COUNSELOR'S LEVEL OF EMPATHY
AND THE LANGUAGE PATTERNS OF
PARTICIPANTS IN COUNSELING

A Thesis
Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree Master of Arts
by
Joseph W. Shannon, III, B.A.
The Ohio State University
1980

Copyright © 1980
by Joseph W. Shannon, III.
All rights reserved.

Approved by
H. E. Pinsky
Dept. of Counseling Psychology
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude and appreciation to a number of people who contributed their time, energy, and expertise to this research:

To my adviser, H. B. Pepinsky (Pep), whose encouragement and invaluable feedback have helped me become a more articulate thinker and writer.

To the members of my committee, Dr. Dell and Dr. Schmidt, for their support and helpful suggestions; special thanks to Dr. Schmidt, for his valuable suggestions in the planning stages of this research.

To Robin Hikida, a dear friend and colleague, whose support and willingness to share her knowledge made my task less difficult.

To Duane Ball, for his assistance in developing a strategy for statistical analysis.

To Kicki Friedlander and John Cranton, who invested much time in rating the transcripts for level of empathy.

To the three Ph.D. interns who participated in this research for their valuable time and energy.

To the Mershon Center for Programs of Education and Research in Leadership and Public Policy, which provided the important funds for using the computer.

To Jayne L. Shannon, for the many hours she spent transcribing the tapes used in the research.

Finally, to Mary J. Shannon, the best mother (and
typist) a son could have. I express my thanks and love.
# Table of Contents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. The Problem</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Method</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Procedures</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Dependent Measures</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Analysis</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Assumptions</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Predictions</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Results and Discussion</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Summary of Results</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Discussion</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference Notes</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>References</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendices</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A ... Literature Review</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ... Transcript of Excerpts Used in Study</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C ... Empathy Scale and Description of Training Procedures for Raters</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ... Verb-Types and Rules for their Classification</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E ... Language Operationalized via Case Grammar and the CALAS</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tables

1 ... Results for the Counselors on the Complexity Measures 13
2 ... Total Frequencies and Proportions of Verb-Types for Three Interactions Both Time Periods 15
3 ... Percentages of Verb Usage for Counselors for Both Time Periods 16
4 ... Rankings for Counselors on Dependent Measures 22
5 ... Correlation of Empathy Ratings of Judges’ Pilot Study: Inter-rater Reliability Check 84

Figures

1 ... Counselor A - Graphs of Counselor and Client Values on Dependent measures at Time 1 and Time 2 17
2 ... Counselor B - (see description for Figure 1) 18
3 ... Counselor C - (see description for Figure 1) 19
4 ... Model of Counselor-Client Interaction and Change via Natural Language 54
5 ... Case Assignment for a Sample Dialogue 95
6 ... Summary of EYEBALL Operations 98
7 ... PHRASER Output 101
Chapter I
The Problem

A number of researchers have attempted to identify and measure key ingredients of counseling relationships, especially along the lines laid down by Rogers (1957; 1959). Considerable evidence, amassed within the last twenty years, suggests the therapeutic relevance of a counselor’s empathy, respect, and facilitative genuineness with clients. Research on these “core characteristics” has been interpreted as indicative of relations between these conditions and measured changes in the behavior of clients during therapy, along with attitudinal changes (e.g., Carlhuff & Berenson, 1967; Truax & Mitchell, 1971).

Empathy is one of the most widely accepted and well known attributes that the accomplished counselor is supposed to possess. As a construct, it has been amply conceptualized and discussed, and, as a construct, has been employed to generate a considerable amount of research (e.g., Carlhuff & Berenson, 1967; Rogers, 1951, 1957, 1959; Truax & Carlhuff, 1967; Truax & Mitchell, 1971). Much of this research has involved the use of either judges’ ratings of counselors’ verbal and/or non-verbal communication of empathy in counseling interviews and determining if there is a
relationship between the counselor's level of empathy and client outcome, or assessing the merits of training counselors to convey high levels of empathy to their clients (Barnabei, Corsier, & Nye, 1974; Barrett-Lennard, 1962; Bergin, 1962, 1963; Budman, 1972; Caracena, 1969; Haase & Tepper, 1972; Reddy, 1969; Truax & Carkhuff, 1964; Truax, Silber, & Wargo, 1967; reviews in Carkhuff, 1969 a, b, c; Fox, 1964; Rogers & Truax, 1965; Truax & Mitchell, 1971). Based on this research, some have concluded that empathy is determined by the way a counselor speaks (e.g., Chinsky & Rappaport, 1970). The conclusion has not been warranted by prior knowledge of what could be observed to occur in counseling interviews. However, one may assume a primary observable behavior in counseling to be the spoken language of the counselor and the client. Recent research on language and communication in counseling suggests the importance of taking into account the concerted actions between counselors and clients (Zieber, Patton, & Fuhriman, 1977; Nears, Note 3; Nears, Shannon, & Pepinsky, 1979; Nears, Pepinsky, Shannon, & Kurray, in press). When inferred linguistically, concerted actions are postulated to exist as cooperative behaviors between counselor and client, which they arrive at through their use of
language. Research suggests that concerted actions may be essential if counseling is to be a process of social influence.

The present study is designed to determine whether a relationship exists between a counselor's level of empathy in counseling interviews with a client and the speech employed interactively by counselor and client during the interviews (i.e., the amount of concerted actions). The study is also designed to investigate the relation between a counselor's rated level of empathy and his/her measured patterns of speech.

This research has been made possible by the development of a computer-assisted system of analyzing language texts. The result, a computer-assisted language analysis system (CALAS), which is described briefly below and extensively elsewhere (Pepinsky, Baker, Metalon, May, & Staubus, Note 6), provides various measures of language, such as clauses, phrases, verb-types and case roles. These measures are not dependent on any theoretical orientation toward counseling, but rather are derived from a conception of natural language as having structural properties (Pepinsky, Note 5; e.g., Chafe, 1970; Cook, 1969; Fillmore, 1968). This permits a comparison of counselors and clients based on an analysis of their spoken language and apart from
preconceptions of how they ought to be acting during counseling. Use of the CALAS permits one to observe and record the language of counselor and client, and amounts and changes in their linguistic behavior over time are to be inferred from the employment of measures on the basis of which the language text is to be analyzed. The model of concerted actions that has guided the collection and analysis of data in this study was proposed by Patton, Bieber, and Fuhrijman (1977) and developed from the earlier work of others (Rush, Pepinsky, Keara, Landry, Strong, Valley, & Young, Note 7; Pepinsky, 1974; Pepinsky & Patton, 1971). It assumes that unless the counselor and client can signal to each other their interpretations of what is taking place and reach some sort of tacit agreement concerning those interpretations (i.e., common understanding), no concerted actions can occur. The model further assumes that concerted actions are necessary antecedents of changes in the client's behavior during counseling.

The present study was designed to ascertain whether a relation exists between (a) measures of counselor's language patterns and those of counselor-and-client during counseling, and (b) the counselor's level of empathy, as determined by trained judges who made independent ratings of the language texts.
The first prediction rests on the proposition that the existence of empathy itself is inferred from the interactive language of counselor and client, and the counselor's language alone is insufficient to be used as a basis for identifying the presence of empathy.
Chapter II

Method

Procedures

To test the foregoing hypotheses, two consecutive interviews held by different pairs of counselors and clients were audio-taped. Three female counselors participating in the study each saw a female client. The counselors were pre-doctoral interns working in a university counseling center. All three counselors were receiving their doctoral training in Counseling Psychology at the Ohio State University. Each counselor (with her client's written consent), tape-recorded her second and third interviews. The first, middle, and final three minutes of each counseling session were selected for linguistic analysis and comparison. These segments were chosen because it was believed they would give a representative sample of each participant's language behavior during a given session. The counselor's statements in these segments were rated by trained judges who used a modified version of the Truax-Carkhuff Accurate Empathy Scale (1967) to identify the counselor's level of empathy during the interview.

Once the appropriate three-minute intervals had been selected, they were transcribed by an experienced typist and punctuated by the author. The transcripts
were then entered verbatim on to an IBM System 370
Model 168 computer and processed through the CALAS.
A detailed account of this processing can be found in
the User's Manual for the CALAS (Fepinsky, et al., Note
6). Briefly, CALAS entails the use of three distinct
programs, sequentially employed: (1) EYEBALL, which
translates the text into grammatical counterparts (e.g.,
noun, verb, adjective); (2) PHRASER, which aggregates
grammatical class assignments into phrases (e.g., noun
and verb phrases); and (3) CLAUSE-CASE, which groups
the phrases into clauses (e.g., main and subordinate
clauses) and assigns labels derived from case grammar
to each phrase within a clause (e.g., Agentive or State-
Experiencer) and to other parts of speech as well (notably
to noun phrases (e.g., Agent or Object case roles) (Cook,
1972, 1975; Chafe, 1970; Filmore, 1968). After resource
to each set of programs, the system provides for human
editing to increase the accuracy of the input into the
next phase. In this study, the hand corrections were
a product of two individuals including the author, who
are well-versed in case grammar and in the use of dis-
plays of the CALAS. The linguistic measures were ob-
tained from displays of structural language provided
by the CLAUSE-CASE output and after these had been edi-
ted and corrected accordingly.
Dependent Measures

(A) Measures of Language

(1) Complexity: Two measures of linguistic complexity were chosen. The first focuses on the word as the unit of measure. WPR (words per respondent) is determined by counting the number of words for each respondent. This measure provides a rough index of the frequency with which language is used. Higher frequencies are assumed to represent greater complexity (see Hurndon, Pepinsky, & Keara, 1979).

The other measure of complexity was one of several proposed by Cook (1975): Average Block Length (ABL) rests on the proposition that the clause is the structural unit of discourse. The measure is based on the idea of a main clause and its cluster of subordinate clauses as constituent features of an information block. This is a unit of communication that must be processed one clause at a time in order for the listener to understand what is being said. ABL provides a quantitative measure of complexity in language and is computed by dividing each speaker’s total number of clauses by the speaker’s total number of main clauses. The simplest structure is represented by the number 1.00 and would indicate that the speaker is using simple sentences having one clause each (see Hurndon, et al., 1979).
(2) **Verb-Types**: the classification of verb-phrases used in this research is adapted from that proposed by Chafe (1976) and modified by others (notably, Cook, 1972 a, b). The categories of verb phrases have been further modified to make them more amenable to computer-analysis (Rush, et al., Note 7; Papinsky, et al., Note 6). The current categories are eleven in number and are listed and defined in Appendix D. In this study, the type and frequency of each participant's kind of verb-phrase employed were identified.

(B) **Measuring Concerted Action**

Concerted action is determined by reference to measures for the counselor and the client at Time 1 (samples from the second interview) with the values for participants at Time 2 (samples from third interview). Concerted action is judged to be present if either tracking or convergence is evident. Tracking occurs if (1) the counselor and the client show a change on the measure in the same direction from Time 1 to Time 2; or (2) if there is not a sizeable difference on the measure between counselor and client at both Time 1 and Time 2. Convergence occurs if there is a sizeable difference between counselor and client at Time 1, and if by Time 2 there is a change in one or both participants so that this difference decreases or disappears.
(c) Rating Counselor’s Level of Empathy

Each counselor’s responses were rated by trained judges to provide a scalar judgement of the counselor’s level of empathy. A modified version (Fradkin, Note 1) of the Truax-Carkhuff Accurate Empathy Scale (1967) was used for the ratings. Each counselor’s ratings were summed across responses and then divided by the total number of ratings to arrive at a mean rating for each counselor. A description of the modified empathy scale used and a summary of the training raters received may be found in Appendix C.

