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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Background of the Problem

The stresses of our contemporary competitive society may serve to induce feelings of anxiety, helplessness, impotence, and alienation in man. One is not surprised to find psychiatrists and psychologists investigating "the self"--the individual human being--with increasing frequency. The importance of these studies has focused on maximizing human potential, utilizing capabilities to the fullest, and the attaining of psychological health.

Educators also have been concerned with these issues. Rohaly (1971) states that although mental health as an educational goal has become a cliche of the times, the concept of mental health as viewed by some educators has lagged behind that of a number of social sciences. She also asserts that any attempt to refer to an individual as "adjusted" or a representative of the norm is a limited approach. Thus one must look to a psychological model for discussion. One school of thought in education has emphasized the basic doctrine of humanistic psychology. The tenants of humanistic psychology focus upon the development of man in terms of his ultimate potentials rather than his typical potentials. Notables in the field, such as Horney (1950) and Fromm (1947) have concentrated on the concept of self-realization, while Buhler (1968) suggested self-fulfillment and Goldstein (1940), Maslow
(1954), and Shostrom (1964) developed the principles of self-actualization. In summary, these various humanistic movements make attempts to explain man in a holistic process of continually reviewing and revising his attitudes about who he is and where he is going.

Relating to self-actualization, Rogers (1961) and Maslow (1968) see the self as an integrated unity which is the sum total of the functioning of the parts. This point of view is also cited by Shostrom (1964) when he defines self-actualization as a degree of emotional stability which represents the self's basic tendency to utilize his unique capabilities or potentialities free of major inhibitions and emotional turmoil. Shostrom, in an attempt to establish a measure related to his definition, cites Ellis (1962) who states that "much of what we call emotion is nothing more or less than a certain kind of a biased, prejudiced, or strongly evaluative kind of thought". Shostrom developed this concept and concluded that a value is an affectively-loaded idea about life. Using this definition, Shostrom (1964) constructed a personality test, the Personal Orientation Inventory. This test consists of comparative value judgments which were empirically selected from observed value judgments of clinically healthy and clinically troubled patients and from the research and theoretical formulations of writers in Humanistic, Existential, or Gestalt Therapy (Perls, et al., 1951; Maslow, 1954, 1962; Horney, 1950; Rogers, 1961; and Ellis, 1962).

Although the interests, attitudes, feelings, values, and goals of the affective domain and the cognitive perceptions of the cognitive domain comprise an important base for this study, the importance of the psycho-motor domain is also necessary to complete the holistic view of
the self. When considering those total functions which positively and negatively effect the perception of the self by the self, the importance of verbal development in the process of healthy self-actualization becomes clearly important.

Verbal interaction has received much attention in educational research, especially the role of teacher verbal behavior and teacher-pupil communications (Aspy, 1969; Flanders, