. This imbalance is resolved by changing either all the things which are already agreed, thereby making disagreement on everything, or changing the stand on the one source of disagreement. Obviously it is
Attitude Theory

The Balance Model

As an attempt to explain the relationship between similarity and liking, Fritz Heider (1958) proposed a theory of cognitive balance or, as it is commonly referred to, the balance model. The basic assumption behind this model is that people tend to prefer consistency. They want things to fit together and to be logical and harmonious, and this holds for their own beliefs, cognitions, thoughts, and feelings. In particular, people want their feelings about other people and objects to be consistent.

The second assumption of the balance model is that imbalance configurations tend to shift toward balanced ones, and it is this assumption that gives the model its importance. Unstable systems produce pressures toward change and continue this pressure until they are balanced.

The change from imbalance to balance can occur in many ways. Any of the relations may be altered to produce balance. In essence, the balance model states that similar people like each other because liking makes their cognitive systems more balanced. It could be said that the model simply restates, in other terms, the idea described above that people with similar attitudes have less conflict. However, the balance model does take a somewhat different position. The model states that it is unpleasant enough for an individual simply to know that someone easier to change an attitude on the one issue, and that is what would be expected.
disagrees in order to avoid interaction with the source of the message.

A final point of the balance model is that the effect of similarity on liking is further strengthened by the fact that we tend to exaggerate the similarity between ourselves and someone similar to us and the dissimilarity between ourselves and someone different from us. If we like someone, we tend to exaggerate how similar he is to us, and if we dislike someone, we tend to exaggerate how different he is from us.

**Congruity Theory**

Congruity theory, proposed by Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955), is another useful model of cognitive consistency. Dealing with simpler situations than does the balance model, congruity theory is concerned entirely with the effect of one person taking a positive or negative position toward another object or person. A brief, detailed discussion of congruity theory follows because the present study incorporates a semantic differential instrument as a means of measuring positive and negative evaluation of counselor traits.

To begin with, the theory measures evaluation of any person or object on a scale from -3 to +3. A rating of +3 indicated a maximum positive evaluation of the object; a rating of -3 indicates a maximum negative evaluation of it; and a rating of 0 indicates a neutral attitude toward it.

The theory makes several predictions about how another person's evaluation of the object affects a third individual's evaluation of both of them. First, to achieve congruity, evaluation of the two must change an amount equal to the discrepancy between them, so final evaluation depends on the discrepancy between the third person's
initial evaluations of them.

Second, a positive association between the two induces attitude changes toward consistency, which would be identical evaluations of the person and the object. Conversely, a negative association between the two induces change toward opposite evaluations of them. In all cases, the ratings of the two would be equally extreme, but they would be on the same side of neutral (e.g., both +2 or both -2).

Third, the amount that each evaluation changes depends on its initial, relative position. The more extreme an evaluation, the less it will change.

The main application of congruity theory is in the prediction of a communicator's effectiveness in producing attitude change.

One contribution of this analysis is that it emphasizes the existence of varying degrees of positive or negative evaluations. The balance model considers objects as either positive or negative evaluations, but congruity theory takes into account the fact that the strength of evaluations is an important factor in attitude-change situations.

Dissonance Theory

Perhaps the most important of the cognitive consistency theories is cognitive dissonance theory, as proposed by Festinger (1957). The focus of dissonance theory has been upon inconsistencies between beliefs and overt behavior. Dissonance theory focuses upon two principal sources of belief-behavior inconsistency: the effects of making decisions, and the effects of engaging in counterattitudinal behavior.
Such inconsistencies produce cognitive dissonance, which may be reduced in a number of different ways.

Festinger proposed that each alternative involved in a decision could be thought of as having positive and negative attributes. When a person makes a decision between two alternatives, the positive attributes of the chosen alternative, and the negative attributes of the rejected alternative, are consistent (or consonant, in the terms of dissonance theory) with the decision. That is, these attitudes about the choice alternatives are consistent with the overt behavior of deciding. However, dissonance arises because usually the chosen object has some bad attributes, and the rejected object has some good ones. Both represent cognitions that are dissonant with the decision.

There are also cases in which people engage in behavior which is counter to their attitudes. The point here is that engaging in behavior discrepant from attitudes leads to cognitive dissonance.

In cases involving attitude-behavior discrepancies, the two modes of dissonance reduction are rejecting the behavior in some way or changing one’s attitudes.

Summary of Attitude Theory

The balance model, the congruity model, or dissonance theory have not been described in great detail. Only main points of the theories have been presented because they have been influential within the theories of cognitive consistency. Balance theory has been used most widely to deal with attraction within interpersonal relationships, especially with similar attitudes as a basis for attraction between people. It has also been widely applied to consistency among various
parts of an attitude structure. Congruity theory has been applied principally to inconsistencies arising in mass communication situations when a communicator takes a position disagreeing with his listener's opinion. And dissonance theory has been concerned with how an individual resolves inconsistencies between his attitudes and his overt behavior. All these models agree on two major points; that when there is inconsistency, there is a tendency for a system to move toward more consistent structures.

Counseling and Attitude Change

Client change in a therapeutic counseling framework is affected by the interactive behavior of the counselor. Good (1952, p. 184) found that clients who experienced attitudinal change expected more from their psychotherapists than clients who perceived their psychotherapists in a negative manner, and that the duration of therapy was related to both therapist and client expectation of client personality change.

It was discovered that the therapist's attitudes regarding prognosis, when communicated to the client, also influence the client's motivation for improvement (Strupp & Williams, 1960, pp. 434-440). This attitudinal variable of expectation has been examined by Goldstein (1960, p. 180-184), who found that clients and counselors differ in their expectations concerning the rate at which improvement should occur and how much overall progress should be anticipated. A relationship between client expectation of change and subsequent personality change in psychotherapy has also been noted by Rosenthal
and Frank (1956, pp. 294-302). Lipkin (1954, p. 374) writes:

The client who anticipates that his experience in counseling will be a successful and gratifying one, undergoes more change in personality structure than does the client who has reservations about the counseling experience.

Another observer of the counseling process has stated that the client's concept of counseling determines how extensively he can envision therapeutic change within himself; that if the client envisions only certain minor adjustments in his life as constituting counseling, he will not be prepared to effect sweeping changes in his style of life (Kelly, 1949, p. 252).

Research has also demonstrated that placebo administrations are as effective as short-term counseling in client improvement. Frank (1979, p. 296) showed evidence indicating that placebo reactivity is an adequate influence of therapeutic change in a variety of helping situations. Observed client attitude change has been related to nonspecific treatment factors designed to impart a belief to the client that he was receiving counseling when, in fact, he was being administered a psychological placebo (Frank, 1979, p. 296).

The major thesis of the placebo reaction hypothesis is that client improvement is partially a result of the clients' belief in the system being used to help them deal with their problems. It follows, then, that other counseling methods can be as effective in producing change in similar clients. Although client attitude change can also be the result of counselor persuasibility which raises the client's expectation for improvement, there are other factors which significantly influence the client's response to counseling treatments.
Discussing client expectation in therapy and its effects upon outcomes, Rotter (1954, p. 85) states that different therapeutic treatment procedures, usualness of therapy, frequency of visits and client-related past experiences also influenced the degree of client personality change.

A study by Cartwright and Cartwright indicated that the client's feelings toward self during the course of counseling influenced the proportion of attitudinal change (1958, pp. 174-177). Among the counseling studies involving measured client attitude change, over the course of therapy, there were an increase of verbalized positive client self-references and a decrease of negative verbalized self-references; following therapy, positive client self-references were expressed more often than negative self-regarding attitudes (Cabush and Edwards, 1976, pp. 34-38). Statements made by individuals in the course of talking about themselves have been found to influence both positive and negative self-attitudes (Taffel, 1955, pp. 496-504; Greenspoon, 1955, pp. 409-416).

Changing attitudes towards self has been a focus of the self-help theories. Self-help theory is oriented to assist clients modify what they say to themselves. Bem (1967) has demonstrated that self-verbalization plays a major role in determining clients' behavioral and emotional responses. The focus of this semantic treatment has been in helping clients change the content of their self-verbalizations. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) were able to train clients to use in facilitative self-talk in ways which furthered the process of self-exploration, growth and attitude change. Once clients learned self-responding skills they were able to employ them as a self-help program across wide
varieties of personal and social problems. Carkhuff (1971) states that self-talk is an internalized interpersonal process that helps clients learn to respond to significant others. Pierce and Drasgo (1967) were able to help hospitalized clients make constructive changes in their self-verbalizations. Pierce and Drasgo also found that by using semantic therapy the hospital population became superior in self-help skills than other groups which were treated with drugs, group therapy, or a combination of the two modes of treatment. Providing the client with relevant skills for facilitating and maintaining self-verbalizations has been shown to result in attitude change.

Robert Bales (1970, pp. 472-473), in discussing the influences of verbal interaction upon client outcomes, has devised a system that makes it possible to analyze a complex communication in terms of a relatively small number of categories and, thereby, to describe the interaction with a manageable number of quantitative measures. Every communication, both verbal and nonverbal, is placed into categories: a) showing disagreement or agreement; b) tension or tension release; c) solidarity or antagonism; and d) giving or asking for suggestions, opinions, and information.

Analyses of this kind indicate that there is a marked difference in the communication of people interacting within a group. The difference in function becomes most apparent when the group is working on a specific task or toward some goal. It also appears in other circumstances as well. One distinction is that the same person tends to be the social leader throughout the existence of the group, whereas the task leader can change according to the requirements of a particular task. When special skills are needed, someone who has these may assume this
role temporarily. Generally, one person retains the role of leader in most situations (Bales, 1970, p. 317).