Analysis

Chi-square tests were computed across both time periods (Time 1 and Time 2) for the raw scores on each of the eleven measures of verb-type and for the complexity measure of NPR to determine whether there were differences among the counselors in frequencies of verb-types used and in the number of words spoken. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was computed for the AEL measure of language complexity to determine differences among the counselors. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) was also computed for the empathy scores to determine whether the counselors were significantly different from each other in their rated levels of empathy.

Concerted action was determined by comparing the
values on each of the dependent measures for client and counselor at Time 1 (the second interview) and Time 2 (the third interview). Concerted action was judged to be present if either tracking or convergence were in evidence. Tracking and convergent trends were inferred from examinations of graphic representations of the counselor's and client's changes over time (from T1 to T2) on the dependent measures.

Once differences in complexity, verb usage, amount of concerted action and global level of empathy had been determined for the counselors, they were ranked (e.g., from most to least complex; from most to least empathic). The Spearman Coefficient of Pank Correlation was employed to determine whether the counselors were ranked the same in level of empathy as on the measured patterns of language (measures of complexity and verb-type) and concerted action.

Assumptions

(1) The counselors will differ significantly in language complexity (as measured by WFR and ABL).
(2) The counselors will differ significantly in the frequencies of verb-types they employ.
(3) The counselors will differ in the amount of concerted action they manifest with their
clients on the language measures over time.

(4) The counselors will differ significantly in the global levels of empathy they offer their clients during the interviews.

Predictions

(1) Differences in rated global levels of empathy will be related to differences in amount of concerted action.

(2) Differences in rated global levels of empathy will not be related to differences in patterns of language (i.e., differences on the complexity and verb-type measures).
Chapter III

Results and Discussion

Summary of Results:

A. Measures of Language Style

1. Complexity (Assumption 1) Table 1 contains the results for the counselors on the complexity measures, both time periods combined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Words Per Respondent (WPR)</strong></th>
<th><strong>Average Block Length (ABL)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>1027</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>655</td>
<td>1.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The counselors differ significantly in overall frequency of words (WPR) \(X^2 = 139.32, p < .001\) with counselor A speaking significantly more words than either counselors B \(X^2 = 7.3, 1, p < .01\) or C \(X^2 = 134.8, 1, p < .001\). The counselors also differ significantly in their Average Block Length (ABL) \(F = 4.80, p < .01\). Counselor A registers the highest ABL with a value of 1.96, with counselor B (1.57) and counselor C (1.54) ranking second and third, respectively. These results indicate that counselor A requires her client to
process more complex information units, speaking at
the rate of 96 subordinate clauses for every 100
main clauses. This is in contrast with counselor B's
pattern of 57 subordinate clauses for every 100 main
clauses, and counselor C's simplest style of 54
subordinate clauses for every 100 main clauses.

2. Verb Usage (Assumption 2) Because of low frequencies
in five of the original eleven categories of verbs,
these eleven were combined to form seven new cate-
gories; (a) State (includes Stative and Stative-Passive
verb-types); (b) Benefactive (BEN) (includes Agentive-
Benefactive, Stative-Benefactive and Process-Benefac-
tive categories); (c) Process (P) (includes Process
and Process-Experiencer verb-types); (d) Agentive (AGN);
(e) Agentive-Experiencer (AE); (f) Stative Experiencer/
Cognitive (SEC); and (g) Stative-Experiencer/Affective
(SEA). Table 2 contains the frequency and proportion
of each verb type for all six interactions (i.e., 3
counselors, 3 clients, 2 interviews for each dyad).
The proportions were obtained by dividing the frequen-
cies in each category by the total number of occurrences.
Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>CLIENTS</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>OCCURRENCE</th>
<th>CLIENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGN</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>.619</td>
<td>.327</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGN-EXP</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP-AGN</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXP</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From Table 2 it can be observed that for all participants, the highest proportions occur in the AGN (.278) and State (.233) categories. These results indicate that overall, participants tended to communicate using verbs that define properties of objects (State verbs) or verbs that define actions performed by an agent (AGN verbs).

Table 3 contains the percentages of use for each of the seven verb-types for the three counselors. These values were obtained by dividing the counselor's frequency for a particular verb-type by the counselor's total occurrences and then multiplying by 100.
### Table 3

Percentage of Verb Usage for Counselors For Both Time Periods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor</th>
<th>STATE</th>
<th><em>(P)</em></th>
<th><strong>(RP)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>18.71</td>
<td>11.88</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21.69</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>8.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20.06</td>
<td>11.53</td>
<td>3.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(40.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>21.78</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25.27</td>
<td>20.60</td>
<td>12.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>26.46</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>9.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(36.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contrary to expectations, the counselors differed significantly only in overall percentages of AE verbs and P verbs. Counselor B had the most AE verbs (20.4%), with counselor A (8.42%) and counselor C (7.91%) ranking second and third, respectively ($X^2 = 16.94, 2, p < .001$). Counselor A used the most P verbs (11.88%) with counselor C (11.51%) and counselor B (4.97%) ranking second and third, respectively ($X^2 = 6.92, 2, p < .05$).

B. Concerted Action (Assumption 3) Figures 1 through 3 compare the values on each of the measured patterns of language for the counselors and the clients at Time 1 (values for the second interview) with the values for the participants at Time 2 (values for the third
Figure 1. Counselor A. KEY: Counselor (C0) and client (C1) values on the dependent measures of language at Time 1 and Time 2. (Solid line represents counselor; broken line, client. AEL = Average Block Length; WPR = Words per Respondent; STATE: Stative Experiencer/Cognitive (SEC); Stative Experiencer/Affective (SEA); Benefactive (BEN); Agentive (AGN); Agent-Experiencer (AE); and Process (P) verbs.)
Figure 2. Counselor B. KEY: (see Figure 1)
interview). All three counselors exhibited varying degrees of concerted action with their clients either in the forms of tracking or convergence. Tracking occurred when (1) the counselor and client showed a change on the measure in the same direction from Time 1 to Time 2; or when (2) there was not a major difference on the measure between the counselor and client at both Time 1 and Time 2. Convergence occurred when there was a major difference between the counselor and client at Time 1, followed by a change in one or both participants, so that this difference decreased or disappeared by Time 2. Tracking and convergent trends were inferred from the graphic representations in Figures 1-3 which display the counselor's and client's changes over time on the dependent measures.

There is evidence for concerted action, thus defined between counselor A and her client on six of the measures. On the ABL, SEC, AGN, and SEA measures, tracking is indicated. Convergence occurs with the WPR and STATE measures. Counselor B and her client act in concert on five of the dependent measures. On the ABL and SEA measures, concerted action takes place in the form of convergence. Tracking is evident on the STATE, SEC, and AGN verb measures. Counselor C and her client act in concert on all nine of the measures. Tracking occurs
with the ABL, REN, SEA, and P measures. There is evidence for convergence on the WPR, STATE, SEC, AE, and AGN measures.

In summary, counselor C and her client appear to exhibit the most concerted action by tracking or converging on all nine measures. Counselor A and her client rank second, demonstrating concerted action on six of the measures, while counselor B and her client rank third, with concerted action on five measures.

C. Rated Level of Empathy for Counselors (Assumption 4)
The counselors differed significantly in their global levels of empathy (F = 8.97, p < .01). Counselor A had the highest level with a mean value of 1.66 (s.d. = .433, ratings ranging from 1.0 to 3.5). Counselor B (mean = 1.36, s.d. = .943, ratings ranging from 1.0 to 2.5) and counselor C (mean = 1.27, s.d. = .459, ratings ranging from 1.0 to 3.0) ranked second and third, respectively, in global levels of empathy.

D. Correlations between Ranking for Empathy and Rankings on Other Measures (Predictions 1 and 2)
Table 4 display how the counselors ranked on each of the measured patterns of language, on concerted action with their clients, and on globally rated levels of empathy. Below each ranking in Table 4 are Spearman coefficients of rank correlation denoting the degree of correlation.
between the rankings of the counselors' use of a
given pattern of language and of the counselors'
levels of empathy. The purpose of measuring these
relations was to indicate trends that might be observ-
ed with larger samples. At best, these correlations
should be interpreted conservatively.

Table 4

Rankings for Counselors on Dependent Measures

Spearman Coefficients Denoting Degree of Correlation between
Empathy Ranking and Other Rankings For Counselors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHR</th>
<th>RNR</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>SEC</th>
<th>SEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>A 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>B 3</td>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>B 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>C 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = .90</td>
<td>r = .50</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRC</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>SRC</th>
<th>SRC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 1</td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>B 3</td>
<td>B 3</td>
<td>B 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td>C 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = .50</td>
<td>r = .50</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
<td>r = .56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>DSR</th>
<th>DSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 1</td>
<td>A 2</td>
<td>A 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 2</td>
<td>B 3</td>
<td>B 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C 3</td>
<td>C 1</td>
<td>C 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r = .50</td>
<td>r = .50</td>
<td>r = .50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The rankings for the two complexity measures, WHR and ARF,
correlate significantly (p < .05) with the ranking for
Empathy.

As anticipated, the rankings on the measures of
verb-usage do not correlate significantly with the
ranking on level of empathy. Contrary to expectation,
there is not a significant relationship between the rankings for empathy and concerted action; however, there is a significant correlation between the rankings for level of empathy and those of the two complexity measures \( r = 1.00, p < .05 \). These results suggest a relationship between the measured complexity of a counselor's pattern of language in interviews and his/her rated level of empathy during the interview.

**Discussion:**

This research was designed to ascertain whether a relationship existed between a counselor's rated level of empathy with a client and the extent to which their measured patterns of speech revealed them to be acting in concert during the interviews. Analysis of the data obtained in the study does not support this relationship. Contrary to expectations, however, there are tentative indications of a relationship between a counselor's level of empathy and the complexity of the language the counselor uses during the interview.

One explanation for these findings may lie in the ways concerted action and level of empathy are measured. Though both constructs as defined imply the existence of a common understanding between the counselor and the client, the two phenomena are measured quite differently. Concerted action is measured linguistically by noting
and comparing observable patterns in the counselor's and client's use of language over time. The linguistic measures that are computed and compared for counselor and client to determine concerted action, such as those in the present research, may be applied to relatively brief excerpts within and between interviews.

Empathy is a more abstruse phenomenon to measure. In the present research, transcripts of brief excerpts from actual counseling sessions were rated by recourse to an inventory of items that purport to measure empathy. Scalar judgements of the interviews based on the use of these items in this study may not accurately reflect each counselor's empathic ability during an interview since the excerpts to be rated were very brief (3 minutes each). The use of excerpts assumes that the behavior sampled is representative of that exhibited throughout the interview. This assumption has been challenged recently by some researchers (e.g., Gurman, 1973). They have concluded that a great deal of variability in the behavior of the counselor is obscured by averaged ratings of a few short excerpts. These researchers suggest that when using excerpts, it may be best to report data for 5-10 minute segments across at least three parts of the interview so as to establish a more representative picture of helper functioning.
Another related problem in measuring empathy is the necessary dependence on derived judgements based on the use of empathy scales, such as the modified version (Fraedkin, Note 1) of the Truax-Carkkuff Accurate Empathy Scale (1967) used in the present study.

