

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

BRIAN HALE BROWN for the degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY  
in Counseling and Guidance presented on July 15, 1977  
Title: AN INVESTIGATION OF QUALITIES PREDICTIVE OF FUTURE COUNSELOR  
EFFECTIVENESS

Abstract approved: *Redacted for Privacy*

Nature of the Phenomenon

The primary purpose of this investigation was to determine if the predisposition of counselor candidates on selected factors found to be associated with effective counseling, upon entering a counselor education program, was predictive of effective counselors at the end of that program.

Hypotheses

Two central hypotheses were conceived to explore the phenomenon of this investigation. The first hypothesis examined post-training effectiveness differences between three groups of master's students in counseling and guidance who functioned (discriminated) at three distinct levels of effectiveness prior to training. The second hypothesis explored pre- to posttest differences within each of the three student groups in terms of effectiveness discriminating ability. Additional secondary hypotheses relating to such factors as undergraduate grade-point average, sex, age, years of prior experience, were generated. Lastly, "personal criteria" supervisor ratings of effectiveness and "prescribed criteria" supervisor ratings of effectiveness were contrasted and subsequently each of these sets of ratings were compared with written inventory indexes of effectiveness.

### Methods and Procedures

The Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory was administered to 30 master's candidates in the Counseling and Guidance Department at Oregon State University during the beginning of fall quarter, 1976. This inventory was adapted from Dr. George M. Gazda's scales measuring the facilitative dimensions in human relations and was developed with the assistance and permission of Dr. Gazda. The sample of 30 master's candidates was composed of 21 females and 9 males and their average age was thirty-two. The instrument consisted of scales to measure the facilitative dimensions of empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness, self-disclosure, confrontation, immediacy of relationship, and an encompassing global scale.

During spring term, 1977 the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory was again administered to the 30 students and two types of counselor effectiveness rating forms were completed by their supervisors: one was based on "personal" criteria while the other was based on "prescribed" criteria (the facilitative dimensions). One-way analyses of variance were utilized to test for post-training differences in effectiveness between "low," "average," and "high" pre-training effectiveness groups as well as for post-training group differences in undergraduate grade-point averages, sex, age, years of counseling experience, and the eight (8) selected criteria of effectiveness measured by the inventory. The major outcome of the study, a counselor selection model for future applicants, was developed through the use of stepwise multiple regression analysis, analysis of variance, t tests of significance, a correlation matrix, and ultimately discriminant analysis. The .05 level of significance was chosen for testing all hypotheses although additional information (.01 level) was furnished where applicable.

### Findings

Results of the investigation indicated that the only significant difference which existed at the completion of the training program

between the three groups of students was between the pre-training "low" effectiveness group and the pre-training "high" effectiveness group. No significant differences existed between the "low" and "average" groups nor between the "average" and "high" groups at the completion of the study. There were no significant differences between post-training level of effectiveness and sex, undergraduate grade-point averages, and age. The variables of "concreteness," "genuineness," and "empathy" were shown to be significant predictors of counselor effectiveness with the variable "concreteness" explaining over 37 percent of the variance alone. A counselor selection model was developed through this investigation and an example provided of its usage.

© 1977

BRIAN HALE BROWN

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

An Investigation of Qualities Predictive  
of Future Counselor Effectiveness

by

Brian Hale Brown

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

June 1978

APPROVED:

*Redacted for Privacy*\_\_\_\_  
Assistant Professor of Counseling and Guidance  
in charge of major

*Redacted for Privacy*\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the School of Education

*Redacted for Privacy*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate School

Date thesis is presented July 15, 1977

Typed by Deanna L. Cramer for Brian Hale Brown

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The people who have assisted this writer to succeed in his efforts are numerous. They have given him their time, constructive criticism, patience, and love. I am sincerely grateful, I am indebted to them, and I thank them deeply.

For being my major professor, devil's advocate, and good friend,	Dr. James L. Firth
For her respected advice, warm support, and sincere interest in my study,	Dr. Mary Jane Wall
For their insistent questioning, accurate perceptions, and genuine concern for quality research,	Dr. Jo Anne J. Trow Dr. Craig C. Lundberg Dr. Robert F. Cain Dr. Glenn E. Clark
For his complete cooperation, consultation, and excitement for my investigation,	Dr. George M. Gazda
For his statistical advice, and suggestions,	Mr. Neil Poulsen
For taking the time to assist with various logistical problems of the investigation,	Ms. Phyllis Leaming
For her care and skill in the typing and preparation of this dissertation,	Ms. Deanna L. Cramer
For being extremely patient, a sounding board, a source of continual encouragement, and someone truly special,	Ms. Anita Brown, my wife
For being my personal confidant, ceaseless critic, paperweight, and combatant of my pen,	Mr. Perrick Brown, our cat

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
	Background and Significance of the Study. . . . .	1
	Nature of the Phenomenon. . . . .	5
	Major Outcome of the Investigation. . . . .	5
	Central Hypotheses. . . . .	5
	Secondary Hypotheses. . . . .	6
	Definition of Terms . . . . .	7
	Basic Assumptions . . . . .	9
	Summary . . . . .	10
II	A REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH . . . . .	12
	A Review of Counselor Candidate Selection	
	Procedures. . . . .	12
	Intellective Selection Measures. . . . .	13
	Personality and Interest Inventory Measures. . . . .	14
	Self-Selection . . . . .	15
	A Review of Counselor Effectiveness Criteria. . . . .	16
	Personality and Trait Criteria . . . . .	17
	Intellectual and Academic Criteria . . . . .	19
	Peer Ratings . . . . .	20
	Experience as a Criteria . . . . .	21
	Philosophical/General Effectiveness Criteria . . . . .	22
	Facilitative Conditions. . . . .	23
	Summary . . . . .	23
	A Review of the Research Support for the	
	Effectiveness Criteria Selected for this	
	Study . . . . .	24
III	METHODS AND PROCEDURES . . . . .	31
	Research Design . . . . .	31
	Sample Selection. . . . .	32
	Characteristics of the Sample . . . . .	32
	The Research Setting. . . . .	35
	Community. . . . .	35
	The University . . . . .	35
	Counselor Education Program. . . . .	35
	Instrumentation . . . . .	38
	Development of the Counseling Situations	
	and Responses Inventory. . . . .	38
	Supervisor Rating Forms. . . . .	42
	Treatment of the Data . . . . .	42
	Major Objective of the Investigation. . . . .	45
	Procedural Summary. . . . .	45



# Table of Contents -- continued

<u>Chapter</u>		<u>Page</u>
IV	ANALYSIS OF THE DATA . . . . .	47
	Presentation of the Results . . . . .	47
	Nature of the Phenomenon. . . . .	47
	Central Hypothesis 1. . . . .	47
	Central Hypothesis 2. . . . .	50
	Secondary Hypothesis 1. . . . .	51
	Secondary Hypothesis 2. . . . .	51
	Secondary Hypothesis 3. . . . .	52
	Secondary Hypothesis 4. . . . .	52
	Secondary Hypothesis 5. . . . .	53
	Secondary Hypothesis 6. . . . .	56
	Secondary Hypothesis 6a . . . . .	56
	Secondary Hypothesis 6b . . . . .	57
	Major Outcome of the Investigation. . . . .	57
V	SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	61
	Summary . . . . .	61
	The Phenomenon . . . . .	61
	Research Design. . . . .	61
	The Sample . . . . .	62
	Instrumentation. . . . .	62
	Treatment of the Data. . . . .	63
	Major Objective of the Investigation . . . . .	63
	Discussion. . . . .	63
	Central Hypotheses 1, 2. . . . .	63
	Secondary Hypothesis 1 . . . . .	65
	Secondary Hypothesis 2 . . . . .	65
	Secondary Hypothesis 3 . . . . .	65
	Secondary Hypothesis 4 . . . . .	66
	Secondary Hypothesis 5 . . . . .	66
	Secondary Hypotheses 6, 6a, 6b . . . . .	67
	Recommendations . . . . .	68
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	70
	APPENDIX A: Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory . . . . .	85
	APPENDIX B: Statement to be Read, Accompanying Administration of the Questionnaire . . . . .	96
	APPENDIX C: Global Scale. . . . .	97
	APPENDIX D: Supervisor's Rating Forms . . . . .	99

# LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Schema, number of subjects, and sex distribution . . . . .	33
2	Age composition by sex distribution of the three groups. .	33
3	Undergraduate grade-point average composition by sex distribution . . . . .	34
4	Number of years of full-time counseling experience . . . .	34
5	Summary of analysis of variance for groups 1, 2 and 3 on post-training effectiveness total scores of the counseling situations and responses inventory. . . . .	47
6	Extent of pretest to posttest "cross over" between groups in level of effectiveness . . . . .	49
7	Results of student's t tests between pre- and posttest level of effectiveness for each group. . . . .	50
8	An analysis of male versus female counselor effectiveness. . . . .	51
9	An analysis of undergraduate grade-point averages and levels of counselor effectiveness. . . . .	51
10	An analysis of age and levels of counselor effectiveness. . . . .	52
11	An analysis of pre-training counseling experience and levels of counselor effectiveness. . . . .	53
12	An analysis of the ability of selected effectiveness criteria to predict counselor effectiveness. . . . .	53
13	Analysis of variance of the three predictive variables: concreteness, genuineness and empathy. . . . .	54
14	Summary analysis of variance accounted for by the full regression model and accompanying t tests. . . . .	55
15	Correlation matrix for the full model. . . . .	55
16	An analysis of supervisor ratings of effectiveness based on "prescribed" versus "personal" criteria . . . . .	56

List of Tables -- continued

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
17	An analysis of supervisor ratings based on "personal" criteria and posttest inventory performance . . . . .	56
18	An analysis of supervisor ratings based on "prescribed" criteria and posttest inventory performance . . . . .	57

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Research design . . . . .	32
2	Pretest to posttest "cross over". . . . .	43
3	Discriminant analysis rules . . . . .	59

# AN INVESTIGATION OF QUALITIES PREDICTIVE OF FUTURE COUNSELOR EFFECTIVENESS

## CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of selecting prospective counselor candidates persists as a complex and unresolved issue in the area of counselor education. While most educators would agree that careful selection procedures are paramount to an effective program of counselor education, a reliably predictive procedure to measure effective counseling potential in candidates has been most elusive. Much research has taken place to significantly improve counselor selection procedures; yet, results have been inconsistent and relatively nonpredictive. While counselor education programs will continue to produce counselors who are both effective and ineffective, it is hoped that increased and varied research efforts will yield candidate selection criteria and procedures that are more consistently predictive of successful or potentially effective counselors.

### Background and Significance of the Study

Few individuals involved in counseling in any capacity disagree with the proposition that selection of prospective counselors is important and should be done rigorously. But no exact criteria for evaluating candidates for admission have yet been established. While relatively little research has focused on predictions of counselor effectiveness in schools or colleges, there appears to be no one yardstick for measuring probable success or failure (p. 554).

This quotation by Shertzer and Stone (1968) is indicative of one of the major problems in the area of guidance and counseling today. In brief, the criteria and processes utilized in the selection of potential counselors are generally untested, and, little has been done to predict who "will" and who "will not" become effective counselors.

Yet, this researcher is in total agreement with McGowan and Schmidt (1962) who point out that there are two major reasons for a careful selection process to take place:

- (1) Professional counselors and counselor trainees have an ethical responsibility to the public to provide capable and well-trained counselors. They also have an obligation to protect their own profession from criticism which could come about as the result of ineffective or unprofessional services.
- (2) Careful selection of students should prevent persons from investing heavily of themselves in a direction which holds little promise for their own personal happiness or professional success (p. 29).

Although graduate programs in counselor education currently employ a variety of selection criteria for entrance, the rationale for most of these criteria (e.g., grade-point average) are simply founded in tradition, while other selection criteria merely consist of personal feelings about individual candidates by selection committees. In this regard, Truax and Carkhuff (1967) feel that:

In part, current selection procedures derive from the fact that solid evidence for selection has been largely non-existent. A supervisor does not know a "good prospective therapist" from a poor one, except in terms of very private norms and experience (p. 233).

In addition to personal selection criteria, very general descriptions of potential candidates have been utilized for selection purposes. Even Carl Rogers (1956) once wrote,

If an individual is bright, sensitive, and desirous of doing psychotherapy, he is probably a suitable candidate for this field, in the present state of our ignorance (p. 760).

While it would undoubtedly be true that some of the candidates selected utilizing this criteria would become effective counselors, many certainly would not. Though estimates vary, Truax and Mitchell (1971) more currently point out that:

From existing data it would appear that only one out of three people entering professional training

have the requisite interpersonal skills to prove helpful to patients. ...In short, current procedures for selection and training are indefensible (p. 337).

This being the situation, it is a most distressing conclusion by Hill (1961) that counseling professions have devoted little time and effort to researching the process or criteria by which prospective counselors are selected.

In the Standards for the Preparation of Counselors and Other Pupil Personnel Specialists proposed by the Commission on Standards and Accreditation (1973), there are essentially six statements which directly address themselves to selection, retention, endorsement, and placement. The most pertinent statement on counselor selection says,

A continuing evaluation through systematic review is made of students as they progress through the program.

Although Lewis (1970) might be correct in assuming that,

Most counseling programs do, however, provide opportunities for on-going selection of their students, especially during the practicum. Thus a student who makes slow progress in acquiring counseling skills or who demonstrates characteristics that appear to mitigate against his success as a counselor may be "counseled" into another field (p. 260).

it is the contention of this researcher that both the counseling program and the students involved would benefit if potentially ineffective counselors could be identified prior to beginning the actual counselor training program. It is also the belief of this researcher that the number of persons who are eventually selected out of counselor education programs is actually very small. Given this present state of selection procedures, the implication is that even the "less skilled" students are being allowed to complete their counseling degrees and subsequently are offering a lesser quality of help to their clients. As Shertzer and Stone (1968) suggest,

...dismissal of a student who has gained entry into a program is painful to all concerned. While it is sometimes done, it is not desirable for those in

counselor education to allow "borderline" students to pass through and be granted degrees. Presumably, no university program of any kind is free of this kind of problem. In truth, both the discipline and the student suffer from it (p. 439).

Hill (1961) has probably written more about the selection of counselors than anyone else. He has pointed out that, first, the literature on counselor selection is meager compared with the general guidance literature; second, that only a limited amount of research has dealt with identification, selection, screening, placement, and follow-up of counselors; and third, that the profession has arrived at a point where concerted attention to these problems is needed. Whiteley (1967) has reinforced Hill's criticism by reiterating that the research which has concerned itself with the selection of counseling students has been surprisingly sparse. Although much of the literature in counseling and guidance has dealt with the content of counselor education programs, Lewis (1970) points out that,

...a training institution must concern itself both with the selection of persons with good "counseling potential" as well as with providing these persons with the program which can best enable them to develop this potential (p. 259).

And, since there is much philosophical as well as practical variability in the counselor education programs being offered to prospective counselors today, perhaps Truax and Carkhuff (1967) should be listened to more closely in their suggestion that:

...one way of producing more effective therapists is to be more selective in reviewing prospective trainees (p. 223).

Durbank (1974) is also supportive of this viewpoint in adding that,

Unless programs effective in promoting the ingredients which make for effective counselors are established, the alternative of careful selection of counselor candidates may be the only available avenue to insure that future counselors will be more effective in their profession (p. 178).



In summary, McGowan and Schmidt (1962) describe the current status of counselor education selection procedures by stating,

It must be emphasized that no solution to the problem of selection has been reached (p. 31).

Consequently, counselor education programs have basically three candidate selection procedures available to them: (1) selecting people before admitting them to the program, (2) selecting out candidates during or at the end of the counselor education program, or (3) both. While the major problem in attempting to select potentially effective counselors before admittance lies in ascertaining the selection criteria, problems involved in the second method include de-selected students as well as the real possibility of ineffective counselors being granted their degrees because of a lack of information received by supervisors as to their competence. Clearly, the problem is a complex one.

#### Nature of the Phenomenon

The primary problem of this investigation is to determine if the pre-training levels of counselor candidates on selected factors found to be associated with effective counseling, upon entering a counselor education program, are predictive of effective counselors at the end of that program.

#### Major Outcome of the Investigation

The major outcome of this investigation will be the development of a prediction model which may be utilized in the selection process of potentially effective counselors.

#### Central Hypotheses

The central hypotheses of this study are as follows:

1. There will be no significant differences in counselor effectiveness at the termination of a counselor education program between

three groups of counselor candidates who discriminated at three distinct levels of effectiveness (low, average, and high) at the initiation of the program.

2. There will be no significant differences in each of the three groups of counselor candidates, between pre-training level and post-training level of effectiveness.

### Secondary Hypotheses

The secondary hypotheses of this study are as follows:

1. There will be no significant difference in counselor effectiveness between males and females at the end of the study.

2. There will be no significant differences between those students initially placed in the low, average, and high effectiveness groups at the end of the counselor education program in terms of pre-training, undergraduate grade-point averages.

3. There will be no significant differences between those students initially placed in the low, average, and high effectiveness groups at the end of the counselor education program in terms of age.

4. There will be no significant differences between those students initially placed in the low, average, and high effectiveness groups at the end of the counselor education program in terms of pre-training counseling experience.

5. There will be no significant differences between the selected criteria of effectiveness in their ability to predict counselor effectiveness (total sample of males and females).

6. There will be no significant difference between supervisor ratings based on "prescribed" versus "personal" criteria.

6a. There will be no significant difference between supervisor ratings based on "personal" criteria and posttest inventory performances.

6b. There will be no significant difference between supervisor ratings based on "prescribed" criteria and posttest inventory performances.

## Definition of Terms

The list of definitions which follows will be utilized for the purposes of this investigation:

Effectiveness criteria refers to those counselor qualities which have been shown to be associated with positive client change, in terms of a variety of outcome measures.

Counseling is defined as a process by which a person or persons with "normal," everyday frustrations and problems are helped to feel and/or behave in a more personally fulfilling way, through the provision of a meaningful relationship with another person or persons.

Candidates are defined as first year master's level students who were enrolled in the "Block" counselor education program during the fall, winter and spring quarters, 1976-77, at Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oregon.

"Block Program" refers to the counselor education program at Oregon State University which is based on the National Defense Education Act counselor training Institute model. The candidates actively participate for a certain "block" of time each day, together and apart, rather than attending various individual classes in counselor education throughout the campus at different time periods.

Statistically significant differences refers to differences found in the data which are too large to be due to chance. The significance level for this study will be the .05 level, unless stated otherwise.

Facilitative dimensions are composed of a common core of conditions which are conducive to facilitative human experiences. The core conditions which have recieved the most impressive support from the research are: empathy, respect, warmth, genuineness, self-disclosure, concreteness, confrontation, and immediacy of relationship (Gazda, 1974, p. 14).