This system which measures group interaction is designed to score only overt behavior and no attempt is made to deduce an individual's feelings during an interaction. Bales' categories measure a person's emotional reactive and cognitive qualities. Each communication is broken down into distinct parts and each part is scored separately (Bales 1970). If a person says, "I agree with you," it is scored "shows agreement," even if the individual appears to be angry at the other person. Although emotions are important elements in group interaction, they could not be scored accurately by simply observing the interaction process. There was disagreement among observers. Therefore, this system deals with them insofar as they are expressed verbally. Despite this limitation, the system does allow a specification of the kinds of interactions taking place, and the role each member is verbally playing the group. The point here is that simple verbal activity appears to be a critical factor in determining the role individuals assume in the interaction process.

Benedek (1953, pp. 201-208) has concluded that the personality of the counselor has a direct influence on client change. Cabush and Edwards (1976, pp. 34-38) have concluded that the counselors' behavior is so intimately interconnected with the behavior of the client that observation of the counselor is a necessary precondition of understanding the client. The counselor's physique, age, sex, cultural education, sense of values, and sincerity may never be touched upon in treatment, but they play an integral role in the counseling process; all have a bearing on that which creates the therapeutic environment
existing between the therapist and client (Berman, 1949, pp. 159-166; Butler, 1952, pp. 366-378; Ellis, 1963, p. 7).

Client attitudes are influenced by the persuasive factors of the counselor though this may also have an adverse affect, which causes people to develop resistance and defense against being persuaded to foreign points of view (Linton, 1959).

William McGuire conducted a series of experiments on the effects of giving people experiences designed to increase their ability to resist persuasion. McGuire has used a medical analogy to describe the influence situation. He pictured the individual faced with a discrepant communication as being similar to somebody being attacked by a virus or a disease. The stronger the persuasive message, the more damage it would do; and the stronger the person's defenses, the better able he is to resist persuasion. McGuire held that there are two different ways of strengthening someone's defense against persuasion.

One procedure that strengthens resistance is to build up the person's opinion directly, by giving the individual additional arguments supporting his original position. Thus, one way of increasing somebody's resistance to persuasion is simply to give him more reasons for believing what he already does.

A different approach is to strengthen the individual's defenses against persuasion rather than to strengthen his opinion. McGuire has argued that, as with diseases, the effective way of increasing resistance is to build up defenses. If a particular opinion has never been attacked, it is extremely vulnerable because no defenses have been built up around it.

This is accomplished by weakly attacking the individual's
attitude. The attack must be weak or it would change his attitude. To be certain that this does not occur, the target is helped to defend himself against the mild attack. He is given an argument directed specifically at the attack or is told that the attack is not very good and he should be able to refute it (McGuire and Papageorgis, 1961). In refuting the mild attack, the individual uses and exercises his defenses by preparing arguments supporting his own position, constructing counterarguments against the opposing position, and derogating the possible sources of opposing views. This makes each of these defensive mechanisms stronger and provides the individual with a generally more effective defensive position.

Another factor is that giving the target a counterargument or telling him that the original argument is not good, diminishes the credibility of the source of the discrepant communication.

Personality researchers have explored individuals differences and persuasibility. A review of the related literature on the relationship between personality and persuasion supports the following conclusions: People who can be persuaded to change their attitudes, beliefs and opinions easily tend to have a strong need for social approval and security, to be conformers, to admire others, to experience feelings of inadequacy and inferiority, and to have a weak and passive self-image, and to think uncritically (Linton, 1959). Research shows some people are generally more persuasible than others, regardless of the issue involved or the type of influence being attempted. Experiments have been conducted in which subjects were exposed to persuasive communications on a variety of issues with different types of appeals and arguments and in different attitude-change situations. They indicated
that the subjects who were highly persuadable under one set of conditions tended to be highly persuadable under others (Hovland and Janis, 1959).

One finding has been that subjects with low self-esteem tend to be more persuadable than those with high self-esteem. The variable has been defined in various ways. Low self-esteem has been considered to entail feelings of inadequacy, social inhibitions, social anxiety, and test anxiety. Self-esteem has also been defined as the discrepancy between the ideal and the actual self, with greater discrepancies indicating lower self-esteem. Self-esteem also defined as the worth the person places on himself.

Cohen (1959) gave subjects a chance to influence one another and found that high self-esteem subjects tended to make more attempts to influence others than did low self-esteem subjects, and that low self-esteem subjects were more easily persuaded than were high self-esteem subjects. Sears (1967) found that making subjects socially anxious by threatening them with criticism for their views increased their susceptibility to persuasion.

Cohen explains the effect of self-esteem in terms of the kinds and effectiveness of the defenses used by high and low self-esteem people. He posited that high-self-esteem people tend to be better able to deny or forget information that attacks them or their ideas. Low self-esteem people, on the other hand, tend to be relatively sensitive to negative information and are therefore more affected by it.

Another explanation of the relationship between self-esteem and persuasibility is that low self-esteem people place a low value on their opinions just as they do on everything else about themselves.
Since they do not value their own opinions, they are less reluctant to give them up and are more likely to change them when they are attacked (Janis & Field, 1959).

Evaluating the Counseling Process

In evaluating the counseling process, there are difficulties in attempting to measure the results of counseling or to verify the empirical proposition that it is helpful (Pepinski, 1953, pp. 291-294; Smith & Glass, 1977 p. 725; Schaffer, 1983, p. 656). The literature shows that exploration of the relationship between client and counselor has been researched primarily on physical, behavioral and linguistic levels, however these have been difficult to study in a framework of traditional empirical research (Larson, 1986, p. 1276).

Pepinski (1953, pp. 291-294), has cited the limitations of research design studies in evaluating the effects of counseling, including a) uncontrollable stimuli impinging upon the client from outside the counseling setting, b) difficulty in establishing controls for variables within the counseling setting, c) lack of adequate testing in setting up meaningful criteria to evaluate change, and d) lack of criterion measures. There have also been inconsistent findings between research studies about the relationship between therapist behavior and client outcome. Some research has attributed this problem to the neglect of in-therapy behavior of both client and therapist (Schaffer, 1983, p. 656).

Even though the argument between scholars and clinicians regarding the effectiveness of counseling has been going on for years, more data is necessary to substantiate claims that counseling results in client
improvement (Smith & Glass, 1977, p. 760). According to this comprehensive survey of nearly 400 controlled evaluations of psychotherapy and counseling, there is virtually no data to support the superiority of any one counseling method over another. This is by no means an indication that counseling is unproductive, but again reflects the difficulty of empirical testing to demonstrate concrete results of compared methods.

In the Smith & Glass analysis of the results of evaluations of psychotherapy and counseling, it was concluded that the typical therapy client was "better off" than seventy-five per cent of untreated individuals (Smith & Glass, 1977, p. 725), though little criteria has been established upon which to measure the improvement of specific personality characteristics of clients alleged to be affected by counseling (Schaffer, 1983, p. 656).

Williamson and Bordin (1941, pp. 5-24) recognized the importance of the criteria to be employed in evaluating the counseling process and stress the importance of the counselor's underlying attitudes. They pointed out that the counselor's attitudes are often based on a belief that the effectiveness of counseling is self-evident, and that counseling is not accessible to evaluation because the process is so personal that evaluation would be disruptive in and of itself.

Work by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957) on the semantic differential showed the overwhelming importance of basic dimensions and, in particular, of the evaluative dimension. Subjects were given a list of pairs of words denoting opposite ends of various dimensions and were asked to indicate where on these dimensions they felt particular concepts, persons, objects, and ideas fell. The list consisted of such
dimensions as happy-sad, hot-cold, and red-blue.

When the subjects' responses were collected, Osgood and his associates analyzed them to see if any clusters of adjectives emerged that could be considered basic dimensions on which all things had been described. They found that three dimensions accounted for a large percentage of the variation in all descriptions. By determining where subjects had placed a particular item on the dimensions of evaluation (good-bad), potency (strong-weak), and activity (active-passive), the experimentors needed little additional information in order to describe that item fully. To a large extent, all other dimensions (e.g., brave-scared, polite-blunt) were simply aspects of these major dimensions.

This method has been most useful when applied to the perception of people. Impressions of people can also be described in terms of the three basic dimensions, but one dimension evaluation, accounts for a major amount of the variance in them and appears to be the main distinction made.

Research has used much more sophisticated evaluative techniques, but has mainly served to emphasize these early results. Evaluation remains the most important underlying dimension of person perception (Rosenberg & Olshan, 1970).

The three basic dimensions of the semantic differential help to illustrate and explain the differences in perception among people, with the evaluative dimension accounting for a majority of the variance. When evaluating personalities, however, it becomes much more difficult and complicated because this often involves inferences about internal states. In evaluating persons, variables such as motives, feelings, personalites and attitudes must be considered. Inferences regarding
variables such as these are often made on the basis of limited information, due to the fact that persons are accessible only by external cues as gestures, facial expressions or verbal behavior. What a person says about his internal state may be the only information by which to evaluate.

In summary, evaluating personalities is accomplished only through indirect information given by external cues, and inferences about internal states are deduced from these. Psychological research has attempted to evaluate personality both by objective inventory and behavioral observation. Regardless of the method being employed, personality evaluation largely relies upon the impressions formulated using perceived inferences. The study of these inferences has been designated as attribution theory.

Theorizing about attributions began with Heider (1958) whose concern was with phenomenal causality. He postulated that the research for causal explanations as to, simply, what causes what, was central to human motivation. The essential issue in perceptions of causality is whether to attribute behavior to internal states or external forces. This question has been at the heart of the research literature which has attempted to evaluate the counseling process.

**Counseling Interaction**

The counseling interview is an interactive process in which verbal expression is a means toward achieving change. There are many types of counseling interviews, differing with respect to goals and methods. The interview may be diagnostic, therapeutic, and range from informal interchange between the counselor and client, to highly structured
sessions. The interview may be viewed as a means of eliciting responses that will have value for both client and counselor.