As Matarazzo (1978) has observed, many researchers (e.g., Chinsky & Rappaport, 1970; Shapiro, 1968) have concluded that empathy scales may actually measure a more general quality of the counselor, such as "good-bad," "warm-cold," or "genuine-insincere" (p. 945).

These researchers point to contradictory results of studies relating levels of empathy to counseling outcomes, and to Truax et al.'s (1966) study in which it was found that raters gave the same mean empathy scores to interviewers with and without knowledge of the concurrent statements made by clients. This implies that raters were responding to something other than level of empathy toward a particular client. There are tentative indications in the results of this study to suggest that when rating for level of empathy raters may have been responding more to the complexity of the counselor's language than to the interactive talk of counselor and client. That would support the research of Matarazzo and Wiens (1978). They found that counselors rated high in level of empathy were also interviewers who (1) talked
more per utterance and per total segment, (2) used silence less, (3) spoke with a longer reaction time when they did answer the client's questions, and (4) interrupted their clients less frequently. It would seem, then, that counselors who talk more have a higher probability of saying something that indicates an accurate understanding of the client's concerns than counselors who talk less.

In summary, the present study lends support to the idea that empathy has some definite behavioral correlates. One of these behavioral correlates seems to be the complexity of the language used by the counselor. This study also raises questions about the validity of the construct of empathy as it is currently measured. If rating scales are to be used in future research to assess level of empathy, relevant methodological questions to be resolved center on the scales to be employed, raters, and rating procedures.
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APPENDIX A: LITERATURE REVIEW
Literature Review

Empathy

Truax and Carkhuff (1967) define "empathy" as the counselor's sensitivity to or accurate understanding of the client's current feelings as well as his/her verbal facility to communicate this understanding in a language attuned to the client. In recent years, many empirical studies have suggested the importance of empathy in successful client treatment. These studies (summarized by Truax and Mitchell, 1971) have shown that many types of clients, from college underachievers to hospitalized schizophrenics, respond positively to situations where the counselor offers a high level of empathy. There is also evidence that clients may react unfavorably when empathy is absent or offered at low levels. These effects remain true regardless of the client's concern, the training and theoretical orientation of the counselor, and the type of counseling situation (e.g., group vs. individual therapy) (p. 310).

In most of the research summarized by Truax and Mitchell (1971), level of empathy for the counselor was assessed using some type of scale. On most empathy scales, the highest numerical rating reflects the highest level of empathy where the counselor's remarks fit
perfectly with the mood and content of the client's remarks and may offer an interpretation of the client's current feelings. Low numerical ratings represent low levels of empathy where the counselor digresses on some tangential topic, or, at the lowest levels, may ignore or misunderstand the client's current feelings and experiences.

Much of the early empathy research made use of the Truax Accurate Empathy Scale (1961). In an early study, Truax (1961b) compared levels of empathy in four hospitalized patients who showed clear improvement on a number of personality tests and four patients who showed clear deterioration after six months of intensive psychotherapy. Level of empathy was assessed with the Truax Scale by rating two-minute segments from the middle-third of the therapy sessions. It was found that patients who improved had counselors who were rated consistently higher in empathy than the counselors of patients who did not improve. In a later study (Truax, 1963), 14 schizophrenic clients were seen in intensive therapy for periods ranging from six months to four and a half years. High empathy ratings were associated with positive change in psychological test data and more time out of the hospital since the initiation of therapy. The positive
relationship between level of empathy and counseling outcome still held true when out-patients were added to the sample (Truax, 1963).

Van der Veen (1965) found that clients had significant effects on their counselors' empathy levels. Truax and Wargo (1966), however, re-analyzed Van der Veen's data and concluded that clients had not significantly affected their counselor's empathy level. In a study of hospitalized schizophrenics (Truax, 1962) a "standard" interviewer saw each client every three weeks throughout the course of counseling. No significant correlation was found between levels of empathy offered throughout counseling and those occurring in the sampling interview, as would be expected if the client had affected the counselor's empathy level.

In another study by Truax, Wargo, Frank, Imber, Battle, Hoehn-Saric, Nash and Stone (1966) 40 clients were randomly assigned to one of two screening interviewers and one of four different counselors. Empathy levels were obtained for each interviewer and each counselor based on samples of dialogue from their interviews. Data analysis indicated that the two interviewers differed significantly in level of empathy. The counselors also differed significantly
in the levels of empathy they offered their clients even though the clients had been randomly assigned to counselors and interviewers. These studies suggest that empathy is a counselor (interviewer) variable which operates independently of the client (interviewee). The present study speculates that empathy may be more of an interactive phenomenon and positively related to the amount of concerted action between the counselor and the client.

Recent research on the effectiveness of empathy has focused on the ways empathy is communicated in counseling. Shapiro, Foster and Powell (1968) found that therapeutic attitudes are communicated through non-verbal behavior, particularly through facial cues. Mehrabian and Ferris (1967) have suggested that a counselor's non-verbal behavior largely accounts for the variability in the judgement of a message rather than the vocal channel. Fretz (1966) has shown significant correlations between several counselor non-verbal behaviors and the judgement of empathy level by clients.

Haase and Tepper (1972) addressed the question of the relative contribution of verbal and non-verbal behaviors to judged level of empathy in a repeated
measure, analysis of variance design. Twenty-six experienced counselors rated 46 combinations of eye contact, trunk lean, body orientation, distance, and predetermined empathic verbal message on a modification of the Truax-Carkhuff Accurate Empathy Scale (1967). Results indicated that non-verbal behaviors accounted for twice the variability in empathy ratings. This research as well as that of Mehrabian and Ferris (1967) and Fretz (1966) suggests that non-verbal forms of communication play a more crucial role in conveying high levels of empathy than verbal behavior.

Taking issue with the above conclusion, Wachtel (1967) maintains that our ability to understand the "language of the body" is limited, and that we have considerable difficulty making use of non-verbal behaviors to communicate to others. If this observation is valid, then the essential difference between verbal and non-verbal behaviors within counseling is negligible. One would not expect the difference (if any) to be reflected in rated empathy levels. Shapiro (1968a) found that judges of counseling tapes were pre-disposed to verbal behavior than to verbal and visual cues combined. Shapiro and others (e.g., Meier & Thurber, 1966) have argued that visual cues can actually serve
as distractors which may interfere with the counseling process. Hughes (Note 2) tested this argument by comparing the rated levels of empathy for telephone counselors with those of counselors engaging in face-to-face interviews. Trained as well as untrained raters were used. For the trained raters, there were no differences between the ratings for the telephone counselors and the face-to-face counselors. Untrained raters judged face-to-face counselors to be more empathic than telephone counselors.

Taken as a whole, previous empathy research suggests the importance of both the verbal and non-verbal channels of communication. Most counselor training programs teach and encourage prospective counselors to convey empathy using both channels (Schmidt, Kaul, Dell, Note 8). It is not the purpose of this research to assess the relative contributions of verbal and non-verbal channels in communicating high levels of empathy. The present study focuses on how empathy is conveyed verbally to the client. Verbal behavior is the focus because it is believed to be a primary observable behavior in counseling.

Summary of Empathy Research

Research over the last twenty years has suggested that empathy is a key ingredient in successful coun-
seling. Much of the research supporting the importance of empathy suggests that it is governed by the way a counselor speaks (i.e., stylistic variables of a counselor’s verbal and non-verbal behaviors). However, it is still unclear how the structure and organization of a counselor’s speech is related to a counselor’s rated level of empathy. The present study speculates that empathy may be an interactive variable rather than a "counselor variable" which is related to the quality of the interaction between the counselor and the client (i.e., the amount of concerted action).

Language and Communication Research in Counseling

Language and communication research in counseling have generally focused on three main areas: (1) the notion that neuroses and psychoses may be viewed as communication pathologies; (2) the therapeutic elements of communication in counseling; and (3) investigations of how the counselor and client use natural language to communicate with one another to achieve counseling goals. Since the present study is an extension of the later two areas, only these will be discussed in the following selected literature review.

Since the end of the nineteenth century, researchers have developed a number of methods for studying
language in counseling. Usually these have involved content analysis of verbal productions by counselor, client, or both. Content categories often relate to the variable being studied (e.g., client hostility, counselor warmth), and transcripts of counseling sessions have been analyzed using these categories (e.g., Kiesler, 1973; Marsden, 1971).

More recently, language research in counseling has dealt with learning theory. Researchers have demonstrated that the systematic manipulation of the counselor's language can reinforce and condition specified client responses (e.g., Barnabei, Cormier, & Nye, 1974; Crowley, 1970; Hackney, 1969; Kennedy & Zimmer, 1968).

Studies have also focused on the "talking level" of the counselor and its relationship to counseling outcome. In one study Scher (1975) investigated the relationship between the verbal activity, sex and experience of the counselor and counseling outcome. Experience was equated with having a Ph. D. and a specified number of hours of counseling experience and was measured by listening to excerpts of each counselor's interviews and rating his/her levels of non-possessive warmth and genuineness. Talking
level was also assessed from the excerpts. Outcome measures were client-reported satisfaction with the interviews and symptom relief. Scher found that while experience level was positively correlated with outcome measures, the sex and verbal activity level of the counselor were not adequate predictors of counseling outcome. The results suggest that counseling outcome may depend more upon what is done in counseling and less upon how verbally active the counselor is. In a more recent study, Kleinke and Tully (1979) found that graduates and undergraduates gave more favorable evaluations to counselors who engaged in low rather than medium or high levels of talking. Counselors were evaluated in terms of attractiveness, trustworthiness, and expertness. Counselors with high levels of talking were evaluated as being domineering. The authors speculate that how the counselor is perceived by the client may depend partially upon the counselor's talking level; moreover, a client's perception may be crucial in determining counseling outcome.

In the studies discussed above, communication via natural language was assumed to be self-evident and therefore not a legitimate subject of inquiry. Recently, however, the structural features of the natural language of the counselor and client have been
the subjects of research. In one study, Budman (1972) examined the effect of the client's lexical organization upon the counselor's empathy level. Naive undergraduates interviewed confederates who had been trained to manipulate the organization of their language. Results indicated that language organization had no significant effect upon the interviewer's level of empathy. The author suggests that empathy may be impervious to situational variables and may be a component of a counselor's style of speech rather than the product of the counseling interaction.

It has been suggested that individuals acting in concert are able to do so because of their connected discourse via natural language (Pepinsky, 1974; Patton, Fuhriman, & Bieber, 1977). It seems apparent that when people speak to each other, they are able to signal to one another what is, did, or should take place through conversation. Pepinsky (1976) and Pepinsky and Patton (1971) have referred to such signal exchange activity as informative display. Pepinsky (1974) and Patton, et al. (1977) have discussed a model for conceptualizing how informative display occurs in two-person interactions. The model is sophisticated for it takes into account the observables of face-to-face interactions, the assumptions and prior knowledge
of the relationship, and the ways of speaking and of recognition based on the prior knowledge. (see Figure 4). There are also avenues for change within the interaction at successive stages. These are conceptualized in the model as the results of feedback during the interaction. The model assumes that the result of the interaction through informative display is concerted action and a "change-in-state" for the relationship.