Empathy means to "put oneself in the shoes of another" and to "see through the eyes of another (Gazda, 1974, p. 25). It means to deeply understand. Carkhuff (1969a) has found empathy to be "the most critical of all helping process variables, the one from which all other dimensions flow in the helping process" (p. 202).

Respect can be defined as one person's belief in or faith that another person has the ability to solve his or her own problems. Respect develops as one person learns about the uniqueness and the capabilities of another (Gazda, 1974, p. 25).

Warmth, a dimension which is basically communicated through non-verbal means, means "caring." Warmth is closely related to empathy and respect in that we tend to love or have concern for those we know (understand) and believe in (respect). (Gazda, 1974, p. 25)

Concreteness refers to the counselor or helpee pinpointing or accurately labeling his feelings and experiences. The helper facilitates this by being specific himself; at least as specific as the helpee has been or more specific than the helpee (Gazda, 1974, p. 26). Taking a range of forms from direct questions to reflections, concreteness is a catalyst that makes possible full exploration of relevant problem areas (Carkhuff, 1969a, p. 181).

Genuineness refers to the ability of the counselor or helper to be real or honest with the helpee. His verbalizations are congruent with his inner feelings (Gazda, 1974, p. 26).

Self-Disclosure basically refers to the ability of the counselor to convey appropriately, "I've been there too." By "appropriately" is meant disclosing relevant information at the right time. When helper self-disclosure is premature or irrelevant to the helpee's problem, it tends to confuse the helpee or put the focus on the helper (Gazda, 1974, p. 26).

Confrontation is best described as the means a helper uses to inform the helpee that there is a discrepancy in what the helpee is saying or doing (Gazda, 1974, p. 52).

Immediacy of relationship refers to what is really going on between helper and helpee (Gazda, 1974, p. 28). Immediacy makes possible the communication of in-depth understanding in the helper-helpee relationship when the helper responds to what is happening between the helpee and him in the here and now (Gazda, 1974, p. 53).

Tukey Test is a significance test often used as a follow-up test to the F test, as well as other analysis of variance tests. If significant differences are found utilizing the F test, the Tukey Test can

then be used to contrast differences between individual means to locate the significant ones. The Tukey Test accomplishes this by contrasting all pairwise comparisons at the given significance level.

Statistical inference is concerned with attempts to make quantitative statements about properties of a population from a knowledge of the results given by a sample (Snedecor and Cochran, 1967, p. 29).

Multiple regression analysis is a method for studying the effects and the magnitudes of the effects of more than one independent variable on one dependent variable using principles of correlation and regression (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 603).

Discriminant analysis consists of a regression equation with a dependent variable that represents group membership. The function maximally discriminates the members of the group; it tells us to which group each member probably belongs.

...The discriminant function, then, can be used to assign individuals to groups on the basis of their scores on two or more measures (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 650).

### Basic Assumptions

In an effort to evaluate whether the predisposition of counselor candidates on selected factors was predictive of effective counseling, particular assumptions had to be made with reference to the counselor candidates, counselor supervisors, the measuring instrument utilized, as well as the time period selected for the study. The assumptions being made were:

1. The three groups of master's candidates, not being physically separated to any great extent during their block program of counselor education, were exposed to essentially the same kinds of discussions, experiences, and learning throughout the program.

2. Purposefully separating the candidates into equal groups of 33-1/3 percent of the total group on the basis of their pretest performances was a reasonable control for the regression effect.

3. The data collected over the period of time of one school year (three terms) yielded sufficiently valid results to either support or refute the stated hypotheses of this study.

4. Supervisors, at the end of the study, were able to respond both objectively (utilizing the rating list given them of described criteria) and subjectively (utilizing solely their "personal" system for rating) in rating the candidate's effectiveness levels.

5. The measurement instrument utilized in this investigation, whose scales were designed by Dr. George M. Gazda of the University of Georgia, is both valid and reliable for measuring the selected counselor effectiveness criteria as purported by Dr. Gazda.

6. Master's candidates responded as realistically and truthfully as possible on the pretest/posttest instrument, as well as for the duration of the counselor education program in terms of their behavior.

7. The same procedures and objectives of this study are applicable to other counselor education programs at other colleges and universities.

#### Summary

Briefly, the major focus of this investigation is to design and test a procedure which can aid counselor education selection committees in the process of selecting counselor candidates for their programs. Specifically, the procedures will conclude with a model which is predictive in the sense of selecting from future applicants those people who have the highest probability of becoming effective counselors. Whereas the end result of this particular study is a prediction model pertinent to the "Block" counselor education program at Oregon State University, depending upon the philosophy of accompanying counselor education programs at other colleges and universities, similar prediction models can be developed accordingly.

Additionally, the present study investigates the proposition that those people who enter counselor training and already possess a relatively high level of effective counselor characteristics necessarily conclude their training with a significantly higher level

of counselor effectiveness skills. As Truax (1970) describes them, there are "inherently helpful" people -- the kind of people whose neighbors and friends seek out in times of need and distress, and the kind of person who we all might wish were the only kind of person to enter graduate training in psychotherapy (pp. 4-15). Consequently, as Patterson (in Whitley, 1967) suggests:

...it certainly would be worth investigating whether those applicants who respond most therapeutically with no preparation or experience, and in a novel or even threatening situation, are the ones who become the best therapists following training (p. 92).

## CHAPTER II. A REVIEW OF THE RELATED RESEARCH

The review of literature and research related to the stated problem is summarized within this chapter. Since the present investigation concerns itself with the main objective of arriving at a model for predicting potential counselor effectiveness in beginning counseling and guidance students, the literature review has been divided into three separate sections, as follows: (1) A Review of Counseling Candidate Selection Procedures; (2) A Review of Counselor Effectiveness Criteria; and (3) A Review of the Research Support for the Effectiveness Criteria Chosen for this Study.

### A Review of Counselor Candidate Selection Procedures

As Shertzer and Stone (1968) suggest, an urgent problem in counselor education is the selection of candidates who are to become counselors. They subsequently propose that the responsibility for screening out unlikely candidates from admission to counselor education programs rightfully belongs to the college or university where preparation is sought. Accordingly, a wide variety of selection methods or procedures have been employed in the hope of being able to predict which candidates for admittance to these programs will successfully complete them and go on to become effective counselors. Screening procedures have included assessing past work experiences, intelligence and achievement test results, personality test results, past academic records, interest inventory profiles, personal interview performances, and letters of reference. As Shertzer and Stone (1968) point out,

Typical criteria for admission to counselor education programs include the candidate's undergraduate grade-point average, a measure of academic ability such as the Miller Analogies Test or the Graduate Record Examination (ability section), results of personality inventories such as the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule or the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and results of interest inventories such as the Strong Vocational Interest Blank or the Kuder Preference Record-Personal. An increasing



number of institutions request that individuals who express interest in entering counselor education be personally interviewed by staff members before action is taken on their application (p. 557).

Although these and other selection procedures have been used in the past and continue to be used today, the rationale for their usage has generally been unclear, if not unfounded.

### Intellective Selection Measures

Investigations like the ones reported by Wittmer and Lister (1971) and O'Hearn and Arbuckle (1964) have found a negligible relationship between measures of academic ability and counselor effectiveness, yet, many graduate programs in both psychology and counseling continue to select applicants on the basis of undergraduate grades and various tests of academic ability. These studies, as well as the one by Callis and Prediger (1964) are actually attempting to predict the academic achievement of potential counselors during their training programs rather than the probability of them becoming effective counselors in the future. As Shertzer and Stone (1974) recently suggested,

Currently, most counselor education institutions place substantial reliance upon intellective measures in selecting candidates. These estimate whether the individual can succeed in graduate study and usually work best to eliminate those who could not cope intellectually with course work. But study after study suggests that nonintellective variables rather than intellect are of crucial significance to effective counseling. Because of this dilemma, the search for an objective approach to assess nonintellective variables goes on (p. 438).

In fairness to counselor education programs, however, it must be noted that graduate schools within universities and colleges have particular standards which must be met. Hence, many times it is undoubtedly not within the jurisdiction of individual programs of counselor education to lower these standards of admittance.

## Personality and Interest Inventory Measures

Investigations which have attempted to utilize personality and interest inventories in the process of counselor selection have been inconsistent and hence, inconclusive. For example, Johnson, Shertzer, Linden, and Stone (1967) administered the Strong Vocational Interest Blank (male) as well as four well-known personality tests (The California Personality Inventory, the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory) to a group of 99 counselor trainees. Ratings of effectiveness in the practicum were utilized as the counselor effectiveness criterion. In brief, results of their study indicated that chance alone would have accounted for a greater number of significant correlations with the criterion "practicum grade" than were found!

A study by Canon (1964), utilizing 18 counselors and 121 clients from eight university counseling centers as subjects, consisted of an elaborate analysis of the relationship of client and counselor attitudes toward one another to measures of Autonomy, Schizoid Functioning, Repression, and Suppression (Omnibus Personality Inventory). The results of Canon's investigations were low relationships and very few were significant.

Lastly, the conclusions of a study by Demos and Zuwaylif (1966) are quite representative. Although their study indicated that on the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule the most effective counselors exhibited more nurturance and affiliation while the least effective indicated more autonomy, abasement, and aggression, the authors themselves concluded that most of the studies which have attempted to arrive at common personality characteristics of effective counselors through the use of personality tests have been inconclusive. They go on to recommend that counselor educators should use extreme caution when attempting to screen or evaluate potential counselors on the basis of personality characteristics measured by present psychological instruments.

George E. Hill (1961), a noted authority on counselor selection, has questioned this search for counselor personality characteristics.

He feels that research in this area has failed to establish a standard personality pattern of counselor characteristics because of the various roles the counselors must fill, the variety of relationships involved in his work, and the diversity of skills he must maintain from one school or college to another.

Research efforts aimed at establishing a counselor personality have been refuted by McGowan and Schmidt (1962), who write,

In regard to the selection of counselors many persons do not expect or even want a specific or exact description of the counselor or his characteristics. They give such reasons as these: (1) the counseling process is far too complex to be related to any one type of counselor personality; (2) because counseling is based on personal and cooperative interaction between the client and the counselor it is not likely that any counselor would be able to interact in the same way with all kinds of clients; (3) the tremendous variation in client problems suggests the need for a similarly wide variation in the people who are going to work with them; and (4) counseling is primarily creative, not mechanical, and as such may be effectively conducted by widely differing but creative individuals (p. 27).

Tyler (1969) concurs with McGowan and Schmidt, expressing that the assumption there is a certain combination of personality characteristics which is optimum for effective counseling is probably unsound. She suggests that we give up the belief that there is one standard personality type and recognize that men and women of a wide variety of personality types can function successfully as counselors.

#### Self-Selection

Self-selection of counselor applicants has been utilized with varying degrees of success. Of course there are consistently a few applicants who de-select themselves from counselor education programs during training. Yet, complete self-selection into or to continue training has been refuted by Wrenn (1952) in the sense of being somewhat of a risk. Wrenn writes,

...Nor is it adequate as a basis for self-selection that the individual feels that he wants to be helpful to others and that he likes to be around people. This desire to "do good" may have its origins in personality needs that limit the person's ability to be objective and effective in working with others (p. 9) ...

However, one study by Thweatt (1963) employing a process of counselor candidate self-selection does merit description. Fifty-five graduate students in advanced counseling classes were initially asked to respond to 30 threatening statements made by clients. The responses were then classified as either "affective" or "cognitive." During the course of the counselor education program the students were asked to assess their own motives and to develop insight as to their responses. At the end of the program, of the 15 students who made above average "cognitive" responses, all but three had decided to leave the program. Of the 40 students who made predominantly "affective" responses, all had decided to stay in the program. It is clear that additional research in this area is warranted.

In summary, the following statement by Shertzer and Stone (1968) accurately describes the present counselor selection situation while alluding to another problem area which is closely related:

The diversity of the methods employed in published studies of counselor and counselee characteristics and effectiveness attests to a lack of satisfaction with the results obtained. Intimately related to this dissatisfaction is the problem of the definition and measurement of adequate effectiveness criteria for assessing counseling activity (p. 170).

#### A Review of Counselor Effectiveness Criteria

Although it is apparent that numerous counselor selection procedures have been utilized or at least suggested, the problem is further compounded when one considers the point so aptly made by Seligman and Bladwin (1972):

...The predictive validity of any selection device is always relative to a criterion... (p. 59).

In brief, one of the critical issues in any counseling research effort has been termed the "effectiveness problem." The question of arriving at what constitutes the criteria for "effective" counselors has been as great, if not greater, than the dilemma of how to select potential counselors. Clearly, these two facets of the problem are necessarily related and must be considered mutually dependent.

### Personality and Trait Criteria

Although there appears to be almost unanimous agreement among counseling theorists that the counselor's personality is one of the truly critical variables in the determination of his or her effectiveness (Ford and Urban, 1963; Allen, 1964), research efforts alluding to specific traits have been inconsistent. Shertzer and Stone (1974) agree, stating,

At the present time, the counseling profession is unable to demonstrate consistently that a single trait or pattern of traits distinguishes an individual who is or will be a "good" counselor. Good counseling, like good teaching, is a highly complex activity which is situationally dependent upon the counselor, the counselee, the setting, the topic, and the conditions under which it is conducted (p. 126).

Tyler (1961) is in agreement with Shertzer and Stone, emphasizing,

...Just as there is no one kind of personality essential to the husband or wife, mother or father, lover, neighbor, or friend, so there is no one kind essential to the counselor (p. 200).

Nevertheless, a study by Demos and Zuwaylif (1966) attempted to identify the most promising and relevant personality variables of "effective" counselors by administering the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Study of Values, Kuder Preference Record-Personal, and the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule to a 30-member summer NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institute. In terms of personality variables or traits, effective counselors exhibited significantly more nurturance and affiliation whereas the least effective exhibited autonomy, abasement, and aggression to a greater degree.

Further, a study by Donald H. Blocher (1963) utilized a multiple regression approach to the prediction of effective counselors. The criteria consisted of staff member rankings of the predicted success as a school counselor. The predictor variables were peer rankings, NDEA Counseling and Guidance Comprehensive Examination data, Kuder Personal Preference scores (Form D), and fall quarter grades. It was Blocher's contention that the high school counselor score of the Kuder Preference Record was extremely valuable in the sense of being predictive of counseling effectiveness.

In a study by Whitely, Sprinthall, Mosher, and Donaghy (1967), the construct "cognitive flexibility" was evaluated as a necessary dimension of counselor effectiveness: cognitive flexibility being defined as:

...the ability to think and act simultaneously and appropriately, consisting of openmindedness, adaptability, resistance to premature closure, etc. (p. 227).

These authors found that predictions made of counselor effectiveness based upon these scores correlated .78 and .73 with ratings made by their supervisors. They also found, however, that intelligence scores only correlated .09 with supervisor ratings.

In a review of the literature on the characteristics of effective counselors by Walton and Sweeney (1969), the following were summarized: open-mindedness, effective communication, high on deference and order, low on abasement and aggression, sensitive to and concerned with perceptions of others and ability for honest self-evaluation. And, in another review of the characteristics of effective counselors, this one by Jackson and Thompson (1971), they found that,

...the most effective counselors were significantly more positive in their attitudes toward self, most people, most clients, and counseling than the least effective counselors (p. 251).

Clearly, the problem of consolidating the results of these studies, as well as numerous others, can be seen. While some researchers have approached the problem from a trait and factor point of view,

others have attempted to arrive at common attitudes, dispositions, and even interests. Tuma and Gustad (1957) pointed out twenty years ago that there had not emerged any standard personality pattern or profile which had resulted from studying the characteristics of practicing or employed counselors which could be consistently related to counselor effectiveness. More recently, Shertzer and Stone (1971) arrived at the same conclusion, stating,

An overriding conclusion to be drawn from a review of the literature pertaining to interests and personality characteristics and counseling effectiveness is that the findings so far have been inconclusive and often conflicting and that additional research is needed (p. 158).

#### Intellectual and Academic Criteria

Neither intellectual nor academic measures have been found to be effective predictors of counselor effectiveness. A representative example of this type of research is the study by Callis and Prediger (1964) which attempted to assess the relative effectiveness of the Ohio State University Psychological Examination (OSUPE), Miller Analogy Test, Cooperative English Test: C2 Reading Comprehension, and grade-point average in predicting the academic achievement of graduate students in counseling and guidance. The subjects consisted of NDEA Counseling and Guidance Institute enrollees during the 1959, 1960, and 1961 summers. In brief, some combination of OSUPE and the Reading Comprehension subtest generally produced the highest multiple correlation. Yet, the intent of the study was to predict academic achievement of potential counselors and this was apparently assumed to be equal to or predictive of "counselor effectiveness." This assumption has been researched in numerous investigations and has been found to be a faulty one.

For example, studies by Allen (1967) and Carkhuff, Piaget, and Pierce (1968) have failed to demonstrate any relationship between grade-point average and counseling effectiveness of counselor candidates (utilizing level of functioning on the facilitative dimensions

as the criteria of effectiveness). Another study with counselor trainees, this one by Bergin and Solomon (1963), indicated no relationship between the level of empathic understanding provided in counseling and such measures as grade-point averages and practicum grades. It should be pointed out, however, that the results of this particular study were based on a small sample and did not consider sex differences.

A large study by Bernos (1966) utilized 349 male and 98 female counselor candidate enrollees as its sample. The enrollees were given a variety of ability and personality tests, and the criterion measures consisted of examination scores, grade-point average, and a global staff rating. While a variety of factors surfaced, very few were related to the three criterion measures.

Lastly, in a multiple regression approach to the problem, Blocher (1963) also looked at grades (fall quarter) as one criterion measure of predicted counselor effectiveness. In short, as was found in similar studies, Blocher's investigation revealed no predictive relationship between the two variables.

In summary, intellectual measures of predicted effectiveness estimate whether counselor candidates will be able to succeed in the course work during their training programs. Therefore, since intellectual measures are not necessarily predictive of counselor effectiveness, non-intellectual measures must necessarily be researched and assessed.

#### Peer Ratings

One of various studies that has employed peer ratings to arrive at predictions of counselor effectiveness was the study by Stefflre, King, and Leafgren (1962) which found that in terms of results on the Edwards Personal Preference Record, counselor candidates in an NDEA Institute who were judged to be most effective by their peers were found to score significantly higher on the scales of Deference and Order. In addition, the chosen counselors scored significantly lower than their counterparts on the EPPS scales of Abasement and Aggression. This last outcome, of course, was similar to one of the findings elicited in the study by Demos and Zuwaylif (1966).