The unfolding events of the counseling interview plays an increasingly valuable role in the therapeutic change of the client. Theoretical orientation of the interviewer plays a significant role in the efforts to evaluate changes in verbal behavior during the interview. Since the interviewer's behavior may influence the data to be analyzed, this holds true in interviews conducted for research as well as for diagnostic and therapeutic reasons. The interview is a special situation in which there is a developing and distinctive relationship between two people. Despite the differences in interview technique or theoretical orientation the interaction between therapist and client is assumed to be the most important vehicle that brings about client change (McCarthy, Shaw & Schmeck, 1986, p. 249). The characteristics of interviewers and clients jointly influence what transpires during the counseling session (Duncan, 1969; Heller, 1968; Laffal, 1968; Mahl, 1968; Schaffer, 1983). In practical usage, the counseling interview is more an art than a science and is more influenced by the personality variables and interaction of client and counselor rather than by established laws of behavior (Schaffer, 1983, p. 656).

Langs (1978) has referred to the interactional process between client and counselor as the "bipersonal field." He has separated therapeutic interaction into two categories defined as: 1) Type One derivatives which are readily available contextual inferences of coommunication, and 2) Type Two derivatives which are specific content meanings of language (Langs, 1980, p. 13). According to Langs, both are essential to client-therapist interaction and all communication
between client and therapist, whether of content or context, influences the client and the therapist.

The bipersonal field concept directs the therapist to take consideration of the nature of the communications that take place within the field; the extent to which verbal communications prevail and maintain their intended meaning (Langs, 1978, p. 559).

All elements of communication constitute this concept of the bipersonal field. This interactional concept also emphasizes the ability of clients and counselor to analyze and interpret these elements together (Grinberg, 1962, pp. 436-440). The main point here is that all phases of the client-counselor relationship depend upon interaction, and that this is the single most important element of the counseling process.

The client-therapist interaction has been examined by Dicks and termed the "Therapeutic Alliance" (1975, p. 508). He states, similarly, that every act of communication by the client is influenced by the therapist, and vice versa.

Rahskopf also writes that individuals behave in accordance with the response patterns of others. Others become mirrors of an individual's behavior and the individual adjusts and evaluates himself in terms of what he sees others do (Rahskopf, 1965, p. 2). This interactive theory of personality development asserts that the individual selects from among the many responses of others which are then organized and integrated into behavior patterns, so that formulation of individual identity develops out of the framework of the social community (Rahskopf, 1965, p. 2).

Mead accordingly states that personality develops on the basis of
individual response to others and that, as a result, individuals derive a sense of self-concept as social beings through the process of social interaction (Mead, 1934, p. 169).

Khan (1973) explored the nature of therapeutic interaction by examining the symbolic discourse of the counselor as an area expressing meanings to the client beyond mere language. He stresses the importance of interaction within the clinical setting which requires a distinctive interventional response by the therapist. Langs (1978, p. 8) also points out that nonverbal communication, silences and all motions and gestures, are vital parts of symbolic interaction within the clinical setting.

Nonverbal communication between client and counselor initiates therapeutic interaction on both conscious and unconscious levels, and may extend to other senses such as touch (Langs, 1978). Communication may be rational or irrational, conscious or unconscious, but through the symbolic interaction of client and therapist, interpretations of internal attitudes and motivations are explored.

Schaffer (1983) has examined the interaction between therapist behavior and client outcomes, concluding that therapist and client codetermine outcome. According to Schaffer, the fact that client and therapist codetermine outcome has important implications for evaluating and planning research; the most central being that further development in the area of client-counselor interaction must consider defining the variables of counselor and client behavior. Some reviews have concluded that the most critical factor in predicting outcome is the application of appropriate therapeutic techniques to suitable clients (Mahoney & Arnkoff, 1978; Marks, 1978). All of these reviews agree
that more needs to be learned about which type of client benefits the most from which type of treatment.

In a study exploring the nature of the counselor's experience during counseling, of a particularly high level of interaction-rapport termed "resonance," it was discovered that this phenomenon occurs frequently with specific clients for some counselors (Larson, 1986, p. 1276). To demonstrate this occurrence of experienced resonance, 130 questionnaires were sent out to two sample pools. Thirty-one counselors who responded affirmatively to the questionnaires became co-researchers in this study. All had claimed to have experienced resonance more than once in their clinical work. These counselors were then interviewed, tape recorded, transcribed, and thematically analyzed.

Results of the study suggested that high levels of "resonance" do occur with many clients though not in every counseling session. This research has particular relevance for the present study because it raises questions regarding the search for specific interactive variables which may give rise to the phenomenon of "resonance," experienced by both clients and counselors.

Another study has explored in a similar vein to the those above, the client-counselor interaction as relative to experienced empathy (Barkham & Shapiro, 1986, p. 3). This study examined counselor and client perceptions of empathy at different stages of the counseling process. This was accomplished by obtaining counselor and client ratings of recorded counseling sessions on the basis of perceived verbal behavior.

Elliott and Stiles (1982) have sought to analyze counselor interaction by classifying utterances into discreet categories determined by
interpersonal intent (Elliott & Stiles, 1982, p. 333). This system of communication analysis, however, is mostly concerned with the development of classification criteria for research.

Moreover, it appears that the focus of prior studies has not answered the questions whether differences can be established between clients receiving counseling from two separate types of counselors; those being verbally highly interactive (high interactive), and those significantly less verbally interactive (low interactive), as determined by the criteria of this study.

Summary

In this chapter, some essentials of attitude change and attitude theory were presented for explaining the relationship between the constructs of counseling and client change. Research was examined and inferences drawn regarding counseling, interaction and the therapeutic attitude change situation.

Research was cited which focuses on the attitude-change situation, and the variety of available alternatives to attitude change. Factors affecting attitude change were presented, followed by a discussion of relevant attitude theories.

The relationship between attitude change, and the counseling process as an attitude change situation, was explored, and the connection established between essential elements of persuasion and their importance within the counseling framework.

Theory and research were presented which focused on particular aspects of expectation theory, perception-evaluation, and interaction.
Finally, some tenents of symbolic discourse, as related to the therapeutic relationship, were outlined which explained the complexity of the counselor client interaction.
CHAPTER III

Method

Introduction

Data for this study was collected during the months of March and April, 1985, from twenty-four individuals who had initiated counseling with eight counselors in the greater Seattle, Washington area. Two methods were used to assess counseling interactive styles. Additionally, the selected audio tape recordings of one counselor-client session for each of the twenty-four individuals were submitted to a panel of three raters who evaluated qualitative dimensions of counselor personality using a Semantic Differential instrument. Administration of a standardized instrument for measuring outcomes was employed before and after counseling. The twenty-four subjects, eight counselors, three judges, instruments, methods of data collection and statistical procedures used are described in this section.

The procedure included contacting practicing counselors, establishing the audio tape recording method, counselor selection of the subjects, administration procedures for the pre- and post-tests of the twenty-four subjects, selecting the audio recordings for judging the counseling interactive styles of the counselors, establishing reliability of judgements among the raters, and analyzing the data statistically.
Null Hypothesis

The null hypothesis of this study was that no significant differences could be shown to separate subjects who participated in therapy programs of different counseling interaction styles.

The purpose of this study was to demonstrate a relationship between counseling interaction styles and measured client therapeutic change. 1) Positive client therapeutic change was related to effective counseling styles, and 2) negative or no therapeutic change was related to ineffective counseling styles.

Subjects

There were two groups of subjects. One group of subjects was exposed to counseling treatment by high interactive therapists, while the other group of subjects was exposed to counseling treatment by low interactive therapists. All subjects were selected for participation in this study from the populations of each counselor’s clientelle. Subjects were chosen for inclusion by their respective therapists. The criteria for inclusion was that each subject had just initiated treatment, and met the diagnostic criteria of being depressed. There were a total of twenty-four subjects. These were both men and women ranging in age from 21 to 35, with a mean age of 26.6.

Counselors

Eight counselors with private counseling practices in the greater Seattle area agreed to participate in this study. There was a total of eight counselor-subjects; four counselors represented low-interactive counseling styles, and four counselors represented high-interactive
counseling styles. All counselors were male. This group of practicing counselors ranged in age from 30 to 38, with a mean age of 34. The conditions and length of experience for each counselor are briefly described below.

1. Age 37, private practice for nine years in partnership with another psychologist in a medical building in a suburb of Seattle.
2. Age 38, social service director of a major Seattle suburb hospital, including selective private practice for twelve years.
3. Age 30, private practice for three years with two other counselors.
4. Age 33, solo, private practice for five years in family counseling clinic.
5. Age 36, practicing eight years, director of an outpatient clinic.
6. Age 31, in practice for four years in a community psychiatric clinic.
7. Age 34, private practice for seven years in a suburb of Seattle.
8. Age 36, shares offices with another counselor and a psychiatrist, in private practice for four years.

Raters

A panel of three counselors was used in this study to rate specific qualitative dimensions of counselor-client interaction. A brief description of the raters is outlined below.

1. Age 37, social service coordinator for outpatient treatment center in a suburb of Seattle; was in a prior private practice for two
years, and continues to supervise staff counselors, as well as seeing a small number of private individuals for therapy.

2. Age 42, in private practice and consulting psychologist for an alcohol residential treatment center in Kirkland, Washington; involved as a counselor for over fourteen years.

3. Age 32, a certified alcohol counselor for the past three years, and sees clients in a number of community clinics in Seattle.

**Procedures**

**Counselor Interactive Styles**

Counselor interactive styles were determined by scoring counselor verbal behavior during the therapy sessions. The instrument used to assign verbal scores to counselors in separating high and low interactive counselors was the Interactive Frequency Rating Matrix. This instrument is described under Instruments and may be found in the appendix.