The focus of research based on the above model has rested in the analysis of the spoken (natural) language of informative display and the structural components of that spoken language. This analysis has been operationalized by means of the aforementioned computer-assisted language analysis program (CALAS). The CALAS is based on a case grammar theory of language. Case grammar postulates that the structure of language has important implications for the interpretation and meaning of utterances. The CALAS and case grammar are discussed extensively in Appendix E. Verb types and other structural measures of quality and quantity derived from a computer-assisted, case grammar analysis of written texts have been used to study the counseling relationships over time.

Some preliminary work in this area has been prom-
Figure 4. Model of counselor-client interaction and change via natural language. (Adapted from Pepinsky, 1974; Rush, et al., Note 7).
ising. Hurndon, Pepinsky and Meara (1979) have demonstrated that language usage may be indicative of conceptual level and that studying speech patterns may be helpful in matching counselors and clients. Bieber, Patton, and Fuhriman (1977) in an analysis of the language texts of the first, eleventh and twenty-fifth interviews of three counseling series found evidence for concerted action using as dependent measures verb types and case roles derived from case grammar. They found similarity between the client's and counselor's direction of change on the measures (i.e., tracking) and greater similarity for participants over time in usage of verb types and case roles that made direct reference to the client (i.e., convergence). The authors interpret these data as possibly providing a means for clients to learn how to talk about themselves in counseling and participate in more effective treatment.

The most recent studies to use the CALAS analyzed segments of the counseling sessions from the film series Three Approaches to Psychotherapy (Shostrom, 1966). In one study, Meara, Shannon, and Pepinsky (1979) found significant differences in number of sentences, average sentence length, average block length, and average clause depth (all measures of
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language complexity) among the three counselors in the films. The differences were commensurate with expectations derived from what was understood to be the major tenets of each counselor's theoretical orientation. The client’s language complexity also differed significantly on the measures across the three interviews. By comparing the data within each interview for two different time periods, evidence for concerted action was found in the forms of trecking and convergence. The authors interpret their results as both supporting previous findings and raising questions about the potency of interpersonal influence in counseling, the effect of the counselor's theoretical orientation upon the language used in counseling, and speculations about how the counselor and client communicate to establish ground rules for treatment.

In an extension of the above study, Keara, Pepinsky, Shannon, and Murray (in press) investigated the relationship between counselor's stated intentions for a counseling interview and the inherent semantic relations present in the language of the interview participants. Using the same computer-generated data from Three Approaches to Psychotherapy (Shostrom, 1966), the essential verb phrase-noun phrase relationships were compared. The analysis indicated that the counselors
differed significantly on two dependent measures of fundamental inherent semantic relators: (a) state verbs and (b) action verbs and one one dependent measure of interactive semantic relators: experiencer verbs. The client’s language usage was found to be relatively consistent across the three interviews. The authors believe their results suggest a paradigm for research which uses intentions as independent treatments and content analysis units as dependent measures and which would examine how policies and ground rules for treatment may be established by participants from diverse cultures and in different stages of the counseling process.

Summary

Studies involving the analysis of counselors' and clients' spoken language as it occurs in counseling have shown that both participants may differ in overall language style and that a given individual’s style may vary over time. The model of informative display discussed above and the research it has stimulated have suggested the importance of concerted actions between the counselor and client in successful counseling. The present study is an extension of this research.
APPENDIX B: TRANSCRIPT OF EXCERPTS USED IN STUDY
Counselor 1

Text A:

Co: How are you doing this week?
C1: Okay, Um, I didn't get a chance to make my list, because I thought of a couple of things that seemed more pressing, that were really bothering me.

Co: Okay, Uh huh...
C1: Two in particular. Um let me tell you about the rape. I live down on 9th and Highland.

Co: You're right in that area, then.
C1: All by myself in the first floor apartment, a perfect target, and I just feel like here I am. Everyone knows it, you know. I don't know. Thursday night and Friday night I was really scared. I couldn't...I had a really hard time falling asleep...The last two nights weren't bad. I just thought...forget it. I'm tired. I don't care. Let them come in. It's too bad. But it really scares me.

Co: Uh huh. That would scare me too. I could see how you would be real concerned.
C1: Yeah, I'm just...part of me says you should feel scared. Statistics say every three women get raped. Um, here you are. You look like a prime suspect, even though you lock all your doors and windows twenty times. You know, everything's locked up before you go to bed, but still it's like the other half of me says, "You're taking precautions." "There's nothing you can do. If it's going to happen, don't worry about it."

Co: Uh huh.
C1: But...
Co: Is that something you would like to talk about here and kind of resolve in your mind?
C1: I don't know. I just get real jittery about it. I don't know if I should be worried or not. I keep wondering, like, I've got to spend the next nine months there, and part of it seems really strange, because during the middle...but, I thought, "Wow, I wish I had someone here." But, I thought that's really ridiculous, because I can't go out on the street and say, "Hey, you. Someone, I would like someone here to spend the night, and I know that is a pretty stupid reason for getting, you know, for trying to develop some sort of relationship...just to have someone there, so that I'm not afraid."
Co: I'm wondering what your gut-level feeling is, if you, like...to have someone living with you, or what you have thought about that.

Cl: Oh, I would. I would feel a lot safer, but it's just not practical. I don't have enough room for a roommate. As for some guy to sleep over all the time, there's not anyone there, and I just don't want to run out and pick up anyone and say, "Hi, I'm scared tonight; come home and sleep with me."

Co: Uh huh.

Cl: That seems...it's just like something I wouldn't want to do.

Co: What could you do?

Cl: I'm not sure. Um...I've been locking up as much as I can, and everything is really shut tight, and they're coming out with that thing for everyone on South Campus to get together and know how to stop crime, and I was going to go to that.

Co: Uh huh?

Cl: I'm not sure what else I could do, because...Well, like, walking out on the streets at night, that doesn't bother me at all.

Text 2:

Co: Okay. These are all thoughts that you begin to get, you know...I'm wondering what I could do. These are ideas... What's your gut feeling right now?

Cl: Loneliness...people that I remember... like where are they? Where are all the people that are here and suppose to love me and stuff like that? They just don't seem to be around at that time for one reason or another. Like, they've got mid-terms, or they've got night classes or something like that, and they just forget and don't make it.

Co: I wonder what is behind that loneliness.

Cl: Oh sometimes I get to the point where if my friends really start fading away, I just want to reach out and grab hold of them to make the bonds stronger. And if they don't, or if I don't see them, or they don't come over, I keep thinking, "Well maybe we're not as good of friends... maybe they really don't like me." It's your really paranoid about it. Trying to decide what went wrong. Why aren't they here? Then, I suppose, sometimes making up excuses just for the sake of, instead "Well, they just forgot."
I don't know. It's got to be something more.

C1: You know I'm trying to think how I would feel in that situation. You know, I think, you know behind that loneliness I'd feel really hurt.

C1: Yeah.

C1: And at the same time I think I'd feel pretty angry too. That here these people I counted on and I thought were friends, they didn't call me on my birthday or forgot about me. I'd be mad.

C1: I suppose I am mad, because we use to have surprise parties for people for every once in a while and uh, I planned surprise parties, or even I'd get people stuff for their birthday and really make something for them; or get them a nice card and a rose or something like that. Then, when it comes time for me, it's like oh, they all forget, and sometimes they make some off-hand excuse like "Well, your birthday is too close to the beginning of the quarter; I can't remember" I said, "Hey, yours is close to the end of the quarter and finals, and I still make it."

C1: I can sense, you know, even in the tone of your voice as you say that, kind of the bitterness and resentment towards them.

C1: Yeah. It seems they don't seem to remember things; that it's not as important to them as it is to me. Well, some friends can just pass it by if someone doesn't stop in and wish 'em a Happy Birthday. It just seems more important to me, maybe because I live alone. I don't get as much contact with them. It just seems more important. And yet, I do get bitter and angry, and it seems like every year I end up crying and getting really pissed at everyone for a couple of days and withdrawing; and in a few days, later I'll say, "You can't go on with this," and I'll just come out of it.

C1: Well, I was wondering what happens to all those angry feelings? How do you deal with them?

C1: Same thing that happens with all my angry feelings. They go down inside and all of a sudden, I blow up, and that's it. Usually my blowing up is only crying.

C1: I wanna...I have been kind of getting the sense from a pattern of, well, if you're upset, it's kind of like you might be mad at the other people, but they never know. It's kind of like it's turned against yourself. And you are the one who gets depressed and down on yourself, and it's your fault, and you haven't accomplished anything. All of these irrationalizations. when the real basic
feelings are, "Hey I'm hurt and I'm sad."
C1: Yeah. I always try to rationalize myself out of anger or stuff like that. Sometimes, I just... well, people sometimes... do that. They don't really realize what they've done. And I just don't want to go up yelling and screaming to them and say, "You did this," and they'll say "What are you talking about?" So then, I start feeling like a fool and then...
C0: Well, what about you, like right now? Just talking about it now, how are you feeling?

Text C1

C0: What does seem really pertinent to you, or is that telling me something about myself, or did I really learn something about myself there?
C1: It brings it more to the awareness. Instead of, like, I always know in the back of my mind that I figure it is right there, and it is there. It's out more in the front, than instead, shoved behind me where I can ignore it.
C0: I imagine it must be pretty scary for it to be right out there, too. It's staring you in the face.
C1: Yes it is. It brings out the conflict between the two sides. Like change and not let the one part stay out so much and the other side says, "No, like you can't, you don't want to be so vulnerable."
C0: I'm wondering if it might be helpful to continue with all of this next time. I know its kind of scary and it takes some risk too.
C1: Okay. Yeah.
C0: The fact that you're willing to say this to me, that side wants to come out...
C1: I can try.
C0: How about between now and next week you can kind of keep track of how your guarded side keeps your warm side out -- What does your guarded side do to keep you down? How do you feel when it happens? Maybe you can have kind of a little log, maybe at the end of the day - write down your thoughts about how you were. What were the situations? Where were you when on guard? How were you feeling at those times? What did you do to be real protective with yourself at those times?
C1: Okay.
C0: Is that alright?
C1: Yeah.
C0: Okay, let's go out to the Women's Study Services
Area and find the materials.

Cl: Okay. So we'll be going out that way there?

Text Di

Co: Where are you today?
Cl: Last week I noticed something really weird, after about the first, like Monday and Tuesday, I just kind of withdrew and tried to stay away from everyone else...just kind of like put up a double wall.

Co: What was going on there?
Cl: I don't know. I figured maybe it was too scary in here, and she's my protection. Like Wednesday and Thursday I was real friendly and I talked to anyone I saw...just "Ks, Personality Plus", and that was really strange...the change. I went from one extreme to the other.

Co: Un huh. Did you feel comfortable in either one of those places? How did it feel?
Cl: Oh, I felt really paranoid the first couple of days when I was just staying away from people. I kind of felt like they were all looking at me and saying, "Well, what's she doing?"