In another study, one which utilized both peer ratings and supervisor ratings, results indicated that high-rated counselors tended to be more anxious, more sensitive to others, more alert, more yielding to the demands of others, and, more open to change than the low-rated counselors (Wicas and Mahan, 1966). Further, a study by Johnson, Shertzer, Linden and Stone (1967) revealed that peer ratings of counseling effectiveness and counseling practicum grade correlated .71, indicating a high degree of agreement between peer and supervisor ratings of counselor effectiveness. Yet, while peer ratings may be quite accurate in terms of correlating highly with other "effectiveness criteria" such as supervisor ratings, for selection purposes they cannot be viewed as optimal measures since accurate peer ratings can only be made after a substantial period of time has been spent within the counselor education program. Sprinthall, Whiteley and Mosher (1966) also point out the major shortcoming of this type of rating approach to be that judgments are made almost entirely on intuitive bases. A method of predicting probable future effectiveness as a counselor prior to admittance to the counselor education program would undoubtedly be preferable.

#### Experience As a Criteria

Lewis (1970), on the proposition that experience as a counselor is helpful in terms of effectiveness, purports, "There is general agreement that experience has a positive influence on counseling, and that most counselors improve with experience" (p. 108). Yet, as Seligman and Baldwin (1972) emphasize, variables such as "past professional experience" have been shown to be inconsistent as predictors. In fact, Lewis (1970) agrees with Seligman and Baldwin, pointing out that,

Experience itself is not automatically profitable;  
a person can continue to make the same mistakes  
repeatedly and learn nothing from them (p. 108).

In studies done by Fiedler, which are now classics, he demonstrated that regardless of theoretical background, there are some common characteristics of the relationships established by experienced

counselors. He observed that experienced counselors differed from non-experienced counselors in their ability to (1) communicate with and understand their patients, (2) maintain an appropriate emotional distance, and (3) divest themselves of status concerns in regard to their patients (Fiedler, 1950a; 1951). Yet, Hopke and Rochester (1969) reported that the "effective" counselors in their investigation were actually younger and had had fewer years of teaching experience than those termed "less effective." Here again, research results have been inconsistent and therefore inconclusive. The rationale for either selecting or screening out potential counselor candidates on the basis of past experience is clearly questionable.

#### Philosophical/General Effectiveness Criteria

Other characteristics have been suggested as being predictive of future counselor effectiveness. Truax (1970) proposed that for the selection of the better counselor candidates,

In an interpretive sense the research evidence suggests that we will get candidates with more natural therapeutic skill or interpersonal skill if we look for people low in anxiety, depression, and introversion who are at the same time striving, strong, dominant, active, and autonomous individuals (p. 8).

Of course the definition and objective measurement of various of the ingredients in Truax's description represent problems in themselves. For example, although Mowrer (1951) stated that the most important ingredient or desirable personal quality to be found in the counselor could be termed "personal maturity," he went on to admit that there was no trustworthy method available to measure this component.

A study by Parloff (1956) indicated that those therapists who established better social relationships with non-clients tended to establish better relationships with their clients. Supporting this finding was the conclusion of Shertzer and Stone (1974), who are convinced that,

Tolerance for ambiguity, maturity, understanding, ability to maintain an appropriate emotional distance from the counselee, and ability to maintain good social relationships with noncounselees are characteristics demonstrated to be associated with counselor effectiveness (p. 125).

Here again, however, the empirical measurement of these variables presents additional and complex problems.

#### Facilitative Conditions

Lastly, a growing number of studies have demonstrated that there are "attitudinal qualities" or "facilitative conditions" which, if possessed by counselors to a substantial degree, are indicative of effectiveness in a variety of situations, by a variety of counselors, with a variety of clients. The effectiveness of these counselor-offered conditions or attitudinal qualities of (1) empathic understanding, (2) respect or positive regard, and (3) facilitative genuineness has been supported by a vast amount of research (Carkhuff and Berenson, 1970; Rogers, Gendlin, Kiesler, and Truax, 1967; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967).

#### Summary

In brief, the diversity of criteria and methods employed to investigate who will and will not become effective counselors is indicative of the varied results, most of which have not been conclusive nor replicated. Although most researchers in the field now agree that efforts should be aimed at nonintellective variables as predictors of counselor effectiveness, to date the same frustrations arise. Jansen, Robb, and Bonk (1970) ask:

Who are the good guys and who are the bad ones? Clearly any tentative answer depends upon the chosen measure or measures of counselor characteristics and the criterion of counseling effectiveness. Research using a variety of measures and criteria has yielded results which are difficult to compare and virtually impossible to synthesize (p. 163).

Hence, as Johnson, et al. (1967) point out, the subject remains largely enigmatic. Attempts to identify the essential non-intellective variables have been frustrated by inadequate instruments, a lack of appropriate criteria, and the general elusiveness of the qualities themselves. Jansen, Robb and Bonk (1970) summarize the main questions which are still unanswered:

Who is an effective counselor? What are the distinguishing characteristics of the potentially competent candidate in a counselor education program? (p. 169)

And, who is likely to become an effective counselor? Since research efforts have been varied, inconsistent, refutable, and perhaps in the wrong direction, the following passage by Lewis (1970) most accurately sums up the current findings of the majority of investigations to date:

There is no ideal counselor personality. Research concerning the characteristics of counselors tells us only that many different kinds of person can become effective counselors. Partly this is because no one person has the ideal combination of strengths. A specific counselor may be able to compensate for a lower level of skill in one area by strength in another, and thus he may be as effective as the next person but for different reasons. Even if it were possible to design a hypothetically ideal counselor, no human being could be expected to fit the model perfectly (p. 109).

#### A Review of the Research Support for the Effectiveness Criteria Selected for this Study

As was pointed out in the previous section on counselor effectiveness criteria, there has been an abundance of traits and personality characteristics associated with effective counseling behavior. Yet, few consistencies appear to exist. Tyler (1961) proposes,

Perhaps it would be better if we all assumed that any personality pattern which permits rich and deep relationships with other human beings to develop is satisfactory (p. 200).

Perhaps, as Tyler suggests, it is the actual counselor-counselee relationship that is more critical and even more researchable in terms of effectiveness criteria. Dr. Tyler is not alone in her belief. Shertzer and Stone (1974) affirm that,

All theories and approaches stress the relationship between participants as the common ground for the helping process. While viewpoints differ in the amount of emphasis and in how they treat this topic, all agree that the relationship is a necessary condition for bringing about change in the individual (p. 269).

Added support for the proposition that the relationship is the critical variable in effective counseling comes from a study by Seeman (1954) which illustrated that success in psychotherapy was closely associated with the emotional quality of the established relationship. Additional evidence for this conclusion has been derived from a study by Parloff (1961) who demonstrated that those clients who established better relationships with their therapists made greater improvement than those clients whose relationships with the same therapists were not as good. Further, in a discussion concerning the outcomes of therapy, Ullman and Krasner (1964) conclude that, "The best results are obtained when the therapist and patient form a good interpersonal relationship" (p. 43). And lastly, from a review of the literature, Goldstein (1962) states,

There can be no longer any doubt as to the primary status which must be accorded the therapeutic relationship in the overall therapeutic transaction (p. 105).

It must be said, then, that there is a common attitude of support or agreement for the counselor-counselee relationship constituting the dominant variable in counselor effectiveness. The establishment of this relationship is critical to the amount of positive change which will follow. Yet, one must first reduce the variable "relationship" into its specific constituents before it can be researched. Therefore, in terms of the actual ingredients constituting the counseling relationship which distinguishes effective from ineffective counselors,

Rogers (1962) accurately sums up the findings of a substantial amount of research when he states,

The major findings from all of the studies is that those clients in relationships marked by a high level of counselor congruence, empathy, and unconditional positive regard show constructive personality change and development (p. 425).

These three qualities, then, have come to form the common thread found in a myriad of counselor effectiveness studies, regardless of the philosophical backgrounds of the counselors, the variety of clients composing the researched samples, environments in which the samples were studied, or whether they were individual or group counseling investigations. These core elements, as originally described, were termed "accurate empathy," "non-possessive warmth," and "genuineness" (Rogers, 1957). Although the main person to support these and similar characteristics was Carl Rogers (1957), various other researchers have added to the growing body of research illustrating their validity (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967; Berenson and Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff, 1969a,b; and, Carkhuff, 1971). Carkhuff (1969a,b) eventually refined and redefined the core conditions (or "facilitative dimensions") to consist of empathic understanding, respect, genuineness, self-disclosure, concreteness, confrontation, immediacy of relationship, and self-exploration. Validation data for each of these facilitative dimensions is plentiful (empathy: Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967; Carkhuff, 1968; and Carkhuff, 1969a. respect: Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967; and Carkhuff, 1968. genuineness: Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; Truax and Carkhuff, 1967; and Carkhuff, 1968. self-disclosure: Truax and Carkhuff, 1967; and Carkhuff, 1968. concreteness: Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; and Carkhuff, 1968. confrontation: Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; and Berenson and Mitchell, 1969. immediacy of relationship: Mitchell, 1967; and Berenson and Mitchell, 1969. self-exploration: Truax and Carkhuff, 1963, 1964, 1965, 1967; Carkhuff and Berenson, 1967; and Carkhuff, 1968). In summary, Patterson (1967) reviewed the literature on the various theoretical orientations of counselors and arrived at the following conclusions:

It appears that the most potent influences of human behavior, or the most potent reinforcer, is a relationship with another individual. It appears that the kind of relationship which is most effective is not a mechanized, controlled, mechanical administration of rewards, such as the expression of interest, concern, understanding, warmth, but a sincere, spontaneous, genuine expression of these characteristics. Thus the problem of selection of counselors is not the selection of techniques, of individuals who can learn procedures involved in the conditioning process, but of individuals who can offer a therapeutic relationship. Even if we agreed with Wolpe and Krumboltz (1966, pp. 7-8) that the relationship was necessary but not sufficient, our problem would be one of selecting individuals capable of offering a therapeutic relationship, since the additional requirements are essentially technical in nature and relatively easily acquired by almost anyone at least capable of graduate level work (p. 86).

As stated earlier, the three main or "core" elements of the effective counseling relationship have come to be known as the three facilitative conditions, or dimensions. They are the common thread found in the therapist- and counselor-client relationship across a wide variety of counseling effectiveness studies. For example, with a sample of 160 hospitalized patients involved in time-limited group psychotherapy, Truax and Wargo (1966) found that measures of positive patient outcome were associated with accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth, and therapist genuineness. Further, in a similar study utilizing a sample of hospitalized patients in group therapy, it was found that the three facilitative conditions were all significantly associated with patients' participation in the process of therapy, with the amount of self-revelation which took place, and with the extent of self-exploration exhibited (Truax, 1961a). And, in a study dealing with 40 outpatients who were treated by resident psychiatrists at the Phipps Psychiatric Clinic at Johns Hopkins University, it was found that patients of therapists offering high levels of accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth and genuineness demonstrated greater improvement than patients whose therapists offered relatively lower levels of these conditions (Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imber, Battle, Hoehn-Soric, Nash and Stone, 1966).

In a study involving a sample of 80 institutionalized juvenile delinquents who were participating in three months of group counseling, it was found that high levels of the facilitative conditions being offered by the group counselor were associated with positive behavioral and personality changes occurring in the juvenile delinquents, while low conditions were associated with negative or deteriorative changes (Truax and Wargo, 1966a). And, with another sample of institutionalized juvenile delinquents, 70 females, it was found that therapists who provided high levels of accurate empathy and non-possessive warmth to the treatment group brought about improvement beyond that of the control group on twelve criteria measures which were obtained before and after therapy. For example, the experimental group made significant gains over the control group toward more adequate self-concepts, toward perceiving parents and other authority figures as more reasonable and less threatening, and most importantly, they showed significant superiority over the control group on a psychological test measure designed to differentiate between delinquents and non-delinquents (Truax, Wargo, and Silber, 1966).

In a study of time-limited group counseling with emotionally disturbed college underachievers, it was found that the offering of relatively high levels of empathy, warmth and genuineness to the experimental group caused improvement over the control group. These college students offered moderate levels of the facilitative conditions illustrated grade-point averages and changes approximately equal to students of the control group, or rather, those not receiving high levels of the facilitative dimensions (Dickenson and Truax, 1966). And, in another research project utilizing college students, it was shown that the levels of conditions offered by college students to their roommates was predictive of their roommates' grade-point averages, even though neither group of students was aware of providing or receiving the interpersonal skills (Shapiro and Voog, 1969).

A classic study entitled "The Wisconsin Schizophrenic Project" found that with 14 schizophrenics receiving individual psychotherapy versus 14 carefully matched schizophrenic patients constituting the control group, patients receiving high levels of the three therapeutic



conditions showed an overall gain in psychological functioning. Conversely, patients receiving low levels showed a loss in psychological functioning with control patients showing moderate gains (Truax, 1963).

It has been illustrated in a study by Truax and Carkhuff (1965a) that transparency or authenticity on the part of the counselor will facilitate self-disclosure on the part of the counselee. Furthermore, their study indicated that the greater the amount of counselee self-exploration, the greater the amount of constructive personality change that would take place. (The one exception was with delinquent adolescents in group psychotherapy. With this population, less self-exploration facilitated a greater amount of positive personality change.) Giving further support to this finding is the study by Shapiro, Krauss and Truax (1969) which illustrated that people disclose themselves more deeply to those members of their family and to close friends who have offered the highest levels of the three therapeutic conditions (accurate empathy, non-possessive warmth, and genuineness). And, in another investigation of the importance of self-disclosure, Goodman (1962) found that clients whose therapists offered high levels of self-disclosure exhibited more self-exploration and "self-experiencing" during therapy than clients with therapists who displayed low levels of self-disclosure. Finally, various studies utilizing samples composed of male graduate students, mothers and fathers, college faculty members, and male and female friend target persons have illustrated that there is a reciprocal effect when the person who is the "helper" discloses to the "helpee" (Jourard, 1959; Jourard and Landsman, 1960; and, Jourard and Richman, 1963), while various other studies (utilizing experimenters and subjects) have shown that high disclosing people elicit greater disclosure from subjects than low disclosing people (Chittick and Himmelstein, 1967; Ehrlich and Graeven, 1971).

In terms of the dimension "confrontation," a study by Anderson (1968) illustrated that those therapists who were functioning at low facilitative levels had a deleterious effect upon self-exploration while those functioning at high levels could utilize confrontation to promote a greater degree of self-disclosure.

With reference to the therapeutic conditions and group counseling, a study by Dickenson and Truax (1966) investigated the effects of time-limited group counseling with forty-eight neurotic underachieving college freshmen. Results indicated that the twenty-four experimental students who received group counseling showed greater improvement in grade-point average than the twenty-four matched, non-counseled students. In addition, those counseled subjects who received the highest therapeutic conditions tended to show the greatest improvement.

In brief, the preceding section summarizes the ample research efforts which support the "facilitative dimensions" as counselor effectiveness criteria. Their universality is prevalent regardless of the geographic locations of the studies, the variety of people composing the samples, the nature of the counselors and therapists sampled and the amount of experience they possess, as well as their philosophical orientation, age, in both individual and group counseling modes. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) concisely depict the present state of the supportive research for the facilitative dimensions as counselor effectiveness criteria in the following narration:

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

### CHAPTER III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

#### Research Design

If we want to predict effective helping, we need to obtain an index of the prospective helper trainee's level of functioning in the helping role (Carkhuff, 1969a, p. 86).

The research design for this investigation was a three-group, pretest-posttest design which was ex post facto in nature. As the study took place in a counselor education setting with master's candidates, the design was necessarily an example of the hypothesis-testing field study described by Kerlinger (1973). At the beginning of the training program during 1976, students were separated into three groups of ten students each, based on pretest performance on the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory. The groups consisted of "low," "average," and "high" levels of performance. During spring term of the program, three posttest measures of effectiveness were taken: (1) a posttest administration of the original instrument, (2) supervisor's ratings based on prescribed effectiveness criteria ( $S_1$ ), and (3) supervisor's ratings based on their personal effectiveness criteria ( $S_2$ ). Subsequently, various analyses were performed to test the stated hypotheses and ultimately, to arrive at a model to predict counselor effectiveness for incoming master's students. In other words, the main aim of this design was to investigate the relationship between pre-training levels of specific qualities associated with effective counseling (i.e., predisposition toward becoming an effective counselor), and post-training levels of these qualities as a method by which selection procedures for future counselor candidates may be improved.

The design for this study necessitated that all three groups of students undergo essentially the same treatment (i.e., training) prior to posttest analyses. This design is illustrated in Figure 1.

	Pre- test	Training	Post- test	Sup. Rat'ngs.	Sup. Rat'ngs.
G <sub>1</sub> ("low")	O <sub>1</sub>	X	O <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>
G <sub>2</sub> ("aver.")	O <sub>1</sub>	X	O <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>
G <sub>3</sub> ("high")	O <sub>1</sub>	X	O <sub>2</sub>	S <sub>1</sub>	S <sub>2</sub>

Figure 1. Research design.

### Sample Selection

The subjects who participated in this study were thirty master's candidates comprising the counselor education program at Oregon State University during the 1976-1977 school year (September through June). In actuality, thirty-five students completed the inventory. However, three students withdrew from the program, one had had prior Gazda training, and one completed the inventory incorrectly. The sample was selected by administering the inventory to all master's candidates who were present the second week of classes during fall quarter, 1976, and subsequently dividing these people into pre-training categories of "low," "average," and "high" levels of effectiveness based on performance. There were ten students in the "low" category, ten students in the "average" category, and ten students in the "high" category.

### Characteristics of the Sample

The final sample population of thirty students was taken from a parent population of thirty-five students and consisted of twenty-one female and nine male graduate students distributed among the three groups as follows: "low" = three males and seven females; "average" = three males and seven females; and, "high" = three males and seven females. The following table illustrates the sex ratio within each of the three groups:

Table 1. Schema, number of subjects, and sex distribution.

Group	Sex		Totals
	Male	Female	
"Low Group" (G <sub>1</sub> )	3	7	10
"Average Group" (G <sub>2</sub> )	3	7	10
"High Group" (G <sub>3</sub> )	3	7	10
Totals	9	21	30

Their ages ranged from twenty-four (24) to forty-nine (49) with a mean age of exactly thirty-two years of age. Table 2 depicts age composition by sex distribution for each of the three pre-training groups:

Table 2. Age composition by sex distribution of the three groups.

Group	Sex		Means
	Male	Female	
"Low Group" (G <sub>1</sub> )	30, 30, 33	24, 26, 29 29, 39, 44, 45	32.9
"Average Group" (G <sub>2</sub> )	25, 30, 37	24, 25, 25, 29, 39, 41, 26	30.1
"High Group" (G <sub>3</sub> )	24, 27, 33	24, 28, 32, 33, 40, 40, 49	33.0
Means	29.89	32.90	32.0

Student's undergraduate grade-point averages ranged from 2.53 to 3.70 with a mean grade-point average of 3.06. Table 3 shows undergraduate grade-point average distribution within each of the three pre-training groups, by sex distribution:

Table 3. Undergraduate grade-point average composition by sex distribution.