The validity of this classification was assessed by both counselors' self reports of their verbal activity and by the interrater reliabilities of independent observers. Therapist self-reports were consistent with their classification into high and low interactive styles, and were verified by the independent raters. Counselor Interactive Styles were labeled High and Low as determined by scoring counselor verbalizations throughout all therapy sessions. These scores were obtained by sampling each 45 minute tape, for each client, for each session. Each tape was sampled nine times. This resulted in nine samples separated by five minute intervals. A value 1 was assigned if
the counselor was talking, otherwise a 0 was assigned. (Sackett, 1979, p. 624; Sawin, 1980, p. 302). Scores were totalled for each counselor across clients and sessions. These verbalization totals were then subjected to a median split into High and Low interactive categories. Thus, four counselors were High Interactive and four were Low Interactive based on the totals of their verbalizations.

Raters

A panel of three raters was used to assess counselor personality traits by reviewing tape recorded counseling sessions. Raters were selected from a population of professional counselors in Seattle, Washington. Raters were asked to evaluate counselor interactions. A semantic differential was provided to identify perceived qualitative differences in counselor personalities.

Raters scored each characteristic of an eleven item semantic differential scale. Raters checked one blank (-3 to +3) for each of the paired opposites in the scale. Each scale of the semantic differential represented a qualitative dimension of counselor interaction, and each rater evaluated all eleven items (Osgood, 1957, p. 38; Singer, 1984, p. 93). Raters were not informed about the counselor’s style.

Each rater was informed that their privacy would not be violated and that individuals participating in this study would remain anonymous. No crosstalk was permitted among raters.

P.O.I. Test Distribution

Each counselor handled the distribution of P.O.I. test packets. The packet, consisting of the P.O.I. and test answer sheet, was matched
by identification numbers to each client. All clients were administered the P.O.I. upon entering counseling treatment, and then again following a six-session treatment period.

Client interviews were conducted in private counseling offices under careful confidentiality. Each counseling session lasted a period of forty-five minutes. Interviews for clients were scheduled once per week. Counseling sessions were arranged at the mutual convenience of clients and counselors.

Following the six-week counseling treatment period, each client was re-tested, using the same procedure as the original pre-testing period.

Audio Recordings

All counseling sessions were tape recorded. At the conclusion of the six-session counseling period, tapes were collected for review.

All recorded counseling sessions were evaluated for counselor Interactive Styles by this researcher, using the Interaction Frequency Rating Matrix. Total scores were used to separate counselors in respective High and Low Interactive categories.

Audio recordings for rating by the outside panel of judges on the semantic differential were selected in the following fashion. Third session tapes of each counselor-client relationship were selected from among all audio recordings for a total of twenty-four tapes. The rationale for selecting mid-therapy samples was to provide a representative segment for each respective counselor's qualitative characteristics.
The Interaction Frequency Rating Matrix

The Interaction Frequency Rating Matrix (IFRM) was designed to facilitate scoring verbal interaction of both clients and counselors on all audio taped counseling sessions. On each IFRM there is a numerical designation as to which counselor is being rated. Clients are vertically listed as one, two or three, and session numbers are shown horizontally, one through six. Counselor and client scores are entered in the appropriate spaces provided and sums are totaled at the bottom. The IFRM is moreover, a worksheet for this researcher to tally responses (See Appendix).

The Semantic Differential

The Semantic Differential instrument is an instrument comprised of eleven items. These items are bi-polar pairs of words separated by seven response options (See Appendix).

The format is brief. Adjectives are used because they provide the primary root meanings of terms that determine judgements. Osgood states that adjectives provide the most "general and natural qualifiers" in the English language. The Semantic Differential relies upon adjectives which are opposites. Osgood (1957, p.38) suggests that polar opposites, such as warm-cold, active-passive, weak-strong, and many other polar pairs, are most useful in differentiating two potentially different groups. In the present study counselors classified as High or Low interactive counselors were examined to determine what, if any, semantic differential differences were displayed.
The Personal Orientation Inventory

The Personal Orientation Inventory was the standardized instrument used in this study to measure degrees of client therapeutic change. The P.O.I. was originally developed to provide a standardized instrument which measured values and behavior.

Maslow (1970) has developed the concept of a person who is more fully functioning and lives a greater enriched life than does the average person. This individual is seen as developing and utilizing his/her potentialities, unencumbered by the limitations of emotional turmoil. Such individuals have been coined by Maslow as "Self-Actualizing."

Rogers' (1951, 1961) writings, as well as Brammer and Shostrom (1977), reflect the similar idea that becoming a self-actualized person is the goal of the counseling process. Many counselors and therapists have felt a need for a comprehensive measure of values and behavior seen to be of importance in the development of the self-actualizing person (Shostrom, Knapp & Knapp, 1976). The P.O.I. was created to meet this need.

The P.O.I. is an instrument which provides the counselor and client with a measure of the client’s personal level of functioning in a variety of specified areas (Shostrom, 1974, p. 4). The interpretation of the P.O.I. often provides a guideline for the goals of the counseling process.

The P.O.I. test items were developed to reflect significant value judgement problems seen by therapists in private practice. Test items were based on observed value judgements of clinically troubled patients seen by several therapists over a five-year period. These criteria for
test development make the P.O.I. a suitable instrument for this study. The P.O.I. has been used in many prior outcome studies (e.g., Dougherty, 1976; Kilman & Sotile, 1976; Knapp & Shostram, 1976; Shostram, 1972).

The P.O.I. consists of one hundred fifty-two items of compared value and behavior judgments. The items are scored twice. It is scored first for two basic scales of personal orientation; (1) inner directed support (127 items) and (2) time competence (23 items). Second, it is scored for ten subscales, each of which measures a conceptually important element of self-actualization.

The time and the support ratio scores cover two major areas important in personal development and interpersonal interaction. The time scale measures the degree to which the individual lives in the present as contrasted with the past or future. The time-competent person lives primarily in the present with full awareness, contact and full-feeling reactivity. The time-imcompetent person lives primarily in the past with guilt, regrets and resentments, and/or in the future with idealized goals, plans, expectations, predictions and fears. The support scale is designed to measure whether an individual's mode of reaction is characteristically "self" oriented or "other" oriented. Inner or self-directed individuals are guided primarily by internalized principles and motivations, while other-directed persons are, to a great extent, influenced by their peer group or other external forces. Since both of these scales are viewed as being clinically interpretable in relative or proportional terms, the scores for the support and time scales each are presented as ratio scores (Shostram, 1974, p. 4).

The P.O.I. format is composed of paired opposites presented in
positive or negative statements. Scales are not paired because each scale is scored independently of the other. The ten subscales are: Self-Actualizing Value (SAV), Existentiality (Ex), Feeling Reactivity (FR), Spontaneity (S), Self-Regard (SR), Self-Acceptance (SA), Nature of Man (no), Synergy (Sy), Acceptance of Aggression (A), Capacity for Intimate Contact (C).

The mean Standard score for each of the ten scales is fifty, with a standard deviation of ten.

Approximately ninety-five per cent of the population falls between the standard scores of thirty and seventy on any given scale (Shostrom, 1974, p. 7).

The ten subscales reflect facets important in the development of the person. All of these scales were used in this study. The measures of acceptance or rejection of self as described below were of particular interest to this researcher.

The Self-Regard (SR) factor measures affirmation of self because of worth or strength. A high score indicated ability to like one's self. Low scores indicate feelings of low self-worth or rejection.

The Self-Acceptance (SA) factor measures the affirmation or acceptance of one's self, in spite of limitations or deficiencies. High scores are indicative of acceptance of weaknesses, and low scores suggest inability to accept one's own limitations.

The Capacity for Intimate Contact (C) factor measures the ability to develop meaningful and intimate relationships with other human beings. High scores indicate ability to develop this type of relationship, and low scores suggest that the individual has difficulty with developing and experiencing intimacy within interpersonal
relationships (Shostrom, 1974, pp. 17-18).

The remaining seven scales are as follows:

**Spontaneity (S)** measures freedom to react spontaneously or to be one’s self.

**Acceptance of Aggression (A)** measures ability to accept one’s natural aggressiveness as opposed to defensiveness, denial and repression of aggression.

**Synergy (Sy)** measures ability to be synergistic to transcend dichotomies.

**Nature of Man (No)** measures degree of the constructive view of the nature of man such as masculinity or femininity.

**Self-Actualizing Value (SAV)** measures affirmation of primary values of self-actualizing persons.

**Existentiality (Ex)** measures ability to situationally or existentially react without rigid adherence to principles.

**Feeling Reactivity (FR)** measures sensitivity of responsiveness to one’s own needs and feelings.

According to Shostrom, the P.O.I. has a built-in lie score profile which can be easily identified. Shostrom concludes that faking responses can be detected by two lie profiles on the P.O.I. One is identified through an excessively high score on Self-Regard (SF) with a depressed Self-Acceptance (SA) and Existentiality scores. The second detection for faking responses is reflected in an elevated overall profile. Shostrom shows that the P.O.I. is based on culturally accepted standards, and that the elevated scores between sixty and seventy can be interpreted as a lie score profile. Attempts to look well-adjusted on the P.O.I. can result in excessively low scores. Al-
though Shostrum suggests that the P.O.I. shows an unexpected resistance to faking, he mentions that persons can improve their P.O.I. scores under certain circumstances (Shostrum, 1974, p. 22).

P.O.I. Validity

The Personal Orientation Inventory was tested to determine whether or not it would be able to discriminate between individuals who had been observed as having achieved a relatively high level of self-actualization from those who had not evidenced such development. The effectiveness of the P.O.I. in making this discrimination was tested. The results indicated that the inventory significantly discriminated between self-actualizing and nonself-actualizing groups.

Table 4 (see page 83) is a graphic representation of the results showing the norm mean at a T score of fifty. There was a consistent difference between the self-actualizing group and the non-self-actualizing group on the P.O.I. (Shostrum, 1974, p. 24). The means for the self-actualizing group were above the norm means of eleven of the twelve scales, and the means for the non-self-actualizing group were below norm means on all scales (Shostrum, 1974; Shostrum & Knapp, 1975).