Co: What were you doing that...What were some of your withdrawing behaviors?
Cl: I just get really quiet, and I don't say much at all. Unless it's like someone I know really well that's sitting near me in class that I usually talk to. I'll number out a few things; but I'm not as um, spontaneous and joking around and really friendly to everyone else. I just kind of...In between classes, if I get to a class early, I'll just open a book or a newspaper and put it in front of my face, and it's like, "Don't disturb me"; and in the evening, I'll just like stay at home and just not even...just study or sit around or maybe call one person or two, but not really make an effort to go out and see my friends or something like that. Then the other way, I just talk to anyone I see in my class. I've seen them sitting across the other side of the room but would happen to be waiting for the class. You know, to get out, or I just strike up any conversation.

Co: Um, hm. I get a real sense that those two polarities that we've seen here the other day kind of dis-associated for a couple of days. One side kind of took over for two days, then the other side came out! I wonder where you are right now?
C1: Being scared is one of those things I push down the hardest on. It seems like I kind of trained myself, especially on that particular one not to pay any attention to it. Like the summer I moved up to Flint, I was petrified. I didn't want to go. I thought, "Oh no, what's going to happen?" I'm not going to meet anyone there. I'm just going to go home and sit in my room all evening and not do anything. I just said "No, you can't be scared, you're going to do it." And then that's the one I block out most often, I think. It seems like I got this little voice that says, "If you're scared, you're not going to accomplish anything. It's going to be really hard and you're just going to put your own obstacles up there."

C0: One thing that I'm thinking is that its impossible not to get rid of the feelings; that they are always there. Sometimes they are expressed in different ways then the way we want them to be expressed. And then we kind of loose control of them, such as being scared and not knowing how to do what...what to do might result in, when you're on the job, being more inhibited, because you're afraid of what you are going to say wrong or not behaving spontaneously, because you're afraid. I'm wondering if that makes sense to you?

C1: Yeah, but it seems like when I worked, I did loosen up after a little while, and I didn't feel leery about asking questions or anything like that. But it seemed like sometimes I was spontaneous at things that I thought were really funny or something like that. It just sounded weird after they came out. Almost like, "Be quiet," or something like that, and I wouldn't say anything. It's like when it came out it wasn't right.

C0: What does this have to do with being scared?

C1: When I'm not scared, and I just let down the guard, and you know, like some kind of remark doesn't come out right, or something I say doesn't quite come out the way I mean it. Then, I put up the guard again. And it seems to come up a while longer. I say, "Wow, you dummy, see what you did!"

C0: Uh huh. You say being scared is one of the hardest feelings to deal with; that you try and ignore them (the feelings). What does it feel like to be scared or frightened?
C1: Try taking some deep breaths now, and see how it feels. How does that feel?
C0: I can feel it loosening up, like right in the middle. I can still feel it down at the bottom.
C1: You can still feel some tension down at the bottom? Okay, maybe you can say, "Hey, relax those muscles in the back." You can say, "Where do I feel the tension?" "Is it in my back?" Just loosen up and keep breathing nice and deeply. Get in a more comfortable position and relax a bit. Think that you'd have a chance between now and next week to try that out?
C1: Yeah, maybe.
C0: Okay, I'm kind of aware that we're at the end of a session. How about it if your assignment for the next time is to try that.
C1: Okay.
C0: Not just once, at least three times.
C1: Okay.
C0: The reason that I'd like you to try it a couple of times is that the first... each time you try it you'll get a little more successful at it. If you expect it the first time it's going to work beautifully for you, then what might happen is you'll have all these expectations, and you'll end up being more tense than usual; and if it doesn't work, it's like, "Well, it's no use in trying it the next time." The first time it probably won't relax you as much as you like, to be relaxed, but each time you try it, you may find you become a little bit more relaxed at it. You're becoming it's a little bit easier.
C1: The first time, you know, it might not have the best results for you. But each time, I think it will work a little bit better for you, so I'd like you to try it at least 3 times.
C0: I'll try it.
C1: You'll try it? Okay. Of all the things we've talked about today, is there anything that kind of sums up how you're feeling? How you're doing? That seems particularly relevant to you or pertinent?
C0: I don't know. It's well, this week-end, since I was sick, it's kind of like I'm in limbo, now. It'll probably take the rest of the day or a couple of hours of class or something to put me in the mood. It's like I'm coming from, well,
I haven't been around too many people this week-end, so, like, it's been really safe, so I haven't been out.

Co: Uh huh. Okay. Well, I'll be eager to hear how it goes.

--------------------------------------
Counselor 2:

Text 6:

Co: How are you doing this week?
C1: Better than last week.
Co: What made it better for you?
C1: I don't know, probably my attitude. I don't even know if that was the answer. Um, it just worked out better somehow. Maybe I tried. I don't know. I think I'm learning to be more independent of other people. "Wait and see what he was going to do, wait for him to call, and wait for him to tell me what we are going to do this week-end"—all that kind of stuff; and now, I've already made plans for the week-end. He can't fit it in, and it's just too bad for him, and I hope I ... I always hate girls who sit around and wait for their boyfriends, and that is all they do is talk about them. Their center of their whole existence and that just disgusts me. But I was doing the same thing, and I wouldn't admit it. I still do it. I also feel that there's a certain amount of compromise in a relationship. You have to, or otherwise it won't work out.
Co: And that's what Malcolm was asking too, wasn't it? For you to be a little more independent, give him some distance.
C1: And now I think I'm the one that wants the distance, not him. Because just --- I haven't felt like being around him hardly at all and when I am, I ... I guess I just, maybe I just don't want to deal with it. When he didn't come over, that really upset me. I said "Don't call me, don't come over; that's alright. If you don't want to call me, don't!" So he didn't. It didn't even bother me. I would have gotten mad.
Co: When did you tell him this ... about "don't come."
C1: That was just last night on the phone. He call- ed, and he had to study for a quiz, and I said, He said, "I'll call you at 11:00 when I get done." I said, "Well, don't, it's okay" I go, He said,
"Are you going to sleep?" and I said, "Well, I don't know if I am or not. But it doesn't matter, if you don't want to, don't!" I said, "It isn't your job to call me! It's kind of felt rejected, I think, but I think he's sensitive. It's been kind of strange. You see, he acts real strange well, not strange; he has a lot of things - tensions, that pile up on him all the time, and he takes them out on me in subtle ways. Like you're - he was just ... I told him so. "I said, "I don't want to be around you at all, and he said, "Why, you know... "Look at ... look at you" He does these things, what I call neurotic habits, and I can tell when something is bothering him, and that he's covering up, and that he is trying to pretend that everything is wonderful to me, and I know.

Co: And I am sensing that now you have a little bit more control within yourself.
Cl: Over myself.
Co: You're saying, "Look you don't have to call me," and I think maybe you like that.
Cl: Yeah. I feel good about it, cause everytime I'd whine on the phone. "Oh, come over." It's disgusting but the next time I'd go do the same thing.
Co: And it would be quite a contrast for you to call him up and say, "I'm not interested in having lunch today." Whatever you would say, it would be quite a contrast.
Cl: Yeah, then he'll think I'm doing it, cause he didn't call me. Last night, you know. Whether he asked me and I deny it, that's what he'll think; I know that's what he'll think. Because he couldn't understand why I said "Don't call me now; I feel rejected." We were on the phone, and he said, "I'll have to study for my quiz tomorrow, and I'll call you around 11." I go, "I don't know." And he goes, "What do you mean?" He said he'll come over, and I said it will be kind of late. He goes, "Don't tell me that, I'll feel rejected." And I started laughing, and I said, "It's not that, It's not that I don't want to see you; I'm concerned about your state of mind." He runs from one thing into another. He runs from class to USG to meetings at night, to dinner, to study, then he never has time to think. And then
when he comes over, it's like "dump it" on Tracy, you know. It's everything he's been worrying about, and he hasn't had time to think about it all day, you know. So he dumps on me, and I compute and tell him what should go on and then, - then he starts talking to discuss anything else, and I just now I just don't want him even coming over, unless he's had time to sit and be by himself and think about things that are bothering him instead of coming over and dumping it or taking it out on me, you know.

Co: Have you told him this?
Cl: Yeah, oh Yeah, definitely. He should be alone more. And that he don't come over when you're feeling like that, but he does. He'll come over and not tell me he's afraid he's going to hurt me, or I'll get upset if he doesn't come over!

Co: I'm wondering if you're as direct with him as you are with me, when you talk with me.


Co: 'Cause you said that very definitely, you know, about, "I don't like him coming over and doing this...".

Cl: Oh, He knows that - cause he even says, (you know), "I don't want to come over because I am not feeling like I want to talk about it," and I will say, "Okay, that's fine."

Text 1:

Cl: I've made my decision, but I still don't know what to do.

Co: Uh huh. I think you have to sit down and say, "How much work do I have left to get through this quarter? Can I do that work without really hurting myself? Will I be able to concentrate?" If the answer is yes, well, finish. On the other hand, if you think you'll be really depressed and/or under too much stress, then I don't think it's worth it. You know. I think you can get back in this University if you withdraw, you know. I don't think it's going to hurt your college career. You will not be the first Freshman the first quarter to withdraw because of your reason. I guarantee it, you know, but you need to choose what you're comfortable with what you think is best for you right now. Um, I might look at the possibility of taking an Incomplete or two, to take some pressure off, you know, so that you
don't have to face that final in Chemistry right
now, you know. I think once you decide and make
a choice, you'll feel a lot better.
C1: Another thing, I was thinking. If I do go on and
finish Chemistry and I don't do so good, I can
come back and take it again. It's the only class
I could possibly not pass. I think I can at least
pull a passing grade from him.
Co: See right now you don't have any perspective on
college, as far as what you know, it's your first
quarter, and I went to college my first quarter,
and I got mono, and I said, "Oh! I didn't know
whether to drop out, and I didn't know what to do.
I was so tired I slept for a month. I swear, you
know. I could hardly go. I practically passed
out in classes. I was really sick. And I didn't
know what to do, you know. I was going through
the same thing you are, and I said, "Well, I'll
stick it out," and I got really panicked about
it. I thought, "Oh, my goodness, I'll never
graduate from college," you know. And I took
two pass-fails, and I passed, and I took the other
and got a "B", but I would have gotten all B's in
everything, but really just thought, "Oh, my,"
you know. I didn't really have any perspective on
it. It was your first quarter. It seems so
important 'cause it's the only one you have, you
know, but in the long run, you know, that's one
out of twelve, and in the long run, no one ever
noticed. But it's really hard when you're starting
out. Give yourself a break.

Text J:

Co: How are you feeling today?
C1: Pretty good, in fact, really good. What am I
doing? Kind of good. At least I'm... Last Thurs-
day, like, I had a good day. Like, Wednesday,
after we talked, I sat down and talked to Malcolm,
and I told him a lot of the things that were
bothering me. You know, I just... and he... he
was like really agreeable. He said we'll work
with that and all that kind of stuff. I told him
he wasn't giving me the respect that I deserve as
a person, and that, like you were telling me, he
was telling me when to get upset and not what to
get upset at, you know?
Co: Uh huh.
C1: And I told him, you know, "you have no right to
tell me that if I'm upset, because you know,
if something is dumb to me, you'll have to
accept that. If you can't accept that, that's
too bad. If you can't accept my feelings, then
you can't accept me."