Group	Sex		Means
	Males	Females	
"Low Group" (G <sub>1</sub> )	2.54, 3.20, 3.01	2.69, 2.84, 3.00, 3.22, 3.41, 3.50, 3.52	3.09
"Average Group" (G <sub>2</sub> )	2.53, 2.60, 2.68	2.90, 3.00, 3.14, 3.20, 3.49, 3.56, 2.53	2.96
"High Group" (G <sub>3</sub> )	3.63, 3.38, 3.60	2.97, 2.55, 2.67, 2.83, 2.89, 3.00, 3.70	3.12
Means	3.02	3.08	3.06

And, students represented a diversity of undergraduate educational background and their number of years of full-time counseling experience ranged from zero to nine years, illustrated in Table 4:

Table 4. Number of years of full-time counseling experience.

Group	Sex		Means
	Males	Females	
"Low Group" (G <sub>1</sub> )	1, 0, 9	0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1	1.10
"Average Group" (G <sub>2</sub> )	1, 0, 0	0, 1, 0, 0, 0 0, 0	.20
"High Group" (G <sub>3</sub> )	0, 0, 1	0, 0, 1, 0, 5, 3. 1	1.10
Means	1.33	.57	.80

## The Research Setting

### Community\*

The heart of the Willamette Valley, Corvallis, is the home of Oregon State University. This city of 40,000 people is located between the Cascade Mountains which rise to the east and the forested Coast Range to the west, beyond which lie the headlands and scenic beaches of the Oregon coast. Portland is 85 miles north and Eugene 40 miles south. In addition to the University, businesses and a few light industries are the chief employers in Corvallis. City parks, the Corvallis Arts Center, and a fine public library offer only some of the varied cultural and recreational activities available in the city. The climate, generally cool and rainy in the winter and warm and sunny in summer, is tempered by the ocean, so there are few temperature and humidity extremes. Rainfall averages 37 inches annually.

### The University\*\*

Oregon State University, located in Corvallis, is Oregon's land-grant and sea-grant University. Each year approximately 15,500 students enroll in the undergraduate and graduate programs of the University's twelve colleges and schools, which offer a wide variety of programs in scientific, technological, professional, and liberal arts fields. In addition to academic instruction, Oregon State conducts extensive research programs, administers the Extension Service in all of Oregon's counties, and maintains branch agricultural experiment stations at several locations throughout the state. The University is a member of the Oregon State System of Higher Education.

### Counselor Education Program\*\*\*

The staff at Oregon State University has adopted an instructional and experiential format which stresses the integration of learning and practice. It has been the staff's experience that students enrolling

---

\*Taken from the Oregon State University General Catalogue, 1976-77, p. 6.

\*\*Taken from the Oregon State University General Catalogue, 1976-77, p. 4.

\*\*\*Taken from the Evaluation Report, Oregon State University's Proposed Counseling and Guidance Program, 1974.

in a number of specified courses taught by individual instructors, leads to fragmented experiences lacking integration and cohesiveness. The faculty believes it is imperative that a counselor-trainee integrate his/her personal, theoretical, and practical views. In the past, this integration has been the responsibility of the students who have received little assistance from the staff. This realization led to a drastic change in the structure of the counseling program. An attempt has been made to eliminate overlap and create an awareness in each of the staff members as to exactly what input has been given to the students. The staff has adopted a model very much like that of the NDEA Institutes. It consists of a block of time set aside for the academic input and structured learning experiences. The students are involved in this time block from approximately 8:30 a.m. to 12 noon, three to four days each week. The remaining time is spent in their practicum sites in the field. The Block instruction is team taught by a staff consisting of faculty members and doctoral students. A great deal of time must be devoted each week to planning and coordinating the efforts. To this end, two to three hours per week are involved in staff planning.

The faculty in Counseling and Guidance consists of four faculty members on full-time assignments in the School of Education as well as doctoral students in Counseling and Guidance. All of the regular faculty members are experienced public school teachers at the elementary and secondary level. Additionally, each of them has served as a pupil-personnel services specialist or counselor in a professional setting. All members of the faculty hold doctorates from recognized accredited universities. They all work with and supervise the master's candidates during the entire year.

The program in Counseling and Guidance utilizes team teaching. Each member of the faculty has the opportunity to work closely with the other members. In this way on-going revision and continuous feedback is provided. The faculty members have come to know and appreciate each other's strengths, and have made much better use of the resources available within the group. A wide variety of instructional techniques are utilized by the faculty. These include, but are not limited to, lectures, experiential learning activities, simulations, such as role plays, video taped demonstrations and micro-counseling. All faculty members attend professional meetings regularly and bring the learning from these meetings into practice during the instructional program. An earnest effort has been made to provide a competent faculty that is balanced in terms of



experience, sex, ethnic background, and geographic origin and instructional preparation.

Upon entering the program, each student confers with an adviser to determine the student's background, skills, and educational experience. Each term the student confers with his/her adviser regarding progress. A term evaluation with supervisor, adviser, and student is conducted at the end of each term. These conferences take as little as two hours or have been known to continue as long as six. Through this intensive one-to-one contact the student's progress and skill development may be carefully monitored and appropriate learning experiences introduced as needed. This procedure has proved highly effective. The staff is convinced that, despite the time-consuming nature of the conferences, it is mandatory to review each person as an individual and carefully and continuously study the progress and development of the student toward his/her stated goals.

Length of the block program varies with each student since it is competency-based. Also, no more than 21 hours of graduate level work may be transferred into Oregon State University and applied to a graduate program. Since each student is urged to complete the entire 57-hour program to gain a recommendation for a counseling norm, this usually entails one full year or three consecutive summers of study.

Each student spends at least 300 hours in a counseling practicum. The field experience begins during the second or third week and continues throughout the entire program. In general (supervisor) visitations are made as often as once a week or as seldom as three contacts per term. Each student meets with his/her supervisor during block time for four hours each week. During this time, skill building exercises, role playing, and problem solving activities are conducted. This contact between supervisor and trainee allows the trainee's progress to be carefully monitored and enrichment or remedial activities prescribed as needed.

Every student participates in an intensive evaluation session each term in which the student's supervisor and adviser are present. During these sessions, the student's progress is discussed and critical questions are raised regarding the student's performance. At times, these meetings border on counseling itself; and many students have chosen to leave the program as a result of thorough and thoughtful questions raised during the evaluation session. The faculty is convinced the best procedure for retention and removal of

students is a self-initiated process in which the student makes the decision whether or not to continue. Each year several students choose to discontinue the program, finding it either not suited to their needs, goals, or temperaments, or discovering that they are not ready for the program.

### Instrumentation

#### Development of the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory

The basic model underlying this study's criterion instrument was developed by Robert R. Carkhuff (1969) and his associates. With reference to selection, Carkhuff's (1969a) main proposition is, "The best index of a future criterion is a previous index of that criterion" (p. 85). And, the corollary which is critical to this proposition is, "If we want to predict effective helping, we need to obtain an index of the prospective helper trainee's level of functioning in the helping role" (Ibid., p. 86). These two main principles comprised the rationale for the designed instrument in terms of measuring empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness, self-disclosure, confrontation, immediacy of relationship, and the global scale. "Warmth," a non-verbal dimension, was not included in the inventory as there were no written scales developed which measure this variable. One of Gazda's colleagues, Frank Asbury, writes,

Warmth cannot be practiced or measured separately. The only way to develop a written exercise would be to ask trainees to list non-verbal behaviors which are generally regarded as communicating warmth. For example: appropriate eye contact, leaning slightly forward, and touching are generally considered to be warm responses. (Personal communication, Frank Asbury, July 19, 1976).

The present Gazda scales (1974) are based on the earlier Carkhuff Scales (1969a,b). In turn, the Carkhuff Scales are a refinement of the Truax Scales (summarized in Truax and Carkhuff, 1967), developed somewhat earlier. The Carkhuff Scales consist of five levels of

discriminating ability whereas the Gazda Scales are composed of four. And, while the responses to Carkhuff's counseling situations are rated (subjectively) by raters, Gazda's counseling situations are accompanied by standardized responses which are then rated by the counselor candidates themselves. The main objective in completing the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory then, was to assess one's level of discrimination of the degree of effectiveness or helpfulness of counselor responses. To quote Carkhuff (1969a),

A discriminant procedure involves presenting the prospective helper with varying examples of high, moderate, and low levels of helper-offered conditions, whether taped or in writing, such as those presented in Carkhuff and Berenson (1967), and asking the prospective helper to identify the levels at which the helpers in the respective excerpts are functioning. Those whose ratings agree closely with those of experts with demonstrated predictive validity of ratings are considered high discriminators; those whose ratings deviate greatly are considered low discriminators... (p. 87).

Further, with relevance to the present investigation, Carkhuff (1969a) goes on to point out that,

Devoid of either training or treatment orientation, Greenberg (1968) in a counterbalanced design established the close relation among the following three conditions: (1) responding in a written form to helpee stimulus expressions; (2) responding verbally to helpee stimulus expressions; (3) responding in the helping role. This research established that both written and verbal responses to helpee stimulus expressions are valid indexes of assessments of the counselor in the actual helping role (p. 108).

To summarize the support for the criterion measures underlying this instrument, "All effective interpersonal processes share a common core of conditions conducive to facilitative human experiences" (Carkhuff, 1969b, p. 7). The core conditions which receive the most impressive backing from the research are: empathy, respect, warmth, genuineness, self-disclosure, concreteness, confrontation, and immediacy of relationship (Gazda, 1974, p. 14). One who communicates or responds on a high level is capable of discriminating or perceiving on a high level:

In other words, one's ability to perceive accurately is a prerequisite to his ability to respond accurately (Gazda, 1974, p. 44).

For the present study, then, the instrument chosen has its basis and design in the scales and situations developed by Dr. George M. Gazda of the University of Georgia. Unlike most attempts at describing future counselors, the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory is not a conventional instrument measuring interests, attitudes, or personality variables (see Appendix A). Brams (1961) notes that objective measures of personality are ineffective in the prediction or identification of graduate students as potential counselors due to the students' knowledge of tests and how to take them. Hence, the present instrument measures discriminatory ability reflective of accurate responsiveness. Gazda (1974) suggests that,

Because research by Carkhuff (1969a,b) has shown that those who communicate or respond at high levels are best prepared to assist helpees, our best indicator of a successful helper will be the initial level of responding of the trainee (pp. 44-45).

Consequently, the instrument was administered by the regular counselor education staff to the master's students in the fall of 1976. It was again administered in the spring of 1977. The instrument was completed anonymously. A complete description of the administrative instructions appear in Appendix B. The instrument itself is composed of counseling situations which are expressive of the qualities of empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness, self-disclosure, confrontation, immediacy of relationship, and a composite scale entitled, "global scale." Following each counseling situation are alternative ways of responding by the counselor. Each alternative response possesses a standardized rating of its level of effectiveness. "Level 4" is a good response and is the highest rating possible; it indicates that the person is definitely being helpful. "Level 3" signifies a minimally helpful response, "level 2" is generally not helpful and is a "poor" response, and, "level 1" is illustrative of a hurtful or irrelevant counselor response. In actuality, there also exist

alternative responses between these four major levels which Gazda has developed (i.e., 1.5, 2.5, and 3.5), an example of which is the "Global Scale" totally described in Appendix C. The global scale encompasses in-depth descriptions of the eight variables which compose the helping process in Gazda's (1974) Human Relations Development: A Manual for Educators (empathy, p. 71; respect, p. 80; warmth, p. 88; concreteness, p. 120; genuineness, p. 128; self-disclosure, p. 136, confrontation, p. 144; immediacy of relationship, p. 150). Yet, the purpose of this investigation was not to train potential counselors in discriminating the finer levels of Gazda's human relations development program. The main concern was identifying people who functioned at high levels of the facilitative conditions without specific training. Therefore, the random sample of helper situations was selected from those accompanied by response alternatives with agreed upon ratings of 1, 2, 3 and 4. Dr. Gazda was contacted to confirm that this sampling procedure and organization of the selected situations and responses would in no way distort the accuracy of the ratings of the response alternatives. Dr. Gazda responded,

I see no reason to doubt that the response ratings would remain the same with your slight modifications of the items selected from Human Relations Development: A Manual for Educators. The key for those items was based on expert agreement of three judges. Best wishes for a successful research study! (Personal communication, August 18, 1976).

The final instrument consists of twenty-five counseling situations, each situation is accompanied by one to nine alternative counselor responses, and the time required to complete the inventory is approximately thirty to forty minutes. A copy of the instrument may be found in Appendix A.

For the purposes of this investigation, the inventory was scored on the basis of deviation scores. In other words, if an alternative response has a correct effectiveness rating of "3" and the student assigns the response a rating of "1," the student will receive a score of "2" for that answer. Or, if the correct alternative response rating is a "1" and the student assigns the response a "4," the student's deviation

experimental unit.) If the null hypothesis was rejected, a Tukey test of all pairwise comparisons of means was made to locate the significant difference(s).

Lastly, although not a hypothesis to be tested, Figure 2 provides an excellent descriptive method to illustrate the extent of pretest to posttest "cross over" between groups,

		Posttest		
		low	average	high
Pretest	low	$N_{11}$	$N_{12}$	$N_{13}$
	average	$N_{21}$	$N_{22}$	$N_{23}$
	high	$N_{31}$	$N_{32}$	$N_{33}$

Figure 2. Pretest to posttest "cross over".

while the correlation coefficient provides a numerical measure of the degree of "cross over:"

$$r = \frac{n\sum XY - \sum X \sum Y}{\sqrt{[n\sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2][n\sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

where X = the pretest scores of the individuals and Y = the posttest scores.

Central Hypothesis 2 - Significant differences in level of post-training versus pre-training counselor effectiveness in each of the three groups of master's students was contrasted through the use of the Student's t significance test for correlated data:

$$\text{Student's "t"} = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{S(\bar{D})}$$

where  $\bar{X}_1$  is the mean for one group of data and  $\bar{X}_2$  is the mean for the other group of data.  $S(\bar{D})$  is the standard deviation of the difference between the means. The formula for computing the  $S(\bar{D})$  for this investigation (correlated data) is as follows:

$$D_i = X_i - Y_i \quad S(\bar{D}) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \cdot \frac{1}{n-1} \sum (D_i - \bar{D})^2}$$

The Student's t test was chosen in that small samples were contrasted and because the Student's t is a robust statistical test of significance. Three separate t tests were performed to test Hypothesis 2.

Secondary Hypothesis 1 - To test for a significant difference in post-training counselor effectiveness between males and females, the Student's t significance test for uncorrelated data was performed. The formula (for uncorrelated data, unequal sample sizes) is as follows:

$$t = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(N_1-1)S_1^2 + (N_2-1)S_2^2}{N_1+N_2-2}} \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_1} + \frac{1}{N_2}}}$$

Secondary Hypotheses 2, 3, and 4 - To test for significance differences in undergraduate grade-point averages, age, and counseling experience between the three posttest groups, a one-way analysis of variance was conducted for each variable. On the basis of each ANOVA, a Tukey test of all pairwise comparisons was made if the null hypothesis was rejected.

Secondary Hypothesis 5 - Multiple regression analysis was used to determine which of the eight criteria of counselor effectiveness were most significant in the prediction of future effectiveness of master's candidates.

Secondary Hypotheses 6, 6a, and 6b - To test for a significant difference between the two sets of supervisor ratings based on "prescribed" and "personal" criteria, a t test for correlated data was

conducted. To test for significant differences between the two sets of supervisor ratings and posttest inventory performances, two separate t tests for correlated data were performed.

#### Major Objective of the Investigation

The development of a prediction model which may be utilized in the selection process of potentially effective counselors was determined by the multivariate tool, discriminant analysis. The predictor variables chosen for the discriminant analysis were those indicated to be most significant by the multiple regression analysis. As Kerlinger (1973) points out, "It can be argued that, of all methods of analysis, multivariate methods are the most powerful and appropriate for behavioral scientific and educational research" (p. 149). Kerlinger (1973) goes on to suggest,

...In educational research, the days of the simple methods experiment with an experimental group and a control group are almost over (p. 656).

In the present model, "counselor effectiveness" represented the dependent variable while the eight selected criteria comprised the independent variables. Multiple regression analysis was employed to secure the best combination of predictors possible (of counselor effectiveness) through the best linear combination of the independent variables. Specifically, the stepwise regression procedure was applied. Discriminant analysis, on the other hand, was utilized to establish a prediction model with which to estimate post-training levels of effectiveness ("low," "average," or "high") of new master's students. The present model was developed by utilizing the pretest scores on the predictor variables in this study, and relating them to total posttest scores at the termination of the training program.

#### Procedural Summary

A sample of thirty master's students in counseling and guidance education received the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory



at the beginning of fall quarter. The instrument was administered to assess pre-training level of predisposition toward being an effective counselor in these master's students. Based on their performance on the pretest, master's candidates were divided into three groups: "low" effectiveness, "average" effectiveness, and "high" effectiveness, before training had taken place. This grouping was not made known to the subjects nor supervisors to control for the Hawthorne effect (Homans, 1965).

During spring term, the written instrument was again administered to the master's students and levels of post-training effectiveness were contrasted through a one-way ANOVA. In addition, supervisor's ratings of post-training counselor effectiveness based on "personal" criteria as opposed to "prescribed" criteria were contrasted. Further significance testing was conducted to determine differences between supervisor ratings and post-training inventory performance, post-training versus pre-training effectiveness within groups, between males and females, in undergraduate grade-point averages, age, counseling experience before training, and lastly, in determining which of the eight (criteria) variables are predictive of future effectiveness. The major outcome of the investigation was to develop a prediction model to be utilized in the selection of future master's students in counseling and guidance, during the screening process. Initially, to arrive at this outcome, stepwise multiple regression was employed to determine which factors were contributive and thus, which ones were to be included in the final prediction model. Subsequently, discriminate analysis was applied in order to complete a model which, on the basis of the factors identified through multiple regression analysis, could serve as part of a selection procedure to predict which future master's students in counseling and guidance would possess relatively "low," "average," and "high" levels of counselor effectiveness after training has taken place.

## CHAPTER IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

## Presentation of the Results

The statistical findings of the investigation are presented in this chapter. Effectiveness criteria were measured by the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory. The format of Chapter IV is as follows: the nature of the phenomenon investigated is presented, each null hypothesis will be restated and subsequently accompanied by its particular findings, and the major outcome of the research, the prediction (selection) model, will be completely described as well as an example given.

## Nature of the Phenomenon

The primary problem of this investigation was to ascertain if the pre-training level of counselor candidates on selected factors found to be associated with effective counseling, upon entering a counselor education program, is predictive of effective counselors at the end of that program.

## Central Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant differences in counselor effectiveness at the termination of a counselor education program between three groups of counselor candidates who discriminated at three distinct levels of effectiveness (low, average, and high) at the initiation of the program.

Table 5. Summary of analysis of variance for groups 1, 2, and 3 on post-training effectiveness total scores of the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory.