P.O.I. Reliability

Test-retest reliability coefficients have been obtained for P.O.I. scales and are presented in Table 5 (see page 84).

Reliability coefficients for the major scales of Time Competence and Inner-Direction were .71 and .77, and coefficients for the sub-scales range from .52 to .82. The corrections obtained in this study
are at a level of other personality inventories.

**Statistical Analysis**

The statistical analysis in this study can be divided into two general areas. First, an analysis was performed to identify the semantic differential scale differences between High and Low interactive counselors. t-tests were run between High and Low interactive counselors for each of the eleven characteristics of the semantic differential scale.

There were significant differences between High and Low interactive counselors on five of the eleven characteristics. The characteristics were judgemental vs. non-judgemental, withholding vs. self-disclosing, expressive vs. unexpressive, passive vs. active, and warm vs. cold. The results of the t-tests are presented in the following section.

A second set of analyses were performed to identify differences in the clients produced by therapy with High and Low interactive counselors. These analyses were 2x2 factorial analyses of variance. The first variable was the test session, which had two values, pre- and post-test. The second variable is counselor interaction style, and had two values: High-and Low-interaction. A separate analysis of variance was performed for both the time and support ratio scales, and the ten sub- scales of the P.O.I. The clients of High and Low interactive counselors were found to differ significantly on three P.O.I. subscales. These were Existentiality, Spontaneity, and Acceptance of Aggression. These are presented in the following section.
CHAPTER IV

Results

This chapter contains the statistical analyses of the data. Variables of interest were the eleven counselor characteristics of the semantic differential scale which functioned as independent (i.e. selected) variables, and the time and support ratio scales; and ten subscales of the P.O.I., which functioned as dependent variables.

The semantic differential was also examined to determine inter-rater reliability. The results of these analyses are presented in the following sections.

Interater Reliability on the Semantic Differential

Interater reliability on the Semantic Differential was assessed using Spearman Rank Order Correlations. The average Spearman rank order correlation coefficient for interater reliability was .93 for the High interactive counselors. These were reliable results (p < .01). Interater reliability on the Semantic Differential items was greater for the High Interactive group of counselors because raters had a larger sample of verbal behaviors on which to base their observations. These correlations are summarized in table III.

Semantic Differential Results

Five of the eleven semantic differential characteristics displayed
statistically significant differences between High interactive and Low interactive counselors. High interactive counselors were rated significantly (t [6] = 12.0, p < .01) warmer (mean = 1.7) than Low interactive counselors (mean = -1.3) who were rated colder. High interactive counselors were rated significantly (t [6] = 15.7, p < .01) more active (mean = 2.0) than Low interactive counselors (mean = -1.6) who were rated more passive. High interactive counselors were rated significantly (t [6] = 12.3, p < .01) more expressive (mean = 1.9) than Low interactive counselors (mean = -1.3) who were rated unexpressive. High interactive counselors were rated significantly (t [6] = 19, p < .01) more self-disclosing (mean = 1.48) than Low interactive counselors (mean = 10.98) who were rated more withholding. Lastly, High interactive counselors were rated significantly (t [6] = 10.0, p < .01) more judgemental (mean = 0.98) than Low interactive counselors (mean = -0.96) who were rated more non-judgemental. These results were expected because of classification into High and Low interactive styles.

There were no significant differences between High and Low interactive counselors on the six remaining semantic differential characteristics. High and Low interactive counselors were not different on the Helpful/Hurtful characteristic (t [6] = 0.0, p > .05). Both groups were more helpful than hurtful. There were no significant differences between High interactive and Low interactive counselors on the Empathetic/Superficial dimension (t [6] = -.5, p > .05). Both groups were more empathetic than superficial. There were no significant differences between High and Low interactive counselors on the Respectful/Disrespectful dimension (t [6] = .73, p > .05). Both groups were more
respectful than disrespectful. There were no significant differences between High and Low interactive counselors on the Weak/Strong dimension. Neither group departed significantly from neutrality.

There were no significant differences between High and Low interactive counselors on the Consistent/Inconsistent dimension ($t[6] = 0.0, p > .05$). Neither group departed significantly from neutrality. Lastly, there were no significant differences between High and Low interactive counselors on the Genuine/Ingenuine dimension ($t[6] = -.76, p > .05$). Both groups were seen as slightly more genuine than ingenuine.

The results of the t-tests and the group means on the eleven dimensions of the semantic differential are summarized in Table I.

**P.O.I. Results**

Separate $2 \times 2$ factorial analyses of variance were performed on the time and support ratio scales and the ten sub-scales of the P.O.I. The first factor represented the pre-test vs. post-test difference. The second factor represented High interactive vs. Low interactive counselors. Three subscales, Existentiality, Spontaneity, and Acceptance of Aggression, differed significantly between clients of High and Low interactive counselors (Table II).

There was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores on the Existentiality sub-scale ($F[1,44] = 16.37, p < .05$). The interaction of counselor style and test for the Existentiality sub-scale was significant ($F[1,44] = 5.47, p < .05$). The interaction revealed that the clients of High interactive counselors were more flexible in the application of values than the clients of Low
TABLE 1: Summary of t-test results for the eleven dimensions of the semantic differential scale for high vs. low interactive counselors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>X High Interactive</th>
<th>X Low Interactive</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helpful (+3)/Hurtful (-3)</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic (-3)/Superficial (+3)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respectful (+3)/Disrespectful (-3)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm (+3)/Cold (-3)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active (+3)/Passive (-3)</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-1.6</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressive (+3)/Unexpressive (-3)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-1.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong (+3)/Weak (-3)</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.0</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent (+3)/Inconsistent (-3)</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-disclosing (+3)/Withholding (-3)</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-0.98</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judgemental (+3)/Nonjudgemental (-3)</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.96</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genuine (+3)/Ingenuine (-3)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interactive counselors who remained unchanged with regard to Existentiality ($F [1,44] = 5.47, p < .05$).

There was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores on the Spontaneity sub-scale ($F [1,44] = 10.14, p < .05$). The interaction of counselor style and test for the Spontaneity sub-scale was significant ($F [1,44] = 7.04, p < .05$). The interaction revealed that clients of High interactive counselors more freely expressed feelings behaviorally than the clients of Low interactive counselors, who remained unchanged with regard to Spontaneity ($F [1,44] = 18.94, p < .05$).

There was a significant difference between the pre-test and post-test scores on the Acceptance of Aggression sub-scale ($F [1,44] = 9.57, p < .05$). The interaction of counselor style and test for the Acceptance of Aggression sub-scale was significant, ($F [1,44] = 6.77, p < .05$). The interaction revealed that clients of High Interactive counselors were more accepting of feelings of anger or aggression than the clients of Low interactive counselors who remained unchanged with regard to Acceptance of Aggression ($F [1,44] = 5.33, p < .05$).

Analyses of variance for the time and support ratio scales and the remaining seven sub-scales revealed no significant differences for pre-test vs. post-test or for High interactive vs. Low interactive counselor styles. Furthermore, there were no significant interactions between styles and test for these scales. On the time and support ratio scales and the remaining seven subscales of the P.O.I., clients of both High interactive and Low interactive counselors remained unchanged over the course of the study.
TABLE II: Results of the analysis of variance of POI scores for High vs Low interactive counselors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 1: Time Competent</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 15.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>HI/LI</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI 15.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 2: Inner-Directed</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 84.6</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>HI/LI</td>
<td>.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI 82</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 3: Self Actualizing Value</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 20.2</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>HI/LI</td>
<td>1.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI 18.8</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 4: Existentiality</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>16.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI 20.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>HI/LI</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI 20.5</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>5.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 5: Feeling Reactivity</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 6: Spontaneity</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>11.75</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 7: Self-Regard</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 8: Self Acceptance</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II (continued)

**Scale 9: Nature of Man, Constructive**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI/LI</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scale 10: Synergy**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>F(1,44)</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre/Post</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HI/LI</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE II (continued)

**Scale 11: Acceptance of Aggression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test:**
- Pre/Post: $F(1,44) = 9.57, p < .01$
- HI/LI: $F(1,44) = 5.33, p < .01$
- Interaction: $F(1,44) = 6.77, p < .01$

**Scale 12: Capacity for Intimate Contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test:**
- Pre/Post: $F(1,44) = 3.01$
- HI/LI: $F(1,44) = 0$
- Interaction: $F(1,44) = 0.53$
### TABLE II (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 13: Time Incompetent</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test: F(1,44) P
Pre/Post 3.2
HI/LI .13
Interaction .03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale 14: Other Directed</th>
<th>Pre</th>
<th>Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HI</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test: F(1,44) P
Pre/Post 3.13
HI/LI .09
Interaction .99
Summary of Method

Eight counselors were divided into High interactive and Low interactive counseling groups on the basis of a median split of their total verbalizations as described earlier. An eleven item semantic differential indicated that High and Low interactive counselors differed significantly on the following characteristics: 1) warm/cold, 2) active/passive, 3) expressive/unexpressive, 4) self-disclosing/withholding, and 5) judgemental/non-judgemental. Client outcome measures were the time and support ratio scales and the ten sub-scales of the P.O.I. The clients of High interactive counselors differed significantly from the clients of Low interactive counselors on the Existentiality, Spontaneity, and Acceptance of Aggression sub-scales.

Limits

It was not possible to assess the nonverbal cues and interactions of clients and therapists, because recordings of counseling sessions were strictly audio.

In addition, counselor bias may have affected the diagnostic criteria for each client in different treatment groups.

More counselors and larger treatment groups may have provided greater reliability.