C0: How did that go over?

C1: Yeah, he was really agreeable, well, not really
agreeable, but...

C0: He understood what you were saying.

C1: Yeah. I was kind of really coming down hard on
him. You know, I was... I had a few things that,
what you said, I was kind of upset when I thought
about doing that. So then, on Thursday, I went
to the office and I got... I finally figured out
what my problem is with him and me; and it's
that... you mentioned, we had a pattern of com-
munication that caused the tension, and it was
that I always want something and he always said:
"No." That's the feeling I always get, and that
I always say, "Why don't we do this," and he
always said, "No, no, no." And I feel a con-
stant rejection. And so, whenever we go up to
the office, I get really depressed everytime, and
I'm suppose to be doing work there. What happens
is I go up there expecting to see him, and he
can't spend time with me when we're there, you
know. He can say, "Hi." You know, that kind of
thing, but we can't, you know, we can't have a
relationship while he is there. And so, I get
really upset, you know. When I'm there, I start
talking to him, and I start taking off-the-wall
things and making big issues out of them, you
know, that really have nothing to do with the
things that are bothering me. He said, "It looks
to me like you're just taking things and creat-
ing controversies. Why don't you just go home
and think." I think like, "here is rejection," and
I get upset. I went home, and I really got
mad at him, and I was thinking how much I hated
him, and how much I never wanted to see him
again and all this stuff. And then, I realized
it really wasn't true, you know. It just wasn't
true. So, I had to figure out why it wasn't
true, and I think what it is is that I need him.
I let him, well, I give him myself. I need him
to affirm me as a person, practically every
minute I'm around him.

Text:

Co: It is a different... um... (you know), and I am not saying you cannot express your needs to him or your emotional needs, but for him to say you can't ever cry in my office or something like that isn't... You know that isn't going to meet your needs all the time... And yet, I would guess that you could avoid some conflicts if you were more that independent person, I would guess that that is one thing that attracted him to you is the sense that "I am in charge of my life."

Ci: Definitely. I really feel I was before I started going out with him, you know. I had gotten over Ted and you know, I was really... it took me a long time, but I really started feeling, putting everything together, and right about when I started to see him, I thought that I was ready to handle a relationship, and I was real confident, and if he didn't come over or call, I - I didn't even think about it, you know.

Co: "That's okay."

Ci: He said I had to go to this and that, and now what do I do? Is I interrogate him? "Where are you going? What time? Why? Who said? What are you going to be doing? Exactly? Did you really?... Do you know what I mean? Then, when he comes back, I interrogate him again... "Did you really do what you said you were going to do?" All this kind of thing, you know and like, I don't know why I do that. You know? It's like I think he's lying to me or something! "What are you really doing there?" Like yesterday morning, one of his friends told me, "Oh, Malcolm has this problem about not going to class and...". And this quarter he's told me he's turned over a new leaf and is always going to class, and yesterday morning when his friends said, "Well", I said, "Could you give this to Malcolm in class", and he goes, "Well, sometimes he doesn't show up" and I say, "Oh," I just wanted to go, and I wanted to go and find him right then and say, "How come you aren't going to class?" You know, and I just, like I fear if he's not where he's suppose to be, then he's doing something to hurt me, or he's doing something that I'm afraid
o; you know what I mean? He's going out with another girl. I know he would never do that, but I'm just so afraid.

Co: These are the kinds of things that Todd did to you?
Cl: Yeah. Yeah, and so I got...like whenever he wants to go do something, like with this week the fraternity (whole week), it's just like I go, "How come you like to do that? That's stupid!" I really honestly feel fraternities are kind of stupid. But he said, "If you don't respect that then you don't respect me." And I said, "I respect you better than I respect fraternities," which is kind of an awful lot. It was like my excuse which wasn't...

Co: I mean there are 2 issues there. You can think that activity is dumb.
Cl: Yeah, and I do.
Co: Or you can respect the fact he wants to go, you know, that he wants to go and do that.
Cl: I feel like if its dumb, then he shouldn't want to do it.
Co: Uh huh. But I think part of your resentment is that he is not going to be with you.
Cl: Exactly.

Text K

Co: Well, that's tough what he thinks, I mean...
Cl: I guess I don't want to give him the satisfaction, you know, of knowing how much he affected me. I want him to think that I just go through my days carefree.

Co: It's not true, though.
Cl: I know that, but I don't want him to know that, because he is really jealous of, you, Malcolm. Malcolm is in the paper; Malcolm is this, and Malcolm is that; all the time, you know?
Co: Uh huh.
Cl: You know, he and Malcolm know each other and who each other are, you know, and they say "Hi." It's just like he's always asks, always asks about me, whenever he sees my friends, (and me and Malcolm).. Whenever he...and they say he's really jealous of everything. I don't want him to think that, you know, that there's something wrong with our (Malcolm & mine's) relationship or with me. So he knows that he's still affecting
me, and he can take that satisfaction.

Co: But he's not. See, he's still hanging on to you in a sense.

C1: I know he is.

Co: But you're not in emotional... you're not interest-
ed in a relationship with him. What you're hang-
ing on to is the hurt from the past, and if you went and expressed that, and said, 'Look, I'm not interested in you. I'm not interested in a relationship with you. You hurt me, and unless I tell you about it, I'm going to tell you, you know. I've wanted to tell you for 1 year and one-
half and I haven't and yeah, he'll know, that he hurt you, and he had an affect on you. But that doesn't mean he's one up on you. You know, he'll just know he hurt you, and at that point, he was one up on you, 'cause he was, you know... but that doesn't mean he is now. And that doesn't mean there's anything wrong with you or anything wrong with yours and Malcolm's relationship.

C1: And in a way, why should I care if that's what he thinks or not. So what? It doesn't mean anything to me.

Co: See, what my concern is that you do what you need to to feel better. If that's writing a letter, then you do it, then that's good.

C1: If I wrote a letter and sent it - I would rather go say it to his face.

Co: Yeah, you might just write it and not send it, you know, just try to express it if you'd rather not face the scene - or you can do what I say and just by acting it out in a sense of, you know...

C1: Sometimes I'm more angry when I'm mad at Malcolm. It's like I go (like) "I think I hate you." I hate him, but it's not him I hate.

Co: Now when you can let go of that, you can see Malcolm for what he is.

C1: Yeah.

Co: We can talk some more about this next week. You know, maybe you could try writing some of these things down.

C1: Okay.

Counselor: 31

Text: 4
C1: There's one thing I'd like to say. I had a little experience Friday. We were going to dinner, and I got impatient with the traffic, you know. I sometimes do; like, the left lane is going through a green light, and my right lane isn't doing nothing. So I got a little irritated. So what I did was, you know, I had my hands on the steering wheel, and with my body you know, I just dropped it, and that's all I did. But to me, what I was doing was I caught my anger, my frustration and pinpointed it. I made up my mind that I wasn't going to verbalize how I was feeling, because it would upset everyone else, so I figured all I really needed to do was to do that small little act. And then my mom, she catches this, you know, so I suppose I, I've done this before, and she'll reach over and put her hand on my leg, and she'll start giving me this "patience bit", which I can't stand. It makes it worse. So I told her, I saw her hand coming over, and I just took my hand over, and I said, "Stop!" I said, "Don't do that." You know. I don't remember my exact words or anything, but I told her that, you know, I caught it, and I could have made everyone else upset by verbalizing how I was feeling and how I handled it. I was not doing that much, and if you had just left it alone Grandma wouldn't have noticed it. I would have been fine. You would have been fine. And that frustrated me more, you know. So, I mean, she gives me this, "I'd better get over this attitude bit." So I was thinking about that little thing that happened and right there, see, is you know, how I'm programmed to behave, like when I feel angry, you know. You're not, from my mom's stand point, you're not, you know, "Don't show anger." You're supposed to be patient, you know, that kind of qualifies, verifies what I've been saying, you know. So, anyway.

C0: Uh huh. "That's the way I am, and that's why I am."

C1: Yeah, um, gee, I don't know. I really haven't worked much on accepting it. I guess, I guess I've got to work on it a little more.

C0: Accepting what?

C1: Being angry. We talked about...

C0: What happened last week? You kind of came to the decision that accepting that was the hardest.
What did we talk about doing as far as that is concerned?

C1: That’s a good question.

Text 0:

C1: I shouldn’t put all my eggs in one basket.
Co: Uh huh.
C1: Cause ya find one, usually . . .
Co: It’s been really hard for you in the past. Is it hard to think about making new friends, thinking about having to be accepted?
C1: That’s a good question. I don’t . . . I’m particular who I pick, you know. It’s hard to come by good friends. I guess as far as me getting into a crowd who parties, smokes pot, drinks and you know, thing like that, I don’t have any problems with that. I don’t want any. ’Cause the way I am, I feel, is the best way to be. I’m not going to get messed up in that stuff. I don’t know, um . . . It’s hard for me to be sociable, and I’m not a talker as you must know.
Co: Yeah, but you can...
C1: Um, this reminds me of something I want to bring up. For two points for extra credit in psychology, I had to fill out this . . . Am I changing the subject? I’m reading your face, now.
Co: You can bring it up, and then we’ll go back to the other. Okay?
C1: Okay. We had to fill out this . . . maybe I did tell you. We had to fill out this number 7 or 6 strongly agree or strongly disagree thing, um?
Co: No, you didn’t tell me. Is it the likert thing?
C1: Yes. And they list all the stuff, you know, and they try to get you to more-or-less determine your personality, how you’re like. (For example) “Are you shy?” And I filled those things out twice just recently. I filled out one versus the other one I filled out last year. There’s really a difference. It’s like I lost, you know, who I think I am.

Text P:

C1: But it’s hard.
Co: And it’s you always being left.
C1: Yes, then I don’t think that my dad has anything to do with it, but he died.
Co: Gone. He died and left.
Cl: And John.
Co: I died.
Cl: And I had a real good friend of mine in my literature class in 11th grade. He committed suicide. I never really dealt with that, I guess, just pushed it aside. So I guess it's possible to go on grieving for 2 years or 4 years. I remember I never did it for my dad.
Co: You never have really allowed yourself, either, because you have to be strong and caring. When will you allow yourself to do anything?
Cl: Brings about why I'm kind of hesitant on letting my emotions go in Houston. It's like there's so much that, I don't know ...
Co: It's almost like you feel like you are going to be overwhelmed, involved, and maybe if you're scared to do it the first day, you probably won't do it. Maybe you can do a little bit of it with someone who really cares, who you trust. Maybe you can do a little of it in here, eventually. We'll just do it all in a big blaze of fire, and we'll both be consumed.
Cl: But it's scary.
Co: You think about it during Spring break, okay?
Cl: Oh, I will.
Co: I'm sure. Can we talk about this next quarter? Is next quarter a sore spot?
Cl: It's coming back.