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Pregroup	2	1,333.80	666.900	7.413**
Error	<u>27</u>	<u>2,429.00</u>	89.963	
Total	29	3,762.80		

\*\*Significant at both the .05 and .01 levels.

A one-way analysis of variance was used to contrast the levels of post-training counselor effectiveness between the three pre-training groups of discriminators: low, average and high. As is evident in Table 5, a significant F ratio was obtained at both the .05 and .01 levels. Accordingly, there were significant differences in counselor effectiveness at the completion of the program between the three pre-training groups of discriminators, and Central Hypothesis 1 must be rejected.

Since Central Hypothesis 1 was rejected, a Tukey test of all pairwise comparisons was performed in order to locate the significant difference(s). The statistical formula for this test is as follows:

$$Q = \frac{\bar{X}_i - \bar{X}_j}{SQ(\bar{X}_i - \bar{X}_j)} \quad \text{where} \quad SQ(\bar{X}_i - \bar{X}_j) = \sqrt{MSE\left(\frac{1}{n_i} + \frac{1}{n_j}\right)}$$

and,  $\bar{X}_1$  = mean of Group 1,  $\bar{X}_2$  = mean of Group 2, and  $\bar{X}_3$  = mean of Group 3 ( $\bar{X}_1 = 74.7$ ,  $\bar{X}_2 = 68.4$ ,  $\bar{X}_3 = 58.5$ ). In brief, the results of the three Tukey tests of significance follow:

$$Q = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{SQ(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2)} = \underline{1.485} \text{ (no significant difference)}$$

$$Q = \frac{\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_3}{SQ(\bar{X}_2 - \bar{X}_3)} = \underline{2.334} \text{ (no significant difference)}$$

$$Q = \frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_3}{SQ(\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_3)} = \underline{3.820} \text{ (significant at the .05 and .01 levels)}$$

A significant difference did appear at both the .05 and .01 levels between groups 1 (low effectiveness) and 3 (high effectiveness) on the basis of post-training level of effectiveness. The differences in effectiveness levels which appear between groups 1 and 2 and between groups 2 and 3 were not large enough to be significant, as previously illustrated.

Next, the following table describes the extent of pretest to posttest "cross over" between groups,

Table 6. Extent of pretest to posttest "cross over" between groups in level of effectiveness.

		Posttest		
		low	average	high
Pretest	low	5	4	1
	average	4	3	3
	high	1	3	6

while the ensuing correlation coefficient provides a numerical measure of the degree of "cross over:"

$$\underline{r = +.687}$$

Table 6 reveals some curious findings. For example, exactly the same number of people (4) who began in the "average" effectiveness group and ended the program in the "low" effectiveness group began the training program in the "low" effectiveness group and completed the program in the "average" effectiveness group. Likewise, the same number of students (3) who began the program in the "high" effectiveness group finished the program in the "high" effectiveness group. And lastly, one person made the dramatic change from Group 1 to Group 3 during the program while one other student moved in exactly the reverse direction, from the "high" to the "low" group. Hence, although the correlation coefficient of pretest to posttest scores for the total group of master's candidates is considered to be "moderate" (Downie and Heath, 1970), there appears to have been quite a bit of movement taking place between the three groups of counselor effectiveness during the training program. This was particularly true of those ten students beginning the program in the "average" group.

In correlating each of the three groups of pretest scores against their posttest scores, the following degrees of relationship were indicated:

Group 1 ("low" group) = +.596

Group 2 ("average" group) = +.292

Group 3 ("high" group) = +.491

The correlation coefficients are once again indicative of the amount of pre- to posttest movement between groups taking place during the program, especially by members of Group 2.

### Central Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant differences in each of the three groups of counselor candidates, between pre-training level and post-training level of effectiveness.

Three separate student's t tests for correlated data were conducted to test Central Hypothesis 2. Results of these computations are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Results of student's t tests between pre- and posttest level of effectiveness for each group.

Values	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3
Pre-training $\bar{X}$	90.7	76.0	62.1
Post-training $\bar{X}$	74.7	68.4	58.5
t-value	6.186**	2.472*	1.638
Degrees of Freedom	9	9	9
t-Table Value @ .95	2.262	2.262	2.262
t-Table Value @ .99	3.250	3.250	3.250

\*Significant at the .05 level.

\*\*Significant at both the .05 and .01 levels.

As indicated in Table 7, Central Hypothesis 2 is rejected in that there were significant differences between pre-training level and post-training level of effectiveness for both Groups 1 and 2. The amount of improvement made by Group 3 was not significant at the .05 level.

## Secondary Hypothesis 1

There will be no significant differences in counselor effectiveness between males and females at the end of the study.

Table 8. An analysis of male versus female counselor effectiveness.

Value	Males and Females
$\bar{X}$ Male Score	68.33
$\bar{X}$ Female Score	66.71
t-Value	.351
Degrees of Freedom	28
t-Table Value @ .95	2.048
t-Table Value @ .99	2.763

The t test reveals that Secondary Hypothesis 1 was accepted at the .05 level of significance. There was no significant difference between males and females in counselor effectiveness at the completion of the training program.

## Secondary Hypothesis 2

There will be no significant differences between those students initially placed in the low, average, and high effectiveness groups at the end of the counselor education program in terms of pre-training, undergraduate grade-point averages.

Table 9. An analysis of undergraduate grade-point averages and levels of counselor effectiveness.

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Pregroup	2	.340	.170	1.232
Error	<u>27</u>	<u>3.726</u>	.138	
Total	29	4.066		

A one-way analysis of variance revealed that there were no significant differences in undergraduate grade-point averages between the three groups of master's students at the completion of the study. Therefore, no Tukey test of all pairwise comparisons was necessary. Although slight increases in mean grade-point average accompanied each group from "low" to "high" level of effectiveness (low  $\bar{X}$  gpa = 2.91, average  $\bar{X}$  gpa = 3.09, and high  $\bar{X}$  gpa = 3.17), these increases were very slight and definitely not significant. Secondary Hypothesis 2 is accepted.

### Secondary Hypothesis 3

There will be no significant differences between those students initially placed in the low, average, and high effectiveness groups at the end of the counselor education program in terms of age.

Table 10. An analysis of age and levels of counselor effectiveness.

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Pregroup	2	10.40	5.200	.094
Error	<u>27</u>	<u>1,481.59</u>	54.874	
Total	29	1,491.99		

An inspection of Table 10 indicates no significant differences between the three levels of post-training counselor effectiveness and age. Consequently, no Tukey test of all pair-wise comparisons was necessary. Mean ages for the three groups were: low group = 31.2, average group = 32.6, and high group = 32.2. Secondary Hypothesis 3 is accepted.

### Secondary Hypothesis 4

There will be no significant differences between the students initially placed in the low, average, and high effectiveness groups at the end of the counselor education program in terms of pre-training counseling experience.

Table 11. An analysis of pre-training counseling experience and levels of counselor effectiveness.

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Pregroup	2	9.800	4.900	1.422
Error	<u>27</u>	<u>92.988</u>	3.444	
Total	29	102.788		

Table 11 reveals no significant differences in pre-training years of counseling experience as contrasted with post-training levels of counselor effectiveness. Accordingly, no Tukey test of pairwise comparisons was necessary since the hypothesis was accepted.

#### Secondary Hypothesis 5

There will be no significant differences between the selected criteria of effectiveness in their ability to predict counselor effectiveness (total sample of males and females).

Table 12. An analysis of the ability of selected effectiveness criteria to predict counselor effectiveness.

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Regression	8	2,223.02	277.877	3.789**
Error	<u>21</u>	<u>1,539.76</u>	<u>73.322</u>	
Total	29	3,762.78		

\*\*Significant at both the .05 and .01 levels.

As is revealed in Table 12, significant differences do exist among the predictors of counselor effectiveness and the null hypothesis is therefore rejected. Through the use of stepwise multiple regression analysis the factors identified as being most predictive were, in order of predictive ability, "concreteness" (accurately labeling feelings and experiences), "genuineness" (verbalizations congruent with inner feelings), and "empathy" (to deeply understand). Table 13



illustrates that there is a significant relationship between these three variables and the posttest effectiveness scores,

Table 13. Analysis of variance of the three predictive variables: concreteness, genuineness and empathy.

Source of Variation	df	SS	MS	F
Regression	3	2,113.03	704.3431	11.100**
Error	<u>26</u>	<u>1,649.77</u>	63.4527	
Total	29	3,762.80		

\*\*Significant at both the .05 and .01 levels.

and individual t values indicated that each of the three factors was significant at the .05 level. The final regression model utilizing the three predictor variables is as follows:

$$TS_2 = 29.291 + 2.8098(CO_1) + 1.7188(GE_1) + 1.1647(EM_1)$$

where  $TS_2$  is the total posttest score on the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory,  $CO_1$  represents a pretest score on the variable "concreteness,"  $GE_1$  represents a pretest score on the variable "genuineness," and  $EM_1$  represents a pretest score on the variable "empathy." Further, Table 14 provides additional supportive data in favor of the three variables which the stepwise multiple regression analysis selected. In brief, the percent of total variance explained by the three variables  $CO_1$ ,  $GE_1$  and  $EM_1$  in the reduced model is in excess of 56% (.5615) while the full model explains slightly more than 59% (.5907) total variance. Clearly, the amount of time and effort involved in the inclusion of any additional variables ( $GS_1$  = global scale,  $CF_1$  = confrontation,  $IR_1$  = immediacy of relationship,  $SD_1$  = self-disclosure,  $RE_1$  = respect) would appear to be most uneconomical. Individual t values are also summarized in Table 14 with only those values for  $CO_1$ ,  $GE_1$ , and  $EM_1$  found to be significant.

Table 14. Summary analysis of variance accounted for by the full regression model and accompanying t tests.

Variable Entered	Multiple R	R <sup>2</sup>	R <sup>2</sup> Increase	t
CO <sub>1</sub>	.6103	.3725	.3725	3.41302263**
GE <sub>1</sub>	.6958	.4841	.1116	2.40183244*
EM <sub>1</sub>	.7493	.5615	.0774	2.14296217*
GS <sub>1</sub>	.7599	.5774	.0159	.96991058
CF <sub>1</sub>	.7646	.5846	.0072	.81484688
IR <sub>1</sub>	.7684	.5904	.0058	.52946008
SD <sub>1</sub>	.7686	.5907	.0003	.23659600
RE <sub>1</sub>	.7686	.5907	.0000	.27850014

\*Significant at the .05 level.

\*\*Significant at both the .05 and .01 levels.

Finally, the interrelationships between all eight of the variables in the full model will be presented in the following correlation matrix:

Table 15. Correlation matrix for the full model.

	CO	GE	EM	GS	CF	IR	SD	RE
CO	1.000							
GE	.256	1.000						
EM	.212	.126	1.000					
GS	.494	.112	.380	1.000				
CF	.223	-.099	.355	.343	1.000			
IR	.025	.438	.210	.139	-.165	1.000		
SD	.170	.221	.049	.241	.045	-.021	1.000	
RE	.442	.275	.392	.499	.154	.287	.040	1.000

An examination of the correlation matrix table for the full model indicates that the relationships for the three combinations of the predictive variables are low (CO-GE = .256, CO-EM = .212, and GE-EM =

.126). Therefore, it is not indicated that the three predictive constructs measure the same factors.

#### Secondary Hypothesis 6

There will be no significant difference between supervisor ratings based on "prescribed" versus "personal" criteria.

Table 16. An analysis of supervisor ratings of effectiveness based on "prescribed" versus "personal" criteria.

Values	"Prescribed versus Personal"
t-value	0.542
Degrees of Freedom	29
t-Table Value @ .95	2.045
t-Table Value @ .99	2.756

As Table 16 indicates, there was no significant difference in supervisor ratings of counselor effectiveness based on "prescribed" versus "personal" rating criteria at the completion of the study.

#### Secondary Hypothesis 6a

There will be no significant difference between supervisor ratings based on "personal" criteria and posttest inventory performance.

Table 17. An analysis of supervisor ratings based on "personal" criteria and posttest inventory performance.

Values	Personal Ratings and Posttest Performance
t-value	-3.171**
Degrees of Freedom	29
t-Table Value @ .95	2.045
t-Table Value @ .99	2.756

\*\*Significant at both the .05 and .01 levels.

Table 17 indicates that there was a significant difference between post-training supervisor ratings based on "personal" criteria and level of effectiveness demonstrated on the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory. Specifically, supervisor ratings of effectiveness were significantly higher than inventory performances of effectiveness.

#### Secondary Hypothesis 6b

There will be no significant difference between supervisor ratings based on "prescribed" criteria and posttest inventory performance.

Table 18. An analysis of supervisor ratings based on "prescribed" criteria and posttest inventory performance.

Values	Prescribed Ratings and Posttest Performance
t-Value	3.548**
Degrees of Freedom	29
t-Table Value @ .95	2.045
t-Table Value @ .99	2.756

\*\*Significant at both the .05 and .01 levels.

Table 18 reveals that supervisor ratings of counselor effectiveness based on "prescribed" criteria and posttest performance are significantly different. Once again, supervisor ratings were found to be significantly higher than inventory performances.

#### Major Outcome of the Investigation

The major outcome of the investigation was a counselor effectiveness prediction (selection) model which may be utilized in the selection process of potential counselors. The three variables indicated by the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory to be significantly predictive and subsequently chosen for the discriminant analysis, in order of predictive ability, were (1) concreteness, (2) genuineness, and (3) empathy. The discriminant analysis model was developed by

utilizing the pretest scores on the predictor variables in this study, and relating them to posttest total scores at the completion of the training program. The result is a model with which potential counselors can be distinguished into relatively "low," "average," and "high effectiveness groups during the application/selection process. This is accomplished by relating their performance on the three predictor variables to their overall performance on the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory.

The steps involved in the development of the present selection model, statistically speaking, were as follows:

(1) Selection of the three predictor variables of concreteness, genuineness and empathy through the multiple regression analysis procedure (stepwise).

(2) Development of the pooled variance-covariance matrix (with values):

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} S_{CC} & S_{CG} & S_{CE} \\ S_{CG} & S_{GG} & S_{GE} \\ S_{CE} & S_{GE} & S_{EE} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 3.846913581 & 1.116049383 & 1.207407409 \\ 1.116049383 & 4.939506174 & .811111110 \\ 1.207407409 & .811111110 & 8.381481481 \end{pmatrix}$$

(3) Computation of the sample means (vectors) of the predictor variables for each group:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{X}_1 &= (7.1, 6.0, 12.9)' \\ \bar{X}_2 &= (5.6, 4.4, 11.7)' \\ \bar{X}_3 &= (4.5, 3.9, 10.5)' \end{aligned}$$

(4) The following linear discriminant functions were then computed, based on the vectors for each group and the variance-covariance matrix:

Discriminant Functions:

$$W_{12} = .294763(CO_1) + .244670(GE_1) + .07703(EM_1) - .409150$$

$$W_{13} = .539378(CO_1) + .273357(GE_1) + .18219(EM_1) - 6.61314$$

$$W_{23} = .244615(CO_1) + .028687(GE_1) + .10516(EM_1) - 2.52164$$

(5) Lastly, utilizing the formulated discriminant functions of  $W_{12}$ ,  $W_{13}$  and  $W_{23}$ , the following decision rules expressed in Morrison (1976) may be applied during the actual selection process:

Decision Rules:

Each new individual is classified as follows:

Population I (low effectiveness group) if  $W_{12} > 0$  and  $W_{13} > 0$

Population II (average effectiveness group) if  $W_{12} < 0$  and  $W_{13} > W_{12}$

Population III (high effectiveness group) if  $W_{13} < 0$  and  $W_{12} > W_{13}$

Figure 3. Discriminant analysis rules.

An Example: To illustrate, during the screening process a counselor education applicant completes the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory and receives the following scores on the three pre-dictive variables: concreteness = 4, genuineness = 3, and empathy = 7. These scores are then substituted into the discriminant functions and  $W_{12}$ ,  $W_{13}$  and  $W_{23}$  are computed in the following manner:

$$W_{12} = .294763(4) + .244670(3) + .07703(7) - 4.09150$$

$$W_{13} = .539378(4) + .273357(3) + .18219(7) - 6.61314$$

$$W_{23} = .244615(4) + .028687(3) + .10516(7) - 2.52164$$

After performing the necessary mathematical computations, these values become:

$$W_{12} = \underline{-1.6392} \quad W_{13} = \underline{-2.3602} \quad W_{23} = \underline{-.7210}$$

Next, using the Decision Rules:

$$W_{12} > 0 \text{ and } W_{13} > 0 = \text{low effectiveness group,}$$

$$W_{12} < 0 \text{ and } W_{13} > W_{12} = \text{average effectiveness group, and}$$

$$W_{13} < 0 \text{ and } W_{12} > W_{13} = \text{high effectiveness group,}$$

it can be predicted that this particular counselor applicant will complete training in the "high effectiveness" group on the basis of this selection model ( $W_{13} < 0$  and  $W_{12} > W_{13}$ ).

## CHAPTER V. SUMMARY, DISCUSSION, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first part of Chapter V consists of a brief summary of the investigation. Next, a discussion section deals specifically with each hypothesis and the implications of findings. And lastly, recommendations for future research and replications of the present study are presented.

### Summary

#### The Phenomenon

The major purpose of this investigation was to determine if the predisposition of graduate students in counseling on selected criteria was predictive of counselor effectiveness at the completion of the program. Central Hypotheses were formulated to explore this problem on the basis of pre-training levels of effectiveness while Secondary Hypotheses examined the predictive ability of undergraduate grade-point average, sex, age, years of counseling experience, and eight (8) non-intellective variables shown to be predictors in a variety of counselor effectiveness studies. Finally, two kinds of supervisor ratings were contrasted with post-training levels of effectiveness as measured by the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory. The major outcome of this investigation was an objective model with which to select future counselor candidates.

#### Research Design

The research design consisted of a three-group, pretest-posttest scheme which was ex post facto in nature. Masters students in counseling and guidance were separated into three distinct levels of counselor effectiveness at the initiation of the training program by their performance on the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory. During



spring term students again were administered this instrument as well as rated by their supervisors as to level of effectiveness. Subsequently, various statistical analyses were performed to test the hypotheses and to develop a counselor selection model for the future.

### The Sample

The sample for this investigation was composed of 30 master's candidates in the Counseling and Guidance Department during the 1976-1977 school year at Oregon State University. There were 21 females and 9 males in the sample, their ages ranged from 24 to 49 ( $\bar{X} = 32.0$ ), they had an undergraduate grade-point average of 3.06, and two-thirds of the students had not had any prior counseling experience while those that had ranged from 1 to 9 years.

### Instrumentation

The main instrument utilized in this study was the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory, the scales of which were developed by Dr. George M. Gazda of the University of Georgia. It was used to objectively measure the ability of counselor candidates to identify levels or quality of counselor effectiveness. Variables measured with this inventory included empathy, respect, concreteness, genuineness, self-disclosure, confrontation, immediacy of relationship, and a global scale which is an encompassing measure of helpfulness or effectiveness. Each scale consists of four possible levels of functioning.