Moreover, in the present study there is no way to assess the longevity or generalizability of the differences exhibited by the clients of High or Low interactive counselors. Without a follow up study it is not possible to determine if these differences continue after therapy. Furthermore, there is no independent validation that
these therapy session differences lead to any extra-therapy differ-
ences. This means that although the clients of High and Low inter-
active counselors exhibit differences during the therapy sessions, they
may not exhibit these same differences outside of the therapy setting.
CHAPTER V

Discussion

Introduction

This chapter brings together the theoretical relationships developed in Chapter II, and the research hypothesis and results of this study contained in Chapters III and IV. The implications of the findings are discussed and suggestions are made for continued research. This is followed by a summary of the results of this study and concluding remarks.

Review of the Study

This researcher noticed that there were distinct differences among counselors regarding their verbal behavior, referred to in the present study as different counseling styles. It was noted that the quantity of verbal behavior, on the part of every counselor, varied. Some counselors talked more, while others talked less. This study separated these two broad categories into groups referred to as High Interactive and Low Interactive counselor styles.

These variations in counselor verbal behavior formulated the basis for this study. Areas of focus were: 1) client populations consisting of adults, 2) the application of two different counseling interaction styles, and 3) one instrument which measured dimensions of self-perception on a pre- and post-test (P.O.I.). Independent raters were used as
a manipulation check to determine the validity of the median split classification of therapists into High and Low interactive groups. This was referred to in this study as the evaluative dimension of perception (Osgood, Suci & Tannenbaum, 1957; Rosenberg & Olsham, 1970).

A relationship was hypothesized to exist between the verbal behavior of counselors and client outcomes. A 2x2 factorial design was employed to test this relationship. The method of measurement consisted of pre- and post-tests of subjects who participated in therapy programs of two different counselor interactive styles.

An eleven item semantic differential was employed in an interrater reliability study to test for differences in the quality of counselor verbal behavior.

The research hypothesis tested was:

No significant differences could be shown to separate subjects who participated in therapy programs of different counseling interactive styles.

Results of the study rejected the null-hypothesis. The research explored client change associated with the effectiveness of a counselor's interactive style, and assumed no change would be associated with the ineffectiveness of a counselor's interactive style.

The eleven-item semantic differential indicated that High and Low interactive counselors differed significantly on the following characteristics: 1) warm/cold, 2) active/passive, 3) expressive/unexpressive, 4) self-disclosing/withholding, and 5) judgemental/nonjudgmental.

Analyses of the time and support ratio scales and the ten sub-scales of the P.O.I. indicated that the clients of High Interactive counselors differed significantly from the clients of Low Interactive
counselors on the Existantiality, Spontaniety, and Acceptance of Agression sub-scales. Although clients of both High and Low interactive counselors improved on the time and support ratio scales and the ten subscales of the P.O.I., the clients of High interactive counselors were significantly more improved on the three previously mentioned subscales.

Implications of the Study

The primary area of the study examined treatment outcomes of different counseling interactive styles. The results indicated that the null hypothesis was rejected.

In order to understand why there were significant differences between counselor-interactive styles and client outcomes, it is necessary to discuss the complex relationship between counselor and client. Theorists, such as Pepinski (1951, p. 329), cite the research difficulties in determining the efficacy of various counseling methods. Other theorists have also acknowledged the problems encountered by the researcher, when analyzing for significant differences between counseling and client outcomes (Williamson & Bordin, 1941, pp. 5-24). Factors such as counselor and client personality traits (Cabush, Edwards, 1976, pp. 34-39), counselor and client expectations (Goldstein, 1960, pp. 399-403), counselor-methodology, counselor-assessment, and counselor-client communication interaction variables, all effect the outcomes of the counseling process (Patterson, 1973, 136-138).

Different theorists have demonstrated the helpful qualities of their own specific counseling methodology upon outcomes of clients. In
other words, each school of thought, regarding counseling methodology, has laid claims to their own effectiveness. However, present research has not shown that one counseling approach is superior to another (Smith and Glass, 1977, p. 752).

Scores were reliable among the counselor-raters. Each counselor-rater had a personal investment in his/her proficiency and knowledge of counseling theory and methodology. Research shows that observational recording of inferences is affected by the degree of training of raters (Gay, 1976, pp. 139-140). The reliability among raters is indicative of extensive training, which enabled each counselor-rater to be proficient in comparing the verbal responses for this study. Therefore, it can be concluded that training increases observer reliability (Gay, 1976, p. 140).

In each case, a word or phrase is also subject to interpretation. Harms (1974, p. 38) points out that when people are asked to observe others who are engaged in communication, a structure is provided to enable more consistent definitions.

Osgood also supports the rationale that single-word phrases of paired opposites are more apt to be readily agreed upon. The evaluation form utilized for this study has provided the essential structure that enabled raters to observe basic qualities of human communication throughout the individual counseling sessions.

The definitions for High and Low Interactive counselors were well-differentiated enough to allow raters to accurately score counselors' interactive characteristics on the semantic differential.

The reliability coefficients for Low Interactive observations was .79 and the reliability coefficient for High Interactive observation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High Interactive Counselor Correlation</th>
<th>Low Interactive Counselor Correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rater 2</td>
<td>Rater 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO1</td>
<td>.91</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.93*</td>
<td>.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.89*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO2</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.82*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.92*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO3</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.65**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LO4</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.60***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.63**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.64**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselor Mean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO2</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.96*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.96*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO3</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td>.95*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.93*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO4</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.92*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>.94*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.97*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .005  
** = p < .01  
*** = p < .05

The average Spearman rank order correlation coefficient for interrater reliability was .93 for the High Interactive group of counselors, and for the Low Interactive counselor group, .79. These were reliable (p < .01).
was .93 (refer to Table III). This suggests that the personality characteristics of High Interactive counselors are more easily identified than Low Interactive counselors.

To facilitate the discussion, a restatement of the Semantic Differential results follows:

There were no significant differences between the raters scoring of High and Low Interactive Counselors on the Helpful vs. Hurtful scale, (a.).

There were no significant differences between the raters scoring of High and Low Interactive counselors on the Superficial vs. Empathetic scale, (b.).

There were no significant differences between the raters scoring of High and Low Interactive Counselors on the Respectful vs. Disrespectful scale, (c.).

There were significant differences between the raters scoring of High and Low Interactive Counselors on the Cold vs. Warm scale, (d.). The High Interactive Counselors were perceived as being warmer than the Low Interactive Counselors, who were perceived as colder.

There were significant differences between the raters scoring of High and Low Interactive Counselors on the Active vs. Passive scale, (e.). The High Interactive Counselors were perceived as
more active, while the Low Interactive Counselors were perceived as more passive.

There were significant differences between raters scoring of High and Low Interactive Counselors on the expressivity scale, (f.). High Interactive Counselors were perceived as Expressive while the Low Interactive Group was perceived as Unexpressive.

There were no significant differences between the raters scoring of High and Low Interactive Counselors on the scales, Strong vs. Weak, (g.). Inconsistent vs. Consistent, (h.). and Genuine vs. Ingenuine, (k.).

There were however, significant differences in the raters scoring of scales Self-Disclosing vs. Withholding, (i.), and Judgmental vs. Nonjudgmental, (j.). High Interactive Counselors were perceived by the independent raters as Self-Disclosing and Low Interactive Counselors were perceived as Withholding.

The raters scored High Interactive Counselors as being more Judgemental and Low Interactive Counselors as Nonjudgmental. These differences on specific scales validate and support this study’s separation of counselors into appropriate groups as represented by their style, (High Interactive vs. Low Interactive).

The literature points to the notion that the agent of client improvement is inherent in the therapeutic relationship itself. This study contributes relevant information toward uncovering important
elements of the therapeutic relationship that may be the causal agents of change, those being particular counseling styles, combined with certain personality traits of the therapist and client.

This study raises important questions for further research using a larger number of clients and longer exposure to the intervening treatment variables between pre- and post-test.

This study raises important questions regarding the nature of clients as raters, and their perceptions of counselor traits. Does generalization from trained observers to untrained (though skilled) observers apply?

This study also suggests a matching process which occurs in the client’s selection of his or her counselor. A client’s progress may improve over a period of counseling treatment by virtue of the climate created as a result of the personality, or stylistic variables of counselor interaction.

The results of the Semantic Differential information additionally validates interactive differences of counselors in that they do in fact occur.

This study provides a rationale for continued research in the development of other classifications of counselor variables to explore perceptual differences among observers and/or clients.

The therapists’s actual personality traits may have special meaning for a particular client's needs. This factor was apparent to the raters, which produced more reliable responses for the High Interactive counselors. This suggests that perceived counselor traits such as warmth, level of activity, and degree of helpfulness may be important determinants in a client's selection of a counselor. The interpersonal
relationship between client and counselor is a critical factor, regardless of counseling interactive style, and the literature supports the idea that the characteristics of counselors and clients jointly influence each other to determine what transpires during the counseling process (Duncan, 1969, pp. 118-137; Heller, 1968, pp. 242-259; Laffal, 1968, pp. 277-294; Mahl, 1968, pp. 295-346; Matarazzo, 1968, pp. 347-394).

There are many important interactive elements which may be factors in the complex counseling process unrelated to counseling style. Evidence shows that there are differences among counselors which influence the effectiveness of their counseling. These differences have been attributed more to their history of experiences, personal characteristics, and non-theory motivated behavior than to their views about the counseling process (Rioch, 1963, pp. 678-689). However, this study reveals that positive therapeutic change can occur regardless of differences in counselor interactive style. Nevertheless, the findings of this study demonstrate that client improvement on selected outcome measures may be facilitated by counselor interactive style.

Concluding Remarks

The results of this study rejected the null hypothesis that no significant differences can be shown to separate subjects participating in counseling programs of different interactive counseling styles. Subjects were administered the P.O.I., which assessed the time and support ratio scales, and ten personality subscales of clients who participated in counseling programs of different interactive styles.
Results were analyzed using multiple analyses of variance. Subjects' P.O.I. pre- and post-test scores between groups of different counseling interactive styles were analyzed. Selected qualitative characteristics of counselor personality traits were also part of this study, as judged by outside raters on an 11-item semantic differential. Interrater reliability was established.