Text Q:
Co: So ...
Cl: Here we go again.
Co: Tell me about Houston.
Cl: We really didn't get to do much cause of their financial situation. So I just, you know, I enjoyed the visit with her. What we did have time to do, and Barb, you know, married Steve and Steve's brother, Joe, and they're living with Joe. So a few times, I did get to go out. Joe took me, last year, we went disco dancing for the first time, and this year I went twice. So that was fun. And I went with Joe, and I went to a Chinese Restaurant, and we went dancing afterwards. He made me feel really good, 'cause we talked more, you know. I really didn't get into myself. We talked about him, and he thought he could be really open with
me. But that made me feel good just being able to spend some time with him, you know, 'cause of my lack of ...'

Co: Spending time with males?

Cl: Yeah. So it made me feel good, you know. It made me feel like a new beginning, you know. (so) 'cause I got all cleaned up and went out to dinner, and there's nice music playing, it's kind of fun. I told him, "I feel like I'm in a movie." I did, too. And so then there was a little bit of a problem with Barb. She was kind of (in a way) happy that I was getting to get out; 'cause that was something she couldn't do. And at the same time, she was kind of jealous that she couldn't get out and um, so there was kind of resentment there towards Joe. And then I used to share with her my poems, some of them. At one time I was going to put them in a book and give them to her, but that was strange. And the night before I left, she wanted to copy some of my poems and get them done by a copier, 'cause, like, I had 100-130, and I didn't want to let her know what was going on - But it was kind of interesting how I was feeling ...'

Co: How did you feel?

Cl: It's like I - those poems are a piece of me and I - you know, I've looked through them many times to try to come up with songs. I feel there's certain words that fit for songs, and you know, it's like I don't like them anymore.

Text R

Co: You spend an awful lot of energy trying to fix your mother.

Cl: Yeah, I don't know. My sister's philosophy is that she's always going to be that way, you know. Quit trying to change things. Give her ice cream when she wants it.

Co: What's your feeling?

Cl: Do I really care? I mean if I just let, just let all that go and not think about it, then I get the sense I don't care ... But then again, it seems like it would be a hell of a lot easier if I would just let go and let her live her life and quit trying to change things. But then, I guess maybe I'm losing the sense that I do care.
To keep myself thinking I do...

Co: Struggling by?
Cl: Yeah.
Co: Do you pretend a whole lot?
Cl: Is it pretend?
Co: I don’t know.
Cl: I don’t know. I don’t feel it is, but then a person can be doing it and not realizing it.
Co: When I say pretend, do you do things like giving your mother a great big hug and Carol a little hug, because you decide that is the right thing to do? You decided the right thing to do is care about your mother, even when you really have some strong feelings about her?
Cl: Yeah, because I’d protect her. I protect her feelings towards her.
Co: Do you protect her?
Cl: But I guess, I don’t want, I don’t want her to feel bad - I guess what it boils down to is protecting me, because if she gets any indication that my feelings are much more different-better towards Carol than her-then I kind of get that back at me.
Co: Also you might harm your image of being a very loving and caring daughter.
Cl: Yeah.
Co: The way you’re suppose to be.
Cl: Uh huh. Yeah, I mean, I can’t, you know. The one thing that I’m trying to avoid is getting the rotten kid label, and what we’re saying to do here is do what I want to do, um...
Co: What you seem to be fighting against is that if you do what you want, then you’re a rotten kid.
Cl: It could turn out to be that way.
Co: You’re right. It has the potential.
Cl: I don’t want that.
Co: Just because it has the potential doesn’t mean that it would.

Text 5:

Co: What do you want from counseling?
Cl: Why do you ask that question?
Co: I want to know what direction you want to go in.
Cl: So that I can open the doors and not have you open them.
Co: Sounds like the direction we discussed before. We all want the same thing, kind of...
Cl: I want to be able to look out and think and be able
to be independent. I'm insecure, unable to accept change. I'm not independent. I lack confidence.

C1: How would we have some indication that some of those things were happening?

C1: Pardon?

C0: How would we get some indication that some of these things were happening? How am I gonna know if I am helping you, that you are helping you?

C1: That's a good question. Well, I figure this can't be done in a day.

C0: No.

C1: I don't want to push it, not that I don't want to push it! Not that I shouldn't. I don't want to... I don't know.

C0: What I want you to do between now and when I see you is to think about it. You told me some of the things you want. Think about how like we both see that these things will come. How can I tell when they will? How can I tell when things have changed? Okay, these are global things. More specifically, we might look on how we might work towards these things. Does that make sense to you?

C1: Yeah, it does, but it is hard.

C0: Yeah, it is, because it entails really thinking about what does having more confidence mean to me. Not what does it mean to C or everybody else; what does it mean to me, E?

C1: Uh huh.

C0: I know what I'm like. If I don't have confidence, what will I look like? What will I be like when I do have confidence? What's blocking it?

C1: That's even harder.

C0: Uh huh. Yeah, and maybe, you'll be spending a whole lot of time thinking and not coming up with anything, but at least, you'll still have a start with the thinking. Okay?

C1: Alright.

C0: This seems like a good place for us to end.
APPENDIX C: EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES: A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

DESCRIPTION OF EMPATHY TRAINING PROCEDURES
SCALE 1
EMPATHIC UNDERSTANDING IN INTERPERSONAL PROCESSES
A SCALE FOR MEASUREMENT

Level 1

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

EXAMPLE: The helper communicates no awareness of even the most obvious, expressed surface feelings of the helpee. The helper may be bored or disinterested or simply operating from a preconceived frame of reference which totally excludes that of the helpee(s).

In summary, the helper does everything but expresses that he is listening, understanding, or being sensitive to even the most obvious feelings of the helpee in such a way as to detract significantly from the communications of the helpee.

Level 2

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

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

In summary, the helper tends to respond to other than what the helpee is expressing or indicating.

Level 3

The expressions of the helper in response to the expressions of the helpee(s) are essentially interchangeable with those of the helpee in that they express essentially the same affect and meaning.

1This scale is a revision of earlier versions of empathy scales (Carkhuff, 1968; Carkhuff & Berenson, 1967; Truax & Carkhuff, 1967).
EXAMPLE: The helper responds with accurate understanding of the surface feelings of the helpee but may not respond to or may misinterpret the deeper feelings.

In summary, the helper is responding so as to neither subtract from nor add to the expressions of the helpee. He does not respond accurately to how that person really feels beneath the surface feelings; but he indicates a willingness and openness to do so. Level 3 constitutes the minimal level of facilitative interpersonal functioning.

Level 4

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

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

In summary, the helper's responses add deeper feeling and meaning to the expressions of the helpee.

Level 5

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

EXAMPLE: The helper responds with accuracy to all of the helpee's deeper as well as surface feelings. He is "tuned in" on the helpee's wave length. The helper and the helpee might proceed together to explore previously unexplored areas of human existence.

In summary, the helper is responding with a full awareness of who the other person is and with a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of that individual's deepest feelings.
EXCERPT RATING GUIDE

1.0 Question, or statement, such as tell me more . . . , advice giving

1.5 Summarization—restatement of content, no implied feeling

2.0 Restatement of content with feelings implied, not stated. Response may also state feelings, but either be inaccurate or subtracts significantly from client’s statement

2.5 Empathic response—labels at least one of client’s feelings, however is subtractive in that it misses labeling other important feelings

3.0 Reflection of feelings significant to client—stays on the level of the client—does not add feelings unstated by the client

3.5 Empathic response which goes beyond feelings stated by client—goes deeper with feelings—may also be additive due to tone of voice used by counselor

4.0 Similar to 3.5—adds noticeably to the expressions of the client by expressing both surface and deeper feelings—may identify patterns of behavior and tie them to the feelings of the client—may also tie together feelings talked about during entire interview

4.5 Counselor expresses all of client’s surface and deeper feelings accurately, being fully with the client in his/her deepest moments

5.0 Similar to 4.5, the counselor responds with a full awareness of who the person is and with a comprehensive and accurate empathic understanding of the individual’s deepest feelings.

Client must give full response (subject and verb, not just yes, or uh huh)

Note: This scale was developed by the raters and the experimenter to increase inter-rater reliability.

2 From Pradkin, Note 1.
Table 5
Correlation of Empathy Ratings of Judges Pilot Study Inter-rater Reliability Check
Spearman Correlation Coefficient and Probability Estimate and
Standard Score Mean and Standard Deviation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables Correlated</th>
<th>Standard Score Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Corr. Probability Coeff.</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy Ratings of Rater 1</td>
<td>1.7504</td>
<td>0.5288</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WITH</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy Ratings of Rater 2</td>
<td>1.8255</td>
<td>0.4496</td>
<td>0.81219</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* \( p < .0001 \)

\(^3\)From Fradkin, Note 1.
Description of Empathy Training

Procedure

(1) Description of Scale: Empathic Understanding in Interpersonal Processes: A Scale for Measurement - this scale was developed by Carkhuff (1969) and is a modification of a more comprehensive scale reported by Truax and Carkhuff (1967). Carkhuff shortened the original 9-point scale to five points to increase reliability and clarified interchangeable, additive and subtractive counselor statements to reduce the ambiguity of the earlier scale. A study by Engranz and Vandergoot (1978) correlated ratings on the two scales by trained, independent raters and found an overall correlation of .89, p<.001. Interrater reliabilities were high for both scales and overlapped considerably.

(2) Description of Rating Procedures and Training: As with previous research (e.g., Avery, D'Augelli, & Danish, 1976; Tepper & Haase, 1978), the CI-Co unit was used as the unit for rating empathy.

Raters were trained with practice excerpts from Carkhuff (1969) and with excerpts from a pilot study in Fradkin's (Note 1) research until they reached an interrater reliability of .60 (see Table 5). Two raters rated every CI-Co unit.
in each of the excerpts used in the present study. The investigator averaged their ratings to give a global rating for each of the counselors' two interviews. Global scores from both raters were averaged to give each counselor one composite score. The range of possible scores is 1.0 to 5.0, with 3.0 being a minimally facilitative score.
APPENDIX D: VERB TYPES AND RULES FOR THEIR CLASSIFICATION
Verb Types and Rules for Their Classification

STATIVE (S) - the verb defines a property of the object.
ex. I am detached.

STATIVE EXPERIENCER/COGNITIVE (SEC) - the verb defines
an experiencer cognitive state or
activity.
ex. I think I know what you said.

STATIVE EXPERIENCER/AFFECTIVE (SEA) - the verb defines
an experiencer's affective state or
activity.
ex. I feel like I want something sweet.

STATIVE BENEFACTIVE (SB) - someone or something has
the state of ownership or possessing
something.
ex. I have four teeth.

STATIVE PASSIVE (SP) - the verb "to be" is followed
by an adjective.
If adjective is past participle and
voice is passive.
ex. She was married twice.

PROCESS (F) - something happens or is happening or
has happened to an object.
ex. He died without a hat.

PROCESS EXPERIENCER (PE) - the verb defines a sensory/
perceptual activity experienced by someone.
ex. I heard a cat.

PROCESS BENEFICIAL (PB) — someone or something is the beneficiary of an act, links the beneficiary and the object.
ex. I received a new pen.

AGENTIVE (A) — someone acts as an agent to make something happen.
ex. I hit a car.

AGENTIVE EXPERIENCER (AE) — someone or something acts as an agent to give someone an experience. (All verbal activities, e.g., tell or say, give something to an audience.)
ex. I said no.