The other two instruments employed in this research were two kinds of supervisor rating forms. One form asked supervisors to rate the effectiveness of students at the end of the study on the basis of their "own, personal, philosophy of counseling" while the other requested ratings based on prescribed criteria which were accompanied by definitions. Both forms were completed anonymously.

## Treatment of the Data

Results of the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory were tabulated by means of deviation scores while the two sets of supervisor ratings were summarized in the form of mean ratings. One-way analyses of variance were employed in the testing of Central Hypothesis 1, Secondary Hypotheses 2, 3, 4 and 5, and Tukey tests of all pairwise comparisons were performed where appropriate. Student's t tests of significant difference were calculated to test Central Hypothesis 2, Secondary Hypothesis 1, and Secondary Hypotheses 6, 6a, and 6b. The major outcome of the research was a counselor selection model which was developed through the use of stepwise multiple regression analysis, analysis of variance, t tests of significance, a correlation matrix, and ultimately discriminant analysis.

## Major Objective of the Investigation

Multiple regression analysis revealed that the constructs of concreteness, genuineness, and empathy were significantly predictive of counselor effectiveness on the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory. Pretest scores on these variables were then associated with post-training performance in the computation of linear discriminant functions. Decision rules for these linear discriminant functions were presented and an actual example of the model in operation was provided.

## Discussion

### Central Hypotheses 1, 2

Results of testing the first central hypothesis indicate that although there were three distinct groups of counselor candidates who began the program, in terms of relative level of effectiveness, at the completion of the program these differences were not as well-defined. The only significant difference revealed was between the low

effectiveness group and the high effectiveness group. Since these two groups were clearly the extreme two groups at the beginning of the study, this researcher views the finding as a most reasonable one. The initial difference in levels of effectiveness between these two groups would necessarily permit Group 1 to improve to a greater extent than Group 3 during the program. Since Group 3 improved during the training program by only 3.6 points, this could be interpreted to mean that the group was functioning at quite a high level of effectiveness at the onset. Group 1, on the other hand, was necessarily able to improve to a much greater extent (16 points). In fact, as the findings of Central Hypothesis 2 illustrate, Group 1 improved significantly (both at the .05 and .01 levels) between the initiation of the training program and its completion. Members of Group 2 significantly improved their level of effectiveness as well (at the .05 level) yet, not as dramatically. The amount of upward and downward movement that took place during the program within Group 2 would appear to be the explanation for this development. And finally, as was alluded to previously, Group 3 did not show a significant gain in effectiveness during the program although the group as a whole did improve. This can be justified by the high level at which they began.

The pre-training mean difference between Groups 1 and 3 consisted of almost 29 points ( $\bar{X}_1^1 = 90.7$ ,  $\bar{X}_2^1 = 62.1$ ) and at the completion of the study their mean difference was still over 16 points ( $\bar{X}_1^2 = 74.7$ ,  $\bar{X}_2^2 = 58.5$ ). In other words, the finding appears to be that the pre-training level of effectiveness of members of Group 3 on the selected criteria of effectiveness is predictive of relatively effective counselors at the completion of the training program. This was supportive of findings of Carkhuff (1969a,b) who utilized different instrumentation. While the members of Group 3 did not function significantly better than members of Group 2 after training, they were significantly more effective than members of Group 1.

### Secondary Hypothesis 1

Although one might expect a significant difference in effectiveness between males and females based upon the present sample composition alone (9 males, 21 females), this was not the case. There was no significant difference in counselor effectiveness between males and females at the completion of the study, a finding which has been duly supported in prior research (Farson, 1954; McClain, 1968; Carkhuff and Berenson, 1969) yet is contradictory to the recent findings of Trotzky (1977).

### Secondary Hypothesis 2

The studies cited in Chapter II which examined academic measures as predictors of counselor effectiveness failed to establish a relationship. The results of testing Secondary Hypothesis 2 are no exception. As indicated in Table 10, there were no significant differences in undergraduate grade-point averages between the low, average, and high effectiveness groups at the completion of the investigation.

### Secondary Hypothesis 3

Occasionally counselor research studies (O'Hern and Arbuckle, 1964; Hopke and Rochester, 1969) have indicated that counselors who were deemed most effective were younger and had had fewer years of prior teaching experience whereas other periodic research (Lawton, 1958) has eluded to the common mistakes of immature counselors. Hypothesis 3 explored the question of age being a predictor of counselor effectiveness and as Table 11 indicated, there were no significant differences in age between the three groups of post-training counselor candidates. It would appear from this finding that people across a wide range of ages can become effective counselors and the factor of age should not be utilized as a predictive criterion.

#### Secondary Hypothesis 4

When the time comes for graduate students in counseling to find a job, most become quickly discouraged by the prevalent requirement of prior years of counseling experience. Experience, then, generally appears to be associated with counselor effectiveness and this conclusion has received extensive support (Fiedler, 1950a, 1951; Rogers, 1962). In the present study, however, there were no significant differences in the number of pre-training years of counseling experience between the three levels (groups) of post-training counselor effectiveness. One explanation might be that the "assumption of normality" was not met in this sample. In other words, since two-thirds of the sample responded that they had not had prior counseling experience, perhaps this particular sample is not "typical" in this respect. An analysis of the variances does, in fact, reveal that the "assumption of normality" does not hold for this hypothesis and this researcher recommends a conclusion of "no findings" rather than "no significant differences" for the variable "experience."

#### Secondary Hypothesis 5

Results of testing Secondary Hypothesis 5 are generally consistent with the literature review in Chapter II. While an analysis of variance indicated the eight criteria of effectiveness on the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory were significantly different, the variables concreteness (accurately labeling feelings and experiences), genuineness (verbalizations congruent with inner feelings), and empathy (to deeply understand) were shown to be significantly related as predictors of counselor effectiveness. This was accomplished through the stepwise multiple regression analysis procedure. In addition, the variables "global scale," "respect," "immediacy of relationship," and "confrontation" were shown in the correlation matrix in Table 15 to be correlated with these three predictors in varying degrees. While "self-disclosure" was the only variable which correlated with one of the three predictors as low as +.22, Truax's (1971) conviction that

self-disclosure is a precondition for the development of genuineness adds to its importance. Further, it should be noted that the findings summarized in the analysis of this study should necessarily be thought of as based on the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory. For example, whereas Carkhuff (1969a) has found "empathy" to be the main component in the helping process, the present investigation revealed "concreteness" to be the main predictor with "empathy" third in importance. Unlike Carkhuff's (1969a,b) scales where responses are written and subsequently rated by raters, responses to situations in this instrument have standardized ratings and it is the task of future helpers to discriminate which level (rating) of effectiveness each response represents. This particular methodology has gained support from the research of Greenberg (1968) who established a close relationship between: (1) responding in a written form to helpee stimulus expressions; (2) responding verbally to helpee stimulus expressions; (3) responding in the helping role. His research found that both verbal and written responses to helpee stimulus expressions were valid indexes of the behavior of counselors in the actual helping role. Consequently, it is the contention of this researcher that present findings are based on less subjectivity than other measures of effectiveness and are perhaps more valid. The one caution this researcher might suggest is that although Carkhuff (1969a) has demonstrated that high discriminators are capable of high level responses, Carkhuff (1969a,b) has also shown that the ability to discriminate accurately does not guarantee that one can or will communicate or respond accurately.

#### Secondary Hypotheses 6, 6a, 6b

As was mentioned in Chapter II, a search of the literature indicates that the most widely used criterion of counselor effectiveness is supervisor ratings. However, these ratings can only be accurately made after prospective counselors have already been admitted to and spent a substantial amount of time in the counselor education program. Consequently, Secondary Hypotheses 6, 6a, and 6b were aimed at testing whether supervisor ratings based on "personal" criteria and "prescribed"

criteria (based on the facilitative dimensions) are significantly different, whether "personal" criteria ratings of effectiveness are significantly different from level of effectiveness as measured by the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory, and whether "prescribed" criteria ratings are significantly different from posttest inventory performance. Findings summarized in Tables 17, 18, and 19 indicate that while supervisor ratings of effectiveness based on "personal" and "prescribed" criteria are not significantly different, both types of supervisor ratings are significantly different from the levels of effectiveness exhibited in the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory. Overall, these supervisor ratings were higher than student performances on the inventory. One explanation for this discrepancy might be the "error of leniency," as Kerlinger (1973) terms it, which is the general tendency to rate too high. Guilford (1954), too, has illustrated that long acquaintances with the people to be rated often results in substantial "generosity errors." Two specific procedures to counteract this in the future would be to: (1) carefully train supervisors to use the prescribed criteria, and (2) construct the rating scales differently so as to increase the degree of fineness of ratings. A more differentiating system of supervisor ratings is recommended by this researcher for future investigations (1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3) rather than the present format which is indicated to be excessively confining (1, 2, 3).

#### Recommendations

The following recommendations are made on the basis of the present investigation:

1. Because of the unique nature of each counselor education program and educational institution, similar studies or (preferably) replications of the present study should be carried out in other programs to add support to the findings and procedures of the present investigation.

2. Replication of this research should take place and the data combined with present findings at Oregon State University for two

additional years before the actual selection model is utilized. The present model is based on the performances of only 30 graduate students and the final model should be developed with the data from at least 90-100 students.

3. This selection model should be used as one criteria of selection along with the personal interview and other informational measures of selection (e.g., undergraduate grade-point average, Miller Analogies Test results, Personality and/or interest inventory results).

4. Alternate forms of the Counseling Situations and Responses Inventory should be researched and developed before actual usage of the model takes place.

5. After three years of study, it might be that the instrument can be shortened to include only those situations and responses relevant to the significant predictor variables.

6. A more empirical approach to contrasting supervisor ratings and posttest performance should be developed.

7. In the future, the instrument should be administered to prospective counselor education students before they are admitted to the program and the findings contrasted with this investigation. Perhaps actually having been selected for the program was a source of bias or contamination.

8. Ethnic background should be looked at closely during the development of the selection model. This suggestion is made because of research on the variable "self-disclosure," for example, where it has been shown that whites disclose more than blacks (Dimond and Hellkamp, 1969) and blacks disclose less than Mexican-Americans (Littlefield, 1968). Clearly, ethnic background and mores might hinder the selection of some minorities if not taken into consideration.

9. Data accumulated each year should be combined with the present model to provide support for it remaining current.

10. On the basis of this investigation's findings, it is recommended that the counseling and guidance staff at Oregon State University include this counselor selection model in their screening and admission process.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allen, T. W., Empathy is a Crucial Variable in the Counseling Relationship. Unpublished qualifying paper, Harvard University, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Effectiveness of counselor trainees as a function of psychological openness. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 14:35-40, 1967.
- American Personnel and Guidance Association, Committee on Professional Training, Licensing and Certification. *Personnel Guidance Journal*, 37:162-166, 1958.
- American Psychological Association, Education and Training Board. Criteria for evaluating training programs in clinical and counseling psychology. *American Psychologist*, 13:59-60, 1958.
- Anderson, S. C., Effects of confrontation by high- and low-functioning therapists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 15:411-416, 1968.
- Antonuzzo, R., and D. Kratochoil, The differential effects of written and audio stimulus material upon counselor responses. Unpublished research, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1968.
- Arbuckle, D. S., Client perception of counselor personality. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*. 3:93-96, Summer, 1956.
- Asbury, Frank R., Professor of Education, University of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia. Personal communication, July 19, 1976.
- Barrett, G. T. Leonard, Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. *Psychological Monographs*, Vol. 16 (Whole No. 562, 1962), No. 43.
- Berenson, B. G., and R. R. Carkhuff, Sources of Gain in Counseling and Psychotherapy: Readings and Commentary. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1967.
- Berenson, B. G., R. R. Carkhuff, and Damelia Myrus, The interpersonal functions and training of college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 13:4, 1966.
- Berenson, B. G., K. Mitchell, Confrontation in Counseling and Life. Mimeographed manuscript, American International College, Springfield, Mass., 1969.
- Bergin, A. E., Some implications of psychotherapy research for therapeutic practice. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 71:235-246, 1966.

- Bergin, A., and S. Soloman, Personality and performance correlates of empathic understanding in psychotherapy. *American Psychologist*, 18:393, 1963.
- Bernos, E. C., Factors related to success in fifteen NDEA counseling and guidance institutes. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 5:94-104, 1966.
- Betz, Barbara J., Bases of therapeutic leadership in psychotherapy with the schizophrenic patient. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 17:196-212, 1963a.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Differential success rates of psychotherapists with "process" and "non-process" schizophrenic patients. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 11:1090-1091, 1963b.
- Blocher, Donald H., A multiple regression approach to predicting success in a counselor education program. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 3:19-22, Fall, 1963.
- Brams, Jerome, Counselor characteristics and effective communication in counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 8:25-31, Spring, 1961.
- Burstein, J. W. and R. R. Carkhuff, Objective therapist and client ratings of therapist-offered facilitative conditions of moderate to low functioning therapists. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 25:105-107, 1969.
- Butler, M. M., L. N. Rice and A. K. Wagstaff, On the naturalistic definitions of variables. In H. H. Strupp and L. Luborsky (Eds.), *Research in Psychotherapy*. Vol. II, Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1962, pp. 178-205.
- Cahoon, R. A., Some Counselor Attitudes and Characteristics Related to the Counseling Relationship. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1962.
- Callis, Robert and Dale J. Prediger, Predictors of achievement in counseling and guidance study. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 3:63-69, Winter, 1964.
- Canon, H. J., Personality variables and counselor-client effect. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 11:35-41, 1964.
- Carkhuff, R. R., The Counselor's Contribution to Facilitative Processes. Mimeographed manuscript, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *Helping and Human Relations: A Primer for Lay and Professional Helpers*. Volume I: Selection and Training. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969(a).

- Carkhuff, Robert R., *Helping and Human Relations: A Primer for Lay and Professional Helpers: Vol. II: Practice and Research.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969(b).
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Development of Human Resources: Education, Psychology, and Social Change.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1971.
- Carkhuff, R. R., and B. G. Berenson, *Beyond Counseling and Therapy.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The counselor is a man and a woman.* *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 48:24-28, September, 1969.
- Carkhuff, R. R., G. Piaget and R. Pierce, *The development of skills in interpersonal functioning.* *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 7:102-106, 1968.
- Carkhuff, R. R., and C. B. Truax, *Lay mental health counseling: The effects of lay group counseling.* *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 29:426-431, 1965.
- Carson, R. C. and R. W. Heine, *Similarity and success in therapeutic dyads.* *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 26:38-43, February, 1962.
- Cartwright, R. D. and B. Lerner, *Empathy, need to change, and improvement with psychotherapy.* *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 27:138-144, February, 1963.
- Cheney, Truman M., *Using non-directive techniques in selecting enrollees for counseling institutes.* *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 2:149-151, Spring, 1963.
- Chittick, E. V. and P. Himelstein, *The manipulation of self-disclosure.* *Journal of Psychology*, 65:117-121, 1967.
- Combs, A. W. and D. W. Soper, *The perceptual organization of effective counselors.* *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 10:222-226, 1963.
- Commission on Standards and Accreditation, *Standards for the Preparation of Counselors and Other Personnel Service Specialists*, Washington, D. C.: Association for Counselor Education and Supervision, mimeographed, pp. 11-13, Fall, 1973.
- Cottle, W. C., *Personal characteristics of counselor.* *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 31:445-450, 1953.
- Demos, George D. and Ladil H. Zuwaylif, *Characteristics of Effective Counselors.* *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 5:163-165, Spring, 1966.

- Dickenson, W. A. and C. B. Truax, Group counseling with college under-achievers. *The Personal and Guidance Journal*, 45:243-246, 1966.
- Dimond, R. E. and D. T. Hellkamp, Race, sex, ordinal position of birth, and self-disclosure in high school students. *Psychological Reports*, 25:235-238, 1969.
- Downie, N. M. and R. W. Heath, *Basic Statistical Methods* (3rd Edition). Harper and Row: New York, p. 101, 1970.
- Durbank, Christine K., Does training change counselor attitudes? In Gary S. Belkin (Ed.), *Foundations of Counseling*, Kendall/Hunt Publishing Company: Dubuque, Iowa, 1974.
- Ellsworth, S., The consistency of counselor feeling-verbalization. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 10:356-361, 1963.
- Ehrlich, H. J. and D. B. Graeven, Reciprocal self-disclosure in a dyad. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 7:389-400, 1971.
- Farson, R. E., The counselor is a woman. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 1:221-223, 1954.
- Fiedler, F. E., The concept of an ideal therapeutic relationship. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 14:239-245, August 1950(a).
- \_\_\_\_\_, A comparison of therapeutic relationships in psycho-analytical, nondirective and Adlerian therapy. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 14:436-445, December, 1950(b).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Factor analysis of psychoanalytic, nondirective, and Adlerian therapeutic relationships. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 15:32-38, February, 1951.
- Ford, D. H. and H. B. Urban, *Systems of Psychotherapy: A Comparative Study*. New York: Wiley, 1963.
- Foulds, Melvin L., Self-actualization and the communication of facilitative conditions during counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 16:132-136, 1969.
- Gazda, George M., *Human Relations Development: A Manual for Educators*. Boston, Mass.: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1974.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Professor of Education and Psychiatry, University of Georgia, Atlanta, Georgia, Personal Communication, August 18, 1976.
- Goldstein, A. P., Therapist and client expectation of personality changes in psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 7:180-184, Fall, 1960.

- Goldstein, A. P., *Therapist-patient Expectancies in Psychotherapy*. New York: Pergamon Press, Inc., 1962.
- Goodman, S. E., *Emotional Self-disclosure in Psychotherapy*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1962.
- Greenberg, B., *The Differential Ratings of Counselor Responses to Client Expressions in a Written, Audio, and Real Life Form*. Unpublished research, State University of New York at Buffalo, 1968.
- Grigg, A. E. and L. D. Goodstein, The use of clients as judges of the counselor's performance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 4:31-36, Spring, 1957.
- Gross, W. F. and L. M. DeRidder, Significant movement in comparatively short-term counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 13:98-99, 1966.
- Guilford, J. P., *Psychometric Methods* (2nd Ed.). McGraw Hill, 1954.
- Halkideg, G., *An Experimental Study of Four Conditions Necessary for Therapeutic Change*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1958.
- Heine, R. W., *An Investigation of the Relationship between Changes and Responsible Factors as Seen by Clients Following Treatment by Psychotherapists of the Psychoanalytical, Adlerian, and Non-directive Schools*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, 1950.
- Hill, George E., The selection of school counselors. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 39:355-360, January, 1961.
- Hill, George E. The selection of school counselors, In *Counseling: Readings in Theory and Practice*, by John F. McGowan and Lyle D. Schmidt. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., p. 58, 1962.
- Hill, G. E. and D. A. Green, The selection, preparation, and professionalization of guidance personnel workers. *Review of Educational Research*, 30:115-130, April, 1960.
- Holland, J. L. and J. M. Richards, Academic and nonacademic accomplishment: Correlated or uncorrelated? *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 56:165-174, 1956.
- Holt, R. R. and L. L. Luborsky, *Personality Patterns of Psychiatrists: A Study of Methods for Selecting Residents*, Vol. I, New York: Basic Books, 1958.