The findings of this study demonstrated the benefits of counseling for all clients. However, there were significant differences in the outcomes produced by High and Low counselor Interactive styles.

Across both therapies, the Low Interactive group scores rose between the pre- and post-test measures, as did group scores of the High Interactive group. These increases were reliable. These findings are consistent with studies using pre- and post-test designs that report significant changes in P.O.I. test scores. Pre- and post-test changes for individuals in therapy are in the direction of greater self-actualization (Weir & Gade, 1969, pp. 227-230; Pearson, 1966).

This study helps provide information to the body of knowledge regarding counseling effectiveness, from a communicative-interactional standpoint.

It is of particular interest to this researcher that High Interactive treatment modalities gained higher reliability scores from observers, by virtue of the fact that particular attitudes and personality characteristics, on the part of the counselor, may have been more easily perceived. This raises some important issues concerning clients' initial counselor selection process, and persistence in therapy.

Although further research may develop in many ways, this study
would like to see a focus upon: 1) repeated research of this study using different populations with greater numbers of subjects; 2) the utilization of the semantic differential in a variety of situations as a tool to help assess counselor traits and/or client interactive characteristics; 3) studies of specific subpopulations such as psychiatric patients or criminals to explore the effects of differential interactive counseling styles on outcomes; 4) male and female differences in outcomes; and 5) long-term counseling program effects, in order to examine therapeutic change as a developmental process.

One major finding of this research resulted in support of the literature, that clients improved with therapy regardless of type. However, this study looked at a communicative aspect of counseling that had not been previously addressed and substantiated by significant outcome differences. Another important finding of this study was that observer reliability, and significant differences on the semantic differential, in evaluations of High and Low interactive style counselors were found. This has significance for counselors and clients in further studies dealing with selection, process, persistence, and the effects of interactive factors on the therapeutic relationship and outcomes of counseling.

This researcher will continue to investigate the effects of interaction variables upon human relationships and their impact upon the counseling process.
**Adaptive Context:** A term used to mean the specific stimulus that evokes an intrapersonal response. (Langs, 1978)

**Behavior:** Any observable response made by a person. In this sense, behavior is comprised of an individual's feelings, drives, impulses, emotions, and conscious and unconscious thoughts.

**Bipersonal Field:** A term first used by Baranger and Baranger (1966, pp. 56-72) as a metaphor for the therapeutic counseling situation. The term stresses the interactional qualities of the communication between client and therapist.

**Communication:** The exchange of information; information being defined as the reduction of uncertainty which is encoded and transmitted.

**Counseling:** When used in this study, the practice of counseling means the professional application of established principles of learning, motivation, perception, and emotional relationships, to problems of evaluation, behavior and attitude adjustment. Counseling includes the use of these principles with clients who have problems regarding self, family, or with interpersonal relationships.

**Identity:** A person's ability to recognize his individuality. Identity enables the individual to distinguish self from another person or thing.
Interpersonal Theory: (Interaction) A system of therapy based on Sullivan’s theory that the role of personal relationships and the study of individuals in relationship to significant others is important. Sullivan emphasized that the interpersonal process during counseling is the only unit of study, rather than the individual alone. Interpersonal theory postulates that personality manifests itself in a person’s behavior in relation to others.

Psychotherapy: Psychotherapy means the planful application of techniques derived from established psychological principles, by persons qualified through training and experience. Application of these techniques are to assist individuals in modifying personal feelings, values, attitudes and behaviors (Smith and Glass, 1977, p.753)

Self: A conscious and unconscious process by which an individual develops a sense of identity.

Self Theory: A philosophical approach which views individuals as striving to become fully functioning and possessing an inner core of positive tendencies. According to self theory, a person develops a sense of awareness through immediate experience with others. Self theory is rooted in the concept that an individual structures Identity according to attitudes and perceptions of reality.
Therapeutic Alliance: A term that describes the communicative interface and mutual cooperation between client and therapist.

Therapeutic Change: For this study, therapeutic change is defined as the expressed feelings held by the client after the counseling process, that change has taken place regarding the expressed problems ascribed to before therapy. In operational terms, therapeutic change will be measured by the difference between a client's self-orientation before treatment, and feelings regarding self-orientation after treatment.

Therapeutic Interaction: A term used to describe the verbal and nonverbal, conscious and unconscious, communicative interplays between client and counselor (Langs, 1980, p. 533).

Therapeutic Relationship: A term used to encompass all components, conscious and unconscious, verbal and nonverbal, of the interaction between client and counselor (Langs, 1980, p. 544).

POI Scale Means, Standard Deviations and Comparison of Differences Between Samples Nominated as "Self-Actualizing," "Normal" and "Non-Self-Actualizing."

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI Scale Symbol</th>
<th>Self-actualizing (29) Mean SD</th>
<th>Normal Adult (158) Mean SD</th>
<th>Non-Self-actualizing (34) Mean SD</th>
<th>Mean Diff. SA-NSA</th>
<th>CR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Competence TC</td>
<td>15.9 2.5</td>
<td>17.7 2.8</td>
<td>15.0 3.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed I</td>
<td>92.9 11.5</td>
<td>87.2 13.6</td>
<td>75.8 16.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>4.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Actualizing Value SAV</td>
<td>20.7 3.6</td>
<td>20.2 3.0</td>
<td>18.0 3.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.9**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality Ex</td>
<td>24.8 3.5</td>
<td>21.8 5.1</td>
<td>18.9 5.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity Fr</td>
<td>16.3 3.8</td>
<td>15.7 3.3</td>
<td>14.3 3.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.4*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity S</td>
<td>12.7 2.9</td>
<td>11.6 3.0</td>
<td>9.8 3.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Regard Sr</td>
<td>12.9 1.9</td>
<td>12.0 2.7</td>
<td>10.2 3.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>4.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Acceptance Sa</td>
<td>18.9 3.5</td>
<td>17.1 4.0</td>
<td>14.2 4.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man Nc</td>
<td>12.3 2.2</td>
<td>12.4 1.9</td>
<td>11.3 2.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy Sy</td>
<td>7.6 1.2</td>
<td>7.3 1.2</td>
<td>6.2 1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression A</td>
<td>17.6 3.1</td>
<td>16.6 3.7</td>
<td>14.7 3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.5**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact C</td>
<td>20.2 3.4</td>
<td>18.8 4.6</td>
<td>16.5 4.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.0**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 confidence level. **Significant at the .01 confidence level.
TABLE V: Test-ReTest Reliability Coefficients for Personal Orientation Inventory.

Test-Retest Reliability Coefficients for Personal Orientation Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POI Scales</th>
<th>Test-Retest Reliability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time Competent</td>
<td>Tc .71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inner Directed</td>
<td>I .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualizing Value</td>
<td>SAV .69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existentiality</td>
<td>Ex .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling Reactivity</td>
<td>Fr .65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneity</td>
<td>S .76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Regard</td>
<td>Sr .71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>Sa .77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature of Man</td>
<td>Nc .68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synergy</td>
<td>Sy .71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptance of Aggression</td>
<td>A .82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Intimate Contact</td>
<td>C .67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Based on a sample of 48 college students from a study by Klavetter and Mogar (1967).
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CONSENT FORM:

I, ______________________ hereby authorize ______________________, to record my counseling sessions on a tape recorder. My recordings will be anonymously and under confidentiality used for evaluation of my counselor’s verbal interactions.

I understand that my records are protected under the Federal and State Confidentiality Regulations and cannot be disclosed without my written consent unless otherwise provided for in the regulations. I also understand that I may revoke this consent at any time.

Executed this _____ day of ____________ , 19____.

Witness ______________________ Signature of Participant _______________________
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

95, Semantic Differential
96, Interaction Frequency Rating Matrix
97-107, Personal Orientation Inventory
108-109, Brief Description of What the POI Measures
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS:

1. Please circle the number in each item (a-k) which most clearly describes this counselor.

   a. HURTFUL    _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ HELPFUL
   b. EMPATHETIC _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ SUPERFICIAL
   c. DISRESPECTFUL _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ RESPECTFUL
   d. WARM _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ COLD
   e. PASSIVE _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ ACTIVE
   f. EXPRESSIVE _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ UNEXPRESSIVE
   g. WEAK _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ STRONG
   h. CONSISTENT _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ INCONSISTENT
   i. WITHHOLDING _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ SELF-DISCLOSING
   j. NONJUDGMENTAL _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ JUDGMENTAL
   k. INGENUINE _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ GENUINE

**INTERACTION FREQUENCY RATING MATRIX**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>Client</th>
<th>Sessions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sums**
PERSONAL ORIENTATION INVENTORY

Everett L. Shostrom, Ph.D.

DIRECTIONS

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

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

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

Remember, try to make some answer to every statement.

Before you begin the inventory, be sure you put your name, your sex, your age, and the other information called for in the space provided on the answer sheet.
1. a. I am bound by the principle of fairness.
   b. I am not absolutely bound by the principle of fairness.

2. a. When a friend does me a favor, I feel that I must return it.
   b. When a friend does me a favor, I do not feel that I must return it.

3. a. I feel I must always tell the truth.
   b. I do not always tell the truth.

4. a. No matter how hard I try, my feelings are often hurt.
   b. If I manage the situation right, I can avoid being hurt.

5. a. I feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.
   b. I do not feel that I must strive for perfection in everything that I undertake.

6. a. I often make my decisions spontaneously.
   b. I seldom make my decisions spontaneously.

7. a. I am afraid to be myself.
   b. I am not afraid to be myself.

8. a. I feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.
   b. I do not feel obligated when a stranger does me a favor.