AGENTIVE BENEFICIARY (AB) — someone or something acts as an agent to give something to a beneficiary.
ex. She entertains me.
She gives me entertainment.
I lend him money.

November, 1976
Pepinsky, et al.
APPENDIX E: LANGUAGE OPERATIONALIZED VIA CASE GRAMMAR AND THE CALAC
Language Operationalized via Case Grammar and
the CALAS

Case grammar conceptualizes language as consisting of names and relators. The relators are verb phrases, prepositions, and conjunctions; every other word that appears in an utterance is either a name or part of a complex name. The clause is the unit of discourse chosen for use in analyzing the name-relator-name conception of language. A clause is an utterance which contains one and only one predicate. The Computer-Assisted Language Analysis System (CALAS) was developed to analyze written texts from a case grammar perspective.

CALAS' treatment of case grammar differs from the one presented by Fillmore (1969), for it includes the conceptualizations of Chafe (1970), Cook (1969, 1972a, 1972b) and others. Basically, case grammar proposes that grammatical structure consists of a series of non-linearly ordered, case marked noun phrases associated with a verb phrase. Cases are really roles which retain their character while participating in different natural language utterances. The verb phrase is the pivotal word class in language analysis via case grammar (Chafe, 1970). The verb phrase is surrounded by noun phrases. Noun phrases exhibit
certain relationships to the verb phrase and thus, to each other and the remaining phrases in the sentence (Rush et al, Note 7). Every phrase with the exception of the verb phrase is a case candidate, and unless the phrase is embedded within another phrase, it performs a role or function within the clause, and consequently is given a case designation. Case designations are either essential or peripheral. Essential cases are governed by the kind of verb found in the clause; these are sometimes referred to as propositional cases. Peripheral or modal cases occur frequently with a wide variety of utterances but are not governed by the type of verb contained in an utterance.

For example:

(a) Mary kicked the goat.
(b) The goat kicked Mary.

In each of these examples there are two essential and no peripheral cases. The pivotal word class is kicked. In example (a), the noun phrase Mary takes the essential role of the actor (agent) and the goat takes the essential role of the acted upon (object). In example (b), the case roles are reversed. Thus, the order of the word chain and the nature of the verb phrase provide the necessary information for describing case roles.
(a) He danced with poise and grace.
(b) In the city people work for higher wages.

Example (a) contains two case roles: he is the actor (essential case) and with poise and grace (peripheral case) tells the manner of his action. Example (b) contains one essential case, people as actors or agents and two peripheral cases, in the city and for higher wages. The first gives the reader some idea of location (locative) and the second, some idea about the reason for the action (causative).

The verb classifications used in this research are based on the classification proposed by Chafe (1970) and modified by others (Cook, 1969, 1972). The eleven verb types listed and described in Appendix D are the result of further development and modification to make them more amenable to computer analysis (Pepinsky, et al., Note 6; Keara, Note 4).

The four essential cases or phrase types are (1) object, (2) agent, (3) beneficiary, and (4) experiencer. All other cases are peripheral or modal cases. The six peripheral cases include those of: (1) location, (2) time, (3) manner, (4) committation, (5) causation, and (6) purpose. Each essential case is related to a particular verb type in a specific
pattern, but the case does not always appear each time
the verb is used. However, no other essential cases
may appear except those that are related. This re-
lationship is determined by the verb type (Cook,
1972b; Rush et al, Note 7).

Peripheral cases are usually assigned to preposi-
tional phrases or single word adverbials. Most often
the specific preposition (e.g., at, to, from, for)
governs the case role which is assigned to the pre-
positional phrases; and the single word adverbials
fill either commitative, locative, time or manner case
roles. A detailed discussion of algorithms developed
for computer-assisted case role assignment is pre-
sented in the following section. With respect to case
grammar, the algorithms for CALAS are based on the
following postulates (Meara, Note 4; Rush et al, Note
7):

(1) the verb phrase is the central word class.
(2) the verb has only one set of essential cases
    associated with it
(3) verbs with the same set of essential cases
    belong to a single verb type.
(4) essential cases are assigned by the verb phrase
    to the noun phrases.
(5) peripheral cases are independent of the
particular verb phrase and the set of essential cases a particular verb requires.

Figure 5 shows a sample dialogue and its case role assignments based on the five postulates above.

```
A  VP
Dana/ succeeded in     A
   VP
   X
   L
   VP
   T
   M
without/ being picked up.

A

A

O

L

Did (you) take/ him to the record store?

L

No/ to the shoe repair shop.

Key:
VP = Verb Phrase
A = Agentive Case
O = Objective Case
L = Locative Case
T = Time Case
M = Manner Case
```

Figure 5. Case Assignment for a sample dialogue

*(from Rush, et al., 1974, p. 23)*
CALAS: Case Grammar Operationalized

In order to isolate, describe, and display language patterns within a case grammar framework efficiently, Rush, Pepinsky, Meara, Strong, Valley, and Young (Note 7) have developed a Computer-Assisted Language Analysis System (CALAS). Essential components of CALAS include (a) selected text written in the English language, (b) one or more persons who make the selection and present the text to a computer in a form that it can read (e.g., the text is keypunched onto cards), (c) the computer which reads the text and acts to transform it in accordance with (d) instructions (programs) and rules (algorithms) which one or more persons have made available to the computer, (e) results of the transformation, to be read and interpreted by one or more persons in accordance with their requirements of the system, and (f) human monitoring of the results with allowances for corrective feedback, as needed, to alter instructions, rules, and/or results (Pepinsky, 1976).

CALAS is a series of four language analysis programs which are conducted through two computer "languages", SPITBALL and PL/I, run on an IBM System/370 Model 168 computer. In its current form the CALAS program consists of three distinct operations:
(1) grammatical class assignment of single word units,
(2) grouping of word units and labeling them in characteristic phrase units, and (3) clause separation and case role assignment. Each of the two stages following the first relies upon the preceding phase for its input. Grammatical assignments made during the first phase are input for the second phase, and phrases, the output from the second stage, are the input for the third phase of CALAS.

Figure 6 summarizes the first phase of CALAS, EYEBALL-FS. This is a set of procedures for assigning labels or classes for every word in the text. The dictionary that is part of EYEBALL-FS contains approximately 600 words. That dictionary is comprised primarily of "function words" (e.g., determiners, prepositions, conjunctions, auxiliary verbs, and relative pronouns). In addition, the dictionary contains punctuation words and a few frequently used verbs. With the dictionary and rules of syntax, the computer can proceed to make grammatical assignments word-by-word for a user's texts. Initially each word in the text is checked against the dictionary. If found, the word is labelled the correct grammatical class. When this initial pass is completed, a second is implemented in which rules pertinent to an
encountered function word are applied, such that the words immediately preceding and following it are assigned a grammatical class. Following this second pass, all unidentified words are assigned during a third and final pass. The computer is also programmed to label instances where two or more contradictory rules of grammatical assignment may apply.

**EYEBALL**

**A. Assigns parts of speech to the text.**

- **J** - adjective
- **A** - adverb
- **X** - auxiliary
- **C** - coordinating conjunction
- **D** - determiner
- **T** - 'to' part of infinitive
- **F** - verb part of infinitive
- **I** - intensifier
- **N** - noun
- **L** - participle
- **P** - preposition
- **U** - pronoun
- **S** - subordinating conjunction
- **V** - verb
- **E** - expletive

**B. Tags parts of speech for each word in the text based upon 3 criteria:**

1. Dictionary (see Appendix) classification (e.g., of function words)
2. Suffixes (e.g., -LY words)
3. Position of a word in the string of words

**Figure 6. Summary of EYEBALL Operations**

It is at this point that a human judgment must be made as to the correct rule and grammatical assignment that
should be made. With human assistance, the EYE-
BALL-FS output may be corrected quickly and easily
to what is judged to be 100% accuracy.

The second phase of CALAS, named PHRASER,
groups words of a sentence into phrases. Five basic
types of phrases are assigned by this phase of the
program: (1) adjectival phrases, (2) noun phrases,
(3) verb phrases, (4) adverbial phrases, and (5)
prepositional phrases. An algorithm was developed
to partition what appear to be sentences into the
above mentioned types of phrases. The input for
this phase of the program is the output from
EYE-BALL-FS. This phase of CALAS, like that of EYE-
BALL-FS, requires three passes. The first pass
groups identical grammatical class assignments con-
ected by the conjunction and. These are then treat-
ed as one part of speech during the remaining opera-
tion. The second pass involves the main grouping
routine and yields one of the five phrase types
described above. The final pass is completed when
identical phrase assignments joined by and are paired.
When case role assignments are made, they are then
treated as a single phrase. A summary of the PHRASER
phase is illustrated in Figure 7.

CLAUSE and CASE, the third and final program of
CALAS, involving both clause separation and case role assignment, follows immediately after the phrase grouping program is completed. Cook (1975) describes four clause types: (1) independent, (2) subordinate, (3) relative, and (4) partial. During the first pass of the clause separation phase of CALAS, the sentence is scanned for coordinating conjunctions. The program also scans for double connectors like both, and and. These are cues for the identification of independent clauses. Clause types 2, 3, and 4 are all dependent clauses. The algorithm for separating subordinate clauses identifies a subordinating conjunction and separates what follows from the word string immediately before it. A subordinate clause will contain an independent clause introduced by a subordinate conjunction.

The fragmentation rules for separating relative clauses are similar to those used with subordinate clauses. The relative clause may fall at the beginning or end of a sentence. If at the end, the relative pronoun is used as the fragmentation point. If found at the beginning of the sentence, the internal clause structure must be scanned for fragmentation cues. Following the initial three parsing processes, in this phase, the fourth type of clause is separated out.
Partial clauses, finite verb forms, and participles are all identified as predicates. Separation of the last type of partial clause requires identification of the participle in a string of words. The string is cut directly before the participle. Where a possessive noun occurs just before the participle, the string is cut just before the possessive. Where an infinitive form of the verb falls in the final position, the string of words is cut just before the to.

Figure 7.

PHRASER output

1. The PHRASER output presents the following items: a) the original text; b) the labels assigned to each phrase; c) a sentence number; and d) a word number. The labels assigned each word during EYEBALL-FS are listed by sentence in a separate printout. This is done so that the user may know why a given phrase was assigned the label shown beneath the text.

ex. # 1 - correct example

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
THE MAN/HIT/THÊ BALL/OVER THE MOUND.
N V N P

ex. # 2 - Incorrect example

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8
THE MAN/HIT THE BALL/OVER THE/BOUND.
N V A

The fourth and final phase of CALAS involves case role assignment. In order to reach this level of analysis the fourth phase of CALAS, using only the output
from the third phase, performs three operations: (1) identification of and assignment of verb types, (2) implementation of rules relevant to specific verb types, and (3) case role assignment of phrases surrounding the verb.

The case role assignment process begins with verb classification. As mentioned earlier, eleven types of verb phrases have been developed and are illustrated in Appendix D.

After the verb phrases have been classified, the phrases surrounding the verb are assigned case roles. The four essential case phrase types are: (1) object, (2) agent, (3) beneficiary, and (4) experiencer. The third pass of this phase of the program assigns peripheral cases namely those of: (1) location, (2) time, (3) manner, (4) comitition, (5) causation, and (6) purpose.