- Holzberg, J. D., H. Gewirtz, and E. Ebner, Changes in self-acceptance and moral judgments in college students as a function of companionship with hospitalized patients. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 28:299-303, 1964.
- Holzberg, J. D., H. S. Whiting, and D. G. Lowy, Chronic patients and a college companion program. *Mental Hospitals*, 15:152-158, 1964.
- Homans, G., Group factors in worker productivity, In H. Proshensky and B. Seidenberg (Eds.), *Basic Studies in Social Psychology*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, pp. 592-604, 1965.
- Hopke, William E. and Dean E. Rochester, Characteristics of effective and use of effective counselors. *Illinois Guidance and Personnel Quarterly*, 33:24-28, Fall, 1969.
- Jackson, M. and Thompson, C. L. Effective counselor: Characteristics and attitudes. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 18:249-254, 1971.
- Jansen, David G., George P. Robb and Edward C. Bonk, Characteristics of high-rated and low-rated Master's degree candidates in counseling and guidance. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 9:162-170, Spring, 1970.
- Jensen, Barry T., George Coles, and Beatrice Nestor, The criterion problem in guidance research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 2:58-61, Spring, 1955.
- Johnson, D. J., B. Shertzer, J. D. Linden, and S. C. Stone, The relationship of counselor candidate characteristics and counseling effectiveness. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 6:291-304, Summer, 1967.
- Jourard, S. M., Self-disclosure and other-cathexis. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 59:425-431, 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_, *The Transparent Self*, New York: Van Nonstrand, 1964.
- Jourard, S. M. and R. Friedman, Experimenter-subject "distance" and self-disclosure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 15:298-282, 1970.
- Jourard, S. M. and M. J. Landsman, Cognition, cathexis, and the "dyadic effect" in men's self-disclosing behavior. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 6:178-186, 1960.
- Jourard, S. M. and P. Richmann, Disclosure output and input in college students. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 9:141-148, 1963.

- Kagan, J., Stylistic variables in fantasy behavior: The ascription of affect states to social stimuli. In J. Kagan and G. Lesser (Eds.), *Contemporary Issues in Thematic Apperceptive Methods*, Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, pp. 196-220, 1971.
- Kamin, I. and J. Caughlin, Subjective experience of out-patient psychotherapy. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 17:660-668, 1963.
- Kell, B. and W. J. Mueller, *Impact and Change: A Study of Counseling Relationships*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1966.
- Kelly, E. L. and D. W. Fiske, *The Prediction of Performance in Clinical Psychology*, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1951.
- Kemp, C. G., Influence of dogmation on counseling. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 39:662-665, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The influence of dogmation on the training of counselors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 9:155-157, 1962(a).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Counseling responses and need structures of high school principals and counselors. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 9:326-328, 1962(b).
- Kerlinger, F. N., *Foundations of Behavioral Research* (2nd Ed.), New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Kim, Jae-On and Frank J. Kohout, Multiple regression analysis: Subprogram regression, statistical package for the social sciences, In Norman H. Nie, *et al.*, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., pp. 320-367, 1975.
- Knapp, R. H. and J. D. Holzberg, Characteristics of college students volunteering for service to mental patients. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 28:82-85, 1964.
- Lawton, George, Symposium on neurotic interaction in marriage counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 2:28-33, Spring, 1958.
- Lesser, W. M., The relationship between counseling progress and emphatic understanding. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 8:330-336, 1961.
- Lewis, Edwin C., *The Psychology of Counseling*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1970.
- Linden, James D., Shelley C. Stone, and Bruce Shertzer, Development and evaluation of an inventory for rating counseling. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 44:267-276, November, 1965.

- Littlefield, R. P., An Analysis of the Self-disclosure Patterns of Ninth Grade Public School Children in Three Selected Subcultural Groups. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1968.
- Luborsky, L. B., The personality of the psychotherapist. *Menniger Quarterly*, 6:1-6, December, 1952.
- Lyman, Howard B., *Test Scores and What They Mean*, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1971.
- Mahan, T. and E. Wicas, Counselor personality characteristics: A preliminary exploration. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 3:78-83, Winter, 1964.
- Matulef, Norman H. and Peter J. Rothenberg, The crisis in clinical training: Apathy and action. *Special Bulletin of the National Council on Graduate Education in Psychology*, 2:8, 1968.
- McClain, E. W., Is the counselor a woman? *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 46:444-448, 1968.
- McGowan, John F. and Lyle D. Schmidt, *Counseling: Readings in Theory and Practice*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1962.
- Minge, R. M., Counseling readiness as readiness for change. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 7:197-202, 1966.
- Mitchell, K. M., Therapist Conditions Beyond the Care Facilitative Conditions: Immediacy and References to Significant Others. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association meeting, Washington, D.C., 1967.
- Morrison, Donald F., *Multivariate Statistical Methods (2nd Edition)*, New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., p. 240, 1976.
- Mowrer, O. H., Training in Psychotherapy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 15:274-277, 1951.
- Munger, P. F., R. A. Myers, and D. F. Brown, Guidance institutes and the persistence of attitudes: A progress report. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 41:415-419, 1963.
- Nelson, James H., A Study of Personnel and Guidance Workers: Some of Their Characteristics, Interests and Attitudes. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Denver University, 1952.
- O'Hearn, Jane S. and D. S. Arbuckle, Sensitivity: A measureable concept? *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 42:572-576, February, 1964.



- Pagell, W., R. R. Carkhuff and B. G. Berenson, The predicted differential effects of the level of counselor functioning upon the level of functioning of outpatients. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 23:510-512, 1967.
- Parloff, M. G., Some factors affecting the quality of therapeutic relationships. *Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology*, 52:5-10, January, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Therapist-patient relationships and outcome of psychotherapy. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 25:29-38, February, 1961.
- Passon, W. R. and G. R. Dey, Counselor candidate personal change and the communication of facilitative dimensions. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 12:57-62, 1972.
- Patterson, C. H., Selection of rehabilitation counseling students. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 41:318-324, December, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The selection of counselors, In *Research in Counseling: Evaluation and Refocus*, by John M. Whiteley (Ed.), Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co., 1967.
- Payne, Paul A., Stephen D. Weiss and Richard A. Kapp, Didactic, experimental and modeling factors in the learning of empathy. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 19:425-429, September, 1972.
- Pierce, R. M., R. R. Carkhuff and B. G. Berenson, The differential effects of high and moderate level functioning counselors upon counselors-in-training. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 23:212-214, 1967.
- Pierce, R. M. and P. G. Schauble, Graduate training of facilitative counselors: The effects of individual supervision. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 17:210-215, 1970.
- Riessman, F., The "helper" therapy principle. *Social Work*, 10:27-32, 1965.
- Rogers, C. R., Training individuals to engage in the therapeutic process. In C. R. Strother (Ed.), *Psychology and Mental Health*, Washington: American Psychological Association, 1956.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The necessary and sufficient conditions of therapeutic personality change. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 21:95-103, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_, The characteristics of a helping relationship. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 37:5-15, September, 1958.

- Rogers, C. R., The interpersonal relationship: The core of guidance. Harvard Educational Review, 32:416-429, Fall, 1962.
- Rogers, C. R., E. Gendlin, D. Kiesler and C. Truax (eds.), The Therapeutic Relationship and Its Impact: A Study of Psychotherapy with Schizophrenics, New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Rokeach, M., The Open and Closed Mind, New York: Basic Books, 1960.
- Russo, J. R., J. W. Kelz and G. R. Hudson, Are good counselors open-minded? Counselor Education and Supervision, 3:74-77, 1964.
- Seeman, J., Counselor judgements of therapeutic process and outcome, reported In C. R. Rogers and R. F. Dymond (Eds.), Psychotherapy and Personality Change, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1954.
- Seligman, Milton and Norman F. Baldwin (Eds.), Counselor Education and Supervision, Readings in Theory, Practice and Research. Springfield, Illinois: Charles C. Thomas, Publisher, 1972.
- Shapiro, J. G. and T. Voog, Effect of the inherently helpful person on student academic achievement. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16, 1969.
- Shapiro, J. G., H. H. Krauss, and C. B. Truax, Therapeutic conditions and disclosure beyond the therapeutic encounter. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 16:290-294, 1969.
- Shertzer, Bruce and Shelley C. Stone, Fundamentals of Counseling, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Fundamentals of Guidance, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1971, p. 158.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Fundamentals of Counseling, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1974, p. 102.
- Snedecor, George W. and William G. Cochran, Statistical Methods, Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1967.
- Sprinthall, Norman A., John M. Whiteley, and Ralph L. Mosher, Cognitive flexibility: A focus for research of counselor effectiveness. Counselor Education and Supervision, 5:188-197, Summer, 1966.
- Stefflre, B. S., Function and present status of counseling theory, In B. S. Stefflre (Ed.), Theories of Counseling, New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965, pp. 1-29.

- Stefflre, B., P. King and F. Leafgren, Characteristics of counselors judged effective by their peers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 9:335-340, Winter, 1962.
- Steph, J. A., Responses to Hypothetical Counseling Situations as a Predictor of Relationship Orientation in School Counselors, unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1963.
- Stoffer, D. L., An Investigation of Positive Behavioral Change as a Function of Genuineness, Non-possessive Warmth, and Empathic Understanding, Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1968.
- Stoughton, R. W., The preparation of counselors and personnel workers. *Review of Educational Research*, 27:174-185, April, 1957.
- Stripling, R. O. and J. L. Lister, Selection, preparation and professionalization of specialists. *Review of Educational Research*, 33:171-178, April, 1963.
- Strupp, H. H., An objective comparison of Rogerian and psychoanalytic techniques. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 19:1-7, 1955.
- Thweatt, R. C., Development of counselor-trainee self-insight: Evaluation in effectiveness of self-selection. *Counselor Education Supervision*, 2:78-81, 1963.
- Tosi, Donald J., Dogmatism within the counselor-client dyad. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 17:284-288, 1970.
- Trotzky, Arthur, An Investigation to Determine the Existence of Sex Bias in Counselor-Trainee Responses to a Video-Based Simulation Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oregon State University, 1977.
- Truax, C. B., The process of group psychotherapy: Relationships between hypothesized therapeutic conditions and intrapersonal exploration. *Psychological Monograph*, 75:7 (Whole No. 511), 1961(a).
- \_\_\_\_\_, A scale for the measurement of accurate empathy, Discussion Paper no. 20, Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, University of Wisconsin, 1961(b).
- \_\_\_\_\_, A tentative scale for the measurement of unconditional positive regard, Discussion Paper no. 23, Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, University of Wisconsin, 1962(a).
- \_\_\_\_\_, A tentative scale for the measurement of therapist genuineness or self-congruance, Discussion Paper no. 35, Madison, Wisconsin: Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, University of Wisconsin, 1962(b).

Truax, C. B., Comparisons between control patients, therapy patients perceiving low conditions on measures of constructive personality change, Brief Research Reports, Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, University of Wisconsin, 31, 1962(c).

\_\_\_\_\_, The relationship between the patient's perception of the level of therapeutic conditions offered in psychotherapy and constructive personality change, Brief Research Reports, Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, University of Wisconsin, 1, 1962(d).

\_\_\_\_\_, Effective ingredients in psychotherapy: An approach to unraveling the patient-therapist interaction. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 10:256-263, Fall, 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_, An approach to counselor education. Counselor Education and Supervision, 10:4-15, 1970.

\_\_\_\_\_, Self-disclosure, genuineness, and the interpersonal relationship. Counselor Education and Supervision, 10(4):351-354, 1971.

Truax, C. B. and R. R. Carkhuff, For better or for worse: The process of psychotherapeutic change. Invited address: Recent Advances in the Study of Behavior Change, Academic Assembly on Clinical Psychology, McGill University, Montreal, Canada, June 1963.

\_\_\_\_\_, The old and the new: Theory and research in counseling and psychotherapy. Personnel Guidance Journal, 42:860-866, 1964(a).

\_\_\_\_\_, Concreteness: A neglected variable in research in psychotherapy. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 20:264-267, 1964(b).

\_\_\_\_\_, Client and therapist transparency in the psychotherapeutic encounter. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 12:3-9, Spring, 1965(a).

\_\_\_\_\_, Experimental manipulation of therapeutic conditions. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 29:119-124, 1965(b).

\_\_\_\_\_, Toward Effective Counseling and Psychotherapy: Training and Practice. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1967.

Truax, C. B., R. R. Carkhuff, and J. Douds, Toward an integration of the didactic and experiential approaches to training in counseling and psychotherapy. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 11:240-247, 1967.

Truax, C. B., G. R. Leslie, F. W. Smith, A. W. Glenn, and G. H. Fisher. Empathy, warmth, and genuineness and progress in vocational rehabilitation. Unpublished manuscript, Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, University of Arkansas, 1966.

- Truax, C. B. and K. M. Mitchell, The psychotherapeutic and the psycho-noxious: Human encounters that change behavior, In Feldman, M. (Ed.), Studies in Psychotherapy and Behavior Change, Vol. 1, Research in Individual Psychotherapy. Buffalo: State University of New York Press, pp. 55-92, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Research on certain therapist interpersonal skills in relation to process and outcome, In A. E. Bergin, and S. L. Garfield (Eds.), Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behavior Change, New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., pp. 299-344, 1971.
- Truax, C. B. and L. D. Silber, Personality and psychotherapeutic skills, unpublished manuscript, University of Arkansas, 1966.
- Truax, C. B., L. D. Silber, and D. G. Wargo, Training and change in psychotherapeutic skills, unpublished manuscript, University of Arkansas, 1966.
- Truax, C. B., B. T. Tunnell, Jr. and D. G. Wargo. Prediction of group psychotherapeutic outcome, unpublished manuscript, Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center and University of Arkansas, 1966.
- Truax, C. B. and D. G. Wargo, Antecedents to outcome in group psychotherapy with juvenile delinquents: Effects of therapeutic conditions, alternate sessions, vicarious therapy pretraining, and patient self-exploration, unpublished manuscript, University of Arkansas, 1966(a).
- \_\_\_\_\_, Antecedents to outcome in group psychotherapy with hospitalized mental patients: Effects of therapeutic conditions, alternate sessions, vicarious therapy pretraining, and patient self-exploration, unpublished manuscript, University of Arkansas, 1966(b).
- Truax, C. B., D. G. Wargo, R. R. Carkhuff, B. T. Tunnell, Jr. and A. W. Glenn, Client perception of therapist empathy, warmth, and genuineness and therapeutic outcome in group counseling with juvenile delinquents, Unpublished manuscript, Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, University of Arkansas, 1966.
- Truax, C. B., D. G. Wargo, J. D. Frank, S. D. Imber, C. C. Battle, R. Hoehn-Soric, E. H. Nash and A. R. Stone, Therapist empathy, warmth, and genuineness and patient personality change in group psychotherapy: A comparison between interaction unit measures, time sample measures, and patient perception measures. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 22(2):225-229, 1966.
- Truax, C. B., D. G. Wargo and L. D. Sibling, Effects of high accurate empathy and nonpossessive warmth during group psychotherapy upon female institutionalized delinquents. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 71:267-274, 1966.

- Truax, D. B., D. G. Wargo, B. T. Tunnell, Jr. and A. W. Glenn, Patient perception of therapist empathy, warmth, and genuineness and therapeutic outcome in outpatient group therapy, Unpublished manuscript, Arkansas Rehabilitation Research and Training Center, University of Arkansas, 1966.
- Tuma, Abdul H., and J. W. Gustad, The effects of client and counselor personality characteristics on client learning in counseling. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 4:136-141, 1957.
- Tyler, L. F., *The Work of the Counselor* (2nd Ed.), New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1961.
- Ullman, L. P. and L. Krasner, *Case Studies in Behavior Modification*, New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.
- Walton, F. S. and T. J. Sweeney, Useful predictors of counseling effectiveness. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 48:32-38, 1969.
- Wasson, Robert M, The Wisconsin relationship orientation scale as a unique variable in the assessment of applicants for counselor education. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 4:89-92, Winter, 1965.
- Whitehorn, J. C., Human factors in psychiatry. *Bulletin of New York Academy of Medicine*, 40:451-466, 1964.
- Whitehorn, J. C. and Barbara J. Betz, A study of psychotherapeutic relationships between physicians and schizophrenic patients. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 3:321-331, 1954.
- Whiteley, John M. (Ed.), *Research in Counseling: Evaluation and Refocus*, Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_, Counselor education. *Review of Educational Research*, 39:173-187, 1969.
- Whiteley, J. M., N. A. Sprinthall, R. L. Mosher and R. T. Donaghy, Selection and evaluation of counselor effectiveness. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 14:226-234, 1967.
- Wicas, E. A. and T. W. Mahan, Jr., Characteristics of counselors rated effected by supervisors and peers. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 6:50-56, Fall, 1966.
- Williamson, Edmund G., Value orientation in counseling. *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 36:520-528, 1958.
- Wittmer, J. and J. L. Lister, The graduate record examination, 16 PF questionnaire, and counseling effectiveness. *Counselor Education and Supervision*, 10:293, 1971.

Wrenn, C. G., The selection and education of student personnel workers. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 31:9-14, 1952.

Wrenn, C. Gilbert, Status and role of the school counselor. Personnel and Guidance Journal, 36:175-183, 1957.

## APPENDICES



## APPENDIX A: COUNSELING SITUATIONS AND RESPONSES INVENTORY\*

Questionnaire # \_\_\_\_\_

DIRECTIONS: This Inventory is composed of a wide variety of individual counseling situations with accompanying counselor responses. Some of these counselor responses are more effective than others. For each situation, put yourself in the role of the counselor and rate each counselor response (1, 2, 3 or 4) accordingly:

4 = Good counselor response

3 = Minimally helpful counselor response

2 = Poor counselor response

1 = Hurtful counselor response

\* \* \* \* \*

Situation #1

Tenth-grade girl to counselor: "I just hate to go home after school. If I'm not fighting with my parents, they're fighting with each other. It's always so uncomfortable at home."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You are dissatisfied with your home life in comparison with school."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "It's upsetting not being able to feel comfortable at home with family fights every day."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You really hate to go home because you feel so uncomfortable as a result of all the fighting between your parents and yourself."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "You're tired of being greeted in your home by harsh words and an unpleasant atmosphere. You'd just like to feel that you could go home and feel welcome."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "Why don't you threaten to move out?"

Situation #2

Student to counselor: "I've lived here all my life but I don't know anybody. Even here at school I just can't seem to make friends. I try to be nice to other kids, but I feel all uncomfortable inside and things just don't go right. Then I tell myself I don't care, people aren't any good, everyone's out for himself, I don't want any friends. Sometimes I think I really mean it."

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \*Adapted, with permission, from the scales developed by George M. Gazda, Professor of Counseling and Psychiatry, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You're in a real bind. You want to make friends but you find yourself excusing yourself when you don't succeed as you'd like to."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "There's nothing wrong with that. Many people learn to live secluded lives."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You're concerned because you haven't been able to make friends."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "You're excusing yourself when you find it's difficult to go out to others. You know that you need and want others in your life. As long as you make excuses, you will feel this emptiness."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "Can you tell me what are some of the things you've done to make friends?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. "When you tell yourself you don't care, that people aren't any good, you wind up feeling crummy inside."

Situation #3

Male: "I'm so fat --- I know that's why I don't have many dates."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "Since you know what it is, why don't you do something about it?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "Oh, that's nothing to worry about for a guy that's been as popular as you. The right girl is going to come along."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "It's depressing to see everyone around you having fun and not being part of it. You don't know what will happen to you if you don't improve your appearance."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "Say, whatever happened to that girl you were dating so much last summer?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "I guess you feel kind of left out -- you figure your weight is keeping you from being more successful with the girls."

Situation #4

Student to counselor: "I could get good grades too, if I did what she does during the test!"

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "We are here to talk about your grades, not hers."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "You get mad seeing someone do better than you by using those methods."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "I think you know what you need to do to get good grades."

Situation #5

John, a fourth-grader who has been avoiding doing his homework for three days, and keeps saying he'll do it the next day to the counselor who has asked him to bring it in: "I'm sorry, I forgot my homework. I won't do it again. I'll bring it tomorrow."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You've said that day after day. You're just trying to see how far you can push me before I'll blow my top. Well, this is it. You can go to the principal's office now."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "Teachers can't allow students just to keep putting off their work. It's time you brought your work in."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You're finding it difficult to remember to bring in your work, and I'm finding it difficult to be patient."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "If you don't bring it in tomorrow, I'll snatch you bald-headed!"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "John, you've told me that for three days. I want to believe you, but it gets harder each day."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. "If you don't bring in your homework tomorrow, you will do it before you leave school."

Situation #6

Sixth-grade student to counselor: "Whenever we pick sides at school I'm always the last one chosen. The kids all know I'm so clumsy I can't help out their team much. It's really disappointing. I like to play, but they're just too good for me. Around home I'm the biggest guy, and they all want me to play even though I'm a little clumsy, but here I don't have a chance. What do you think I should do?"

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "I don't really have any idea. Lots of people get left out of things."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "You may need to get some coaching so you can play better. Maybe your dad could help you improve."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "At one time I felt left out at school, too. I'm not sure that the way I solved the problem will work for you. Would you like to tell me some more about your situation?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "My classmates all hated me, and everybody that gets to know me now hates me."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "You feel it's not fair for them to choose you last."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. "You know, when I was in the sixth grade, no one wanted me on their softball team. It took me a long time to get over that. It sounds like you're experiencing some of the same kind of disappointment I experienced at your age. Maybe we can work this out together."

Situation #7

White counselor to another: "Sure, I believe they ought to have a good education, but this busing is a big waste of money! Stop busing and use that same money to improve their schools, then they could get a good education where they live and the education of our kids wouldn't have to suffer. I want to see everybody get a good education."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You feel that busing will cause some students to suffer an unnecessary price for progress. You are not sure you want equality of education but, if you did, you don't think this is the way to get it."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "You believe everybody should have a good education, but there is a better way. Busing may hurt some kids as much as it helps others."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You know, what you say makes a lot of sense, but it doesn't do any good to talk about it; it's all up to the courts. The bureaucrats will make our decisions for us."

Situation #8

Student counselor to another student counselor: "If I had done what I thought was best instead of listening to my supervising counselor, the child's mother wouldn't be mad at me now."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "What did you do?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "Who is your supervisor?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You're mad at yourself for depending on someone else's opinion instead of acting on your own."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "You think you have problems! Let me tell you what my supervisor got me into!"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "I've got to run down for a coke. Tell me about it when I get back."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. "By not following your own good judgment, you got into a mess. But what else could you have done?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 7. "That's hard to take. Want to talk about it?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 8. "There is one thing you should have thought of. I'll tell you how you should have handled it."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 9. "That's nothing to worry about. It'll blow over."

Situation #9

College student to counselor: "Things couldn't be better! You know that girl I was telling you about meeting last week? Well, we're going to be married. We decided that there is no way we can live apart much longer. Don't you think it's great?"

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "It must have been love at first sight!"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "That's really great!"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "I'm wondering what your parents will say about this."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "You know you can't meet somebody one week and get married the next."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "Do you know the statistics on young marriages?"

Situation #10

Seventh-grade boy to father (a counselor): "Please let me go. Every-body else is going."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "Not being able to go is a hard thing for you to have to explain."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "Who knows better about this, you or me?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "Everybody is not going."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "I'm reading the paper now. Let's talk about it when I'm finished."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "We'll discuss it after supper."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. "I suppose it seems to you that I'm just being mean, that I don't care if you're embarrassed in front of your friends. I want us to understand each other; let's discuss it."

Situation #11

Eighth-grade boy to a student counselor: "I know someone who likes you and wants a date with you. Me!"

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You know counselors can't date students."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "Your asking for a date really takes me by surprise."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You should ask someone of your own age. I wouldn't think of dating anyone as young as you."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "I already have a boyfriend."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "I'm glad to hear that you like me, but I'm finding it difficult to know how to answer your request for a date."

Situation #12

Tenth-grade girl to counselor: "There are times when I feel like school is not important to me. Since I'm not going to college, there isn't much use for me to waste my time here."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "It's frustrating to be caught in the middle of such a conflict."

Situation #13

A seventh-grade class was having recess inside on a rainy day. A white boy accidentally hit a black girl with a basketball. She accused the boy of doing it on purpose. When the white counselor, who had seen the incident, told the girl it was an accident, the girl said, "That's the way it always is! The whites take up for the white kids against the blacks."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "It really makes you angry to think that I am picking on you because you are black."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "You know I always treat everyone fair."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "I guess I didn't make myself clear when I was explaining to you; I saw what happened and it was an accident."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "What do you mean, always? You make it sound pretty one-sided!"

Situation #14

White girl to a counselor: "I really wanted to meet Mary's parents at the reception last night -- after all, we've been in classes together for two years -- but when the blacks gathered at one end of the hall and the whites at the other, I was hesitant to go over there."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You wanted to, but seeing the people group off like that made you unsure if you would feel welcome. You wondered if they really would care to meet you."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "You felt pulled two ways: you wanted to meet Mary's family but were afraid to enter their group. You didn't know how the blacks would react, and were maybe a little fearful of how whites would feel about you doing it."

Situation #15

Second-grader to counselor: "I'm sure glad I was placed in your group."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "Oh?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "You're really glad I'm your counselor instead of someone else."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You're darn lucky to have me. I really know now to keep discipline in my group."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. (hugging child) "Gee, I feel so good, hearing you say how much you like me."

Situation #16

Teacher to counselor: "Our principal is really living in the Dark ages. He won't let me follow through on any of the new teaching techniques I learned in college."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You resent this man telling you what you can and can't do in your own classroom."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "Why don't you solicit support for your ideas from other teachers? He'll have to go along with the majority."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "If you think this is bad, you should have been here before he came."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "He will if you insist on it. You just haven't been forceful enough."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "It's a real put-down when people don't take your ideas seriously."

Situation #17

College student to counselor: "I'm really in a bind for money. It looks like every time I get ahead, something happens and I have to spend all my savings. I need to stay out of school a while and work so I won't be broke all the time."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You feel frustrated because you can't seem to get ahead financially. Now you want to quit school and work a while to catch up."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "Don't talk like that. Things have always worked out for you eventually."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You're taking a big risk that you won't ever come back. I've seen that happen too many times, and I wouldn't want it to happen to you."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "Everytime you get ahead, you get wiped out; now it seems hopeless. Working full-time looks like the thing to do."

Situation #18

Fifth-grader, who has been absent frequently, to counselor: "I'm worried about my math grade. It seems that the harder I work the lower my grade gets."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "The Law of Diminishing Returns operates in devious ways."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "Students who are absent usually do poor work."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You are really concerned because you are working harder but it doesn't seem to help your grade."

- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "I'll let you borrow my book which simplifies much of this work."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "It seems that you are worried more about your grade than learning. If you really wanted to learn, you wouldn't be absent so often."

#### Situation #19

Teacher to counselor: "I don't know what I'm going to do with that kid Billy Watson. He's disrupting my entire class. He causes the other kids to act up, and then the whole class is out of control. I wish there was some way to get him in another class."

#### COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You're not going to let one little kid get the best of you, are you?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "It's really disappointing to look forward to a good year and then find that you have the school trouble maker in your class. You don't see how you can put up with it any longer."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "So you're finally going to get that Watson boy transferred to another class."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "It's rough to have such a bad experience in the classroom. You're blaming Billy Watson for most of this, but aren't you also expressing some question about your own role? It sounds like you might be thinking, 'The whole scene is blowing apart, all because I couldn't handle one student. I should have been able to, but I couldn't.'"

#### Situation #20

Male high school student to counselor during tenth counseling session: "We've been talking about my future for weeks now, and it just doesn't seem to be doing any good. I might as well quit coming to see you. In fact, I didn't even want to come in today."

#### COUNSELOR RESPONSES

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "I think I have something here that will interest you. It's that book on forestry that I told you about last week."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "Don't give up. This is a natural occurrence in long-term counseling."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You are experiencing a lot of frustration because nothing seems to be happening. It sounds like you think I'm not able to help you with this. Maybe we ought to talk about that."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "You think we're not getting anything done. Maybe we can talk about it sometime."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "You're not satisfied with the way things are going. It is not unusual to feel that way. Most counseling relationships bog down from time to time."



Situation #21

Student to counselor: "You don't know what it's like to be laughed at behind your back."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "Yes I do."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "It's pretty painful to be made fun of."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "You can't understand why people would do something that would cause you so much hurt."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "There are all sorts of people in the world; some will laugh at you and some won't."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "It's not going to be an easy thing to talk about, but if you want to share some of this, I'll listen and do whatever I can."

Situation #22

Female student to male counselor who just suggested terminating counseling because he feels the student no longer needs the sessions: "Oh no, I'm not ready to terminate. These sessions mean too much to me. I couldn't get along without coming in to see you every week. I would miss you too much."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. (Chuckling) "Don't be bothered by those feelings. They are natural and will go away in a few weeks."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "You're saying your feelings about me are quite important to you. Should we talk about that, right now?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "I have already given your time slot to someone else beginning next week."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "Sometimes people get dependent on their counselors. I think that has happened to us."

Situation #23

Student to counselor, "I can't see why Mrs. Brown gave me a 'C' on my paper. I worked on it six weeks. It was twice as long as Joe's, and Mrs. Brown gave him an 'A.' That doesn't seem fair to me."

## COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You don't think 'C' is a fair grade for your paper."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "You're angry Mrs. Brown gave you a 'C' when your paper was twice as long as Joe's. Do you have any ideas about why Mrs. Brown has given you a lower grade?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "There's no reason for you to be angry. A 'C' is a good grade for you."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "You feel Mrs. Brown wasn't fair in grading your paper."

- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "I'm sure your final grade will be very good. You're doing well in Mrs. Brown's class except for this one paper."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. "The idea of Joe doing a paper half as long as yours and getting an 'A' really burns you up."

#### Situation #24

Male: "I've been looking forward to the senior prom since I was a freshman, and now it looks like I won't be able to go. It boils down to a matter of money, since there is no way I can afford to rent a tux."

#### COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "You've looked forward to it all these years. Are you sure you have exhausted all means of getting a tux?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "You feel left out because the money problem might cause you to miss the senior prom."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "The prom really means a lot to you."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "You are disappointed because you feel you can't afford to go to the prom."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "What happened to all that money you made last summer?"
- \_\_\_\_\_ 6. "It is upsetting to think you might miss the prom this year because you don't have enough money to go."

#### Situation #25

High school girl to counselor: "I can understand how women were discriminated against when they had to do so much farm work, but I think women have it good now. I really get confused when my friends tell me I should work for women's liberation."

#### COUNSELOR RESPONSES:

- \_\_\_\_\_ 1. "It doesn't seem to you that women are discriminated against today and you are trying to decide whether the women's lib movement is worthwhile."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 2. "The history of mankind indicates that women have always been subservient to men. Women have always been child-bearers, et cetera, et cetera."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 3. "Women today don't know when they're well off. Women's lib is one of the most powerful social forces of this decade, and quite a few women feel it's a good thing. There are lots of things like this that are confusing."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 4. "You don't feel discriminated against personally, so you're wondering whether you should work for women's liberation, and you're wondering how to relate to your friends who do."
- \_\_\_\_\_ 5. "Your friends may see society's attitudes as threatening to their career aspirations, but you see no threat to your goals in life, perhaps because you have lower aspirations."

---

\_\_\_\_\_ Number of years of full-time, pre-training counseling experience,  
if any.

APPENDIX B: STATEMENT TO BE READ, ACCOMPANYING  
ADMINISTRATION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

"An O.S.U. doctoral candidate in guidance and counseling would like to request your cooperation in filling out a questionnaire as part of a research project he is conducting. Specifically, the research with which he is involved deals with present attitudes of potential counselor candidates. The questionnaires will only be seen by the researcher -- no one else -- and obviously, the researcher promises that individual answers or results will not be discussed with anyone else, including staff members here at O.S.U. Although you are in no way required to fill out this questionnaire, your cooperation is requested in the hope that this research project will strengthen the counselor education program here at O.S.U. And lastly, of course, your assistance will be duly appreciated by this researcher and struggling graduate student, who at the least will be eternally grateful.

In order to aid the anonymity of the questionnaire's results, a number has been assigned to each student and has been placed on each questionnaire. The researcher would like to emphasize that this list will not become available to anyone else but himself. Finally, this student would like to sincerely thank you for agreeing to fill out the questionnaire for his study."

APPENDIX C: GLOBAL SCALE  
(Gazda, 1974, p. 96)

1.0 - A response in which the helper attends to neither the content nor the surface feelings of the helpee; discredits, devalues, ridicules, or scolds the helpee; shows a lack of caring for, or belief in the helpee; is vague or deals with the helpee in general terms; tries to hide his feelings or uses them to punish the helpee; reveals nothing about himself or discloses himself exclusively to meet his own needs; passively accepts or ignores discrepancies in the helpee's behavior that are self-defeating; ignores all cues from the helpee regarding their immediate relationship.

1.5

2.0 - A response in which the helper only partially attends to the surface feelings of the helpee or distorts what the helpee communicated; withholds himself from involvement with the helpee by declining to help, ignoring the helpee, responding in a casual way, or giving cheap advice before really understanding the situation; behaves in a manner congruent with some preconceived role he is taking, but is incongruent with his true feelings; is neutral in his nonverbal expressions and gestures; is specific in his verbal expressions (e.g., gives advice or own opinion) or solicits specificity from the helpee (e.g., asks questions) but does so prematurely; does not voluntarily reveal, but may briefly answer questions regarding his own feelings, thoughts, or experiences relevant to the helpee's concerns; does not accept discrepancies in the helpee's behavior but does not draw attention to them either; comments superficially on communications from the helpee regarding their relationship.

2.5

3.0 - A response in which the helper reflects the surface feelings of the helpee and does not distort the content; communicates his openness to entering a helping relationship; recognizes the helpee as a person of worth, capable of thinking and expressing himself and acting constructively; communicates his attention and interest through his nonverbal expressions or gestures; shows that he is open to caring for and believing in the helpee; is specific in communicating his understanding but does not point out the directionality emerging for helpee action; shows no signs of phoniness but controls his

expression of feeling so as to facilitate the development of the relationship; in a general manner, reveals his own feelings, thoughts, or experiences relevant to the helpee's concerns; makes tentative expressions of discrepancies in the helpee's behavior, but does not point out the directions in which these lead; discuss his relationship with the helpee but in a general rather than a personal way.

3.5

4.0 -

A response in which the helper goes beyond reflection of the essence of the helpee's communication by identifying underlying feelings and meanings; is committed to the helpee's welfare; is intensely attentive; models and actively solicits specificity from the helpee; shows a genuine congruence between his feelings (whether they are positive or negative) and his overt behavior and communicates these feelings in a way that strengthens the relationship; freely volunteers specific feelings, thoughts, or experiences relevant to the helpee's concerns (these may involve a degree of risk taking for the helper); clearly points out discrepancies in the helpee's behavior and the specific directions in which these discrepancies lead; explicitly discusses their relationship in the immediate moment.



SUPERVISOR'S RATING FORM

Dear Supervisor,

In conjunction with the "Supervisor's Rating Form" which you completed earlier, I would like to ask you to complete the present (and last!) rating from which will complete the research study. Again, these ratings will remain anonymous and no one outside of the researcher will review their contents. Unlike the earlier ratings, however, these ratings will not be based on your "own, personal, philosophy of counseling." Instead, eight (8) criteria will be supplied, including their definitions. Although some or all of these criteria might be new to you, please try to follow their definitions as closely as possible in making the ratings. Lastly, as with the earlier rating from, please follow the accompanying scale when making your ratings:

- L = low level of possession
- A = average level of possession
- H = high level of possession
- NE = not enough contact to make a valid rating.

I am a \_\_\_\_ permanent staff member; a \_\_\_\_ doctoral student.

\*\*\*\*\*

THE CRITERIA: (Suggestion: Rate each student on one criteria at a time.)

- (1) Empathy - means to "put oneself in the shoes of another" and to "see through the eyes of another." It means to deeply understand.
- (2) Respect - can be defined as one person's belief in or faith that another person has the ability to solve his/her own problems.
- (3) Warmth - is basically communicated through non-verbal means; it means "caring." Warmth is closely related to empathy and respect in that we tend to love or have concern for those we know (understand) and believe in (respect).
- (4) Genuineness - refers to the ability of the counselor or helper to be real or honest with the helpee. His/her verbalizations are congruent with his/her inner feelings.
- (5) Self-Disclosure - basically, refers to the ability of the counselor to convey appropriately, "I've been there too." "Appropriately" means disclosing relevant information at the right time.
- (6) Concreteness - refers to the counselor pinpointing or accurately labeling his feelings and experiences.
- (7) Confrontation - is best described as the means a counselor uses to inform the helpee that there is a discrepancy in what the helpee is saying or doing.
- (8) Immediacy of Relationship - refers to what is really going on between counselor and counselee. Immediacy makes possible the communication of in-depth understanding in the counselor-counselee relationship when the counselor responds to what is happening between the counselor and him in the here and now.



\* \* \* \* \*

[illegible]