9. a. I feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.
   b. I do not feel that I have a right to expect others to do what I want of them.

10. a. I live by values which are in agreement with others.
    b. I live by values which are primarily based on my own feelings.

11. a. I am concerned with self-improvement at all times.
    b. I am not concerned with self-improvement at all times.

12. a. I feel guilty when I am selfish.
    b. I don't feel guilty when I am selfish.

13. a. I have no objection to getting angry.
    b. Anger is something I try to avoid.

14. a. For me, anything is possible if I believe in myself.
    b. I have a lot of natural limitations even though I believe in myself.

15. a. I put others' interests before my own.
    b. I do not put others' interests before my own.

16. a. I sometimes feel embarrassed by compliments.
    b. I am not embarrassed by compliments.
17. a. I believe it is important to accept others as they are.
    b. I believe it is important to understand why others are as they are.
18. a. I can put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
    b. I don't put off until tomorrow what I ought to do today.
19. a. I can give without requiring the other person to appreciate what I give.
    b. I have a right to expect the other person to appreciate what I give.
20. a. My moral values are dictated by society.
    b. My moral values are self-determined.
21. a. I do what others expect of me.
    b. I feel free not to do what others expect of me.
22. a. I accept my weaknesses.
    b. I don't accept my weaknesses.
23. a. In order to grow emotionally, it is necessary to know why I act as I do.
    b. In order to grow emotionally, it is not necessary to know why I act as I do.
24. a. Sometimes I am cross when I am not feeling well.
    b. I am hardly ever cross.
25. a. It is necessary that others approve of what I do.
    b. It is not always necessary that others approve of what I do.
26. a. I am afraid of making mistakes.
    b. I am not afraid of making mistakes.
27. a. I trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
    b. I do not trust the decisions I make spontaneously.
    b. My feelings of self-worth do not depend on how much I accomplish.
29. a. I fear failure.
    b. I don't fear failure.
30. a. My moral values are determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.
    b. My moral values are not determined, for the most part, by the thoughts, feelings and decisions of others.
31. a. It is possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.
    b. It is not possible to live life in terms of what I want to do.
32. a. I can cope with the ups and downs of life.
    b. I cannot cope with the ups and downs of life.

GO ON TO THE NEXT PAGE
33. a. I believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.
b. I do not believe in saying what I feel in dealing with others.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

46. a. Reasons are needed to justify my feelings.
b. Reasons are not needed to justify my feelings.

47. a. There are times when just being silent is the best way I can express my feelings.
b. I find it difficult to express my feelings by just being silent.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

64. a. Appearances are all-important.  
       b. Appearances are not terribly important.
65. a. I hardly ever gossip.
   b. I gossip a little at times.

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

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

68. a. I feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.
   b. I do not feel free to be myself and bear the consequences.

69. a. I already know all I need to know about my feelings.
   b. As life goes on, I continue to know more and more about my feelings.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

80. a. For me, work and play are the same.
   b. For me, work and play are opposites.
81. a. Two people will get along best if each concentrates on pleasing the other.
   b. Two people can get along best if each person feels free to express himself.

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

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

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

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

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

87. a. People should always repent their wrongdoings.
   b. People need not always repent their wrongdoings.

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

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

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

91. a. People should always control their anger.
   b. People should express honestly-felt anger.

92. a. The truly spiritual man is sometimes sensual.
   b. The truly spiritual man is never sensual.

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

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

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

96. a. I am orthodoxly religious.
   b. I am not orthodoxy religious.
97. a. I am completely free of guilt.
   b. I am not free of guilt.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

112. a. What I have been in the past dictates the kind of person I will be.
      b. What I have been in the past does not necessarily dictate the kind of person I will be.
113. a. It is important to me how I live in the here and now.
   b. It is of little importance to me how I live in the here and now.

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

115. a. Evil is the result of frustration in trying to be good.
   b. Evil is an intrinsic part of human nature which fights good.

116. a. A person can completely change his essential nature.
   b. A person can never change his essential nature.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

129. a. I like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
   b. I do not like to withdraw from others for extended periods of time.
130. a. I always play fair.
   b. Sometimes I cheat a little.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

138. a. I have had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of ecstasy or bliss.
   b. I have not had moments of intense happiness when I felt like I was experiencing a kind of bliss.

139. a. People have an instinct for evil.
   b. People do not have an instinct for evil.

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

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

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

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

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

145. a. My hope for the future depends on having friends.
   b. My hope for the future does not depend on having friends.
146. a. I can like people without having to approve of them.
    b. I cannot like people unless I also approve of them.

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

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

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

150. a. I can overcome any obstacles as long as I believe in myself.
    b. I cannot overcome every obstacle even if I believe in myself.
Your Profile on the Personal Orientation Inventory (POI) shows the degree to which your attitudes and values compare with those of self-actualizing people. A self-actualizing person is one who is more fully functioning and who lives a more enriched life than does the average person. Such a person is developing and utilizing his unique talents to the fullest extent. It is generally agreed that a self-actualizing person might be seen as the desired result of the process of counseling or psychotherapy.

The interpretation of your scores falls into two general categories, the ratio scores and the profile scores. If your ratio scores are close to the scores that self-actualizing persons make, you may consider your values and attitudes, as measured by the POI, to be similar to these people. Your profile scores will further help you to compare yourself with self-actualizing people.

**RATIO SCORES**

**Interpretation of the Time Ratio (T₁ - Tₓ)**

In order to understand the Time (Time Incompetent – Time Competent) ratio, it is of help to consider time in its three basic components – Past, Present, and Future.

The T₁ (Time Incompetent) person is one who lives primarily in the Past, with guilts, regrets, and resentments, and/or in the future, with idealized goals, plans, expectations, predictions, and fears.

In contrast to the T₁ person, the Tₓ (Time Competent) person lives primarily in the Present with full awareness, contact, and full feeling reactivity. Because it is known that the self-actualizing person is not perfect, he is understood to be partly T₁ and partly Tₓ. His T₁ – Tₓ ratio is, on the average, 1 to 8. His ratio shows that he therefore lives primarily in the Present and only secondarily in the Past or Future.

If your score is significantly lower than 1 to 8, for example 1 to 3, this suggests that you are more time incompetent than the self-actualizing person. If your score is above 1 to 8, for example 1 to 10, this suggests that you are excessively time competent and this may perhaps reflect a need to appear more self-actualized than you really are.

**Interpretation of the Support Ratio (0 - 1)**

In order to understand your score on the Support (Other – Inner) ratio, one should first understand that the self-actualizing person is both “other-directed” in that he is dependent upon and supported by other persons’ views, and he is also “inner-directed” in that he is independent and self-supportive. The degree to which he is each of these can be expressed in a ratio. The O – I ratio of a self-actualizing person is, on the average, 1 to 3, which means that he depends primarily on his own feelings and secondarily on the feelings of others in his life decisions.

If your score is significantly higher than 1 to 3, that is 1 to 4 or above, it may be that this indicates an exaggerated independence and reflects a need to appear “too self-actualized” in responding to the POI. On the other hand, if your score is lower than 1 to 3, for example 1 to 1, it would suggest that you are in the dilemma of finding it difficult to trust either your own or others’ feelings in making important decisions.

**PROFILE SCORES**

A short description of each scale which describes low and high scores are presented on the back of this page.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME INCOMPETENT vs TIME COMPETENT</th>
<th>TIME INCOMPETENT - Lives in the past or future</th>
<th>TIME COMPETENT - Lives in the present</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OTHER DIRECTED vs INNER DIRECTED</td>
<td>OTHER DIRECTED - Dependent, seeks support of others' views</td>
<td>INNER DIRECTED - Independent, self-supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ACTUALIZING VALUE</td>
<td>Rejects values of self-actualizing people</td>
<td>Holds values of self-actualizing people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXISTENTIALITY</td>
<td>Rigid in application of values</td>
<td>Flexible in application of values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEELING REACTIVITY</td>
<td>Insensitive to own needs and feelings</td>
<td>Sensitive to own needs and feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPONTANEITY</td>
<td>Fearful of expressing feelings behaviorally</td>
<td>Freely expresses feelings behaviorally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-REGARD</td>
<td>Has low self-worth</td>
<td>Has high self-worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SELF-ACCEPTANCE</td>
<td>Unable to accept self with weaknesses</td>
<td>Accepting of self in spite of weaknesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATURE OF MAN, CONSTRUCTIVE</td>
<td>Sees man as essentially evil</td>
<td>Sees man as essentially good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNERGY</td>
<td>Sees opposites of life as antagonistic</td>
<td>Sees opposites of life as meaningfully related</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCEPTANCE OF AGGRESSION</td>
<td>Denies feelings of anger or aggression</td>
<td>Accepts feelings of anger or aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY FOR INTERPERSONAL CONTACT</td>
<td>Has difficulty with warm interpersonal relations</td>
<td>Has warm interpersonal relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROFILE SCORES (Continued)**

*In general, scores above the average on these scales, that is, above the mid-line shown by a standard score of 50, but below a standard score of 60 are considered to be more characteristic of self-actualizing adults. The closer your scores are to this range, the more similar are your responses to the POI responses given by self-actualizing people.*

**The further below the score 50 your scores are, the more they represent areas in which your responses are not like those of self-actualizing people. If most of your scores on the profile are considerably above 60, you may be presenting a picture of yourself which is “too” healthy or which overemphasizes your freedom and self-actualization. Your counselor can discuss the psychological rationale of each scale in greater detail with you.*

The ratings from this inventory should not be viewed as fixed or conclusive. Instead they should be viewed as merely suggestive and to be considered in the light of all other information. The Personal Orientation Inventory is intended to stimulate thought and discussion of your particular attitudes and values. Your profile will provide a starting point for further consideration of how you can achieve greater personal development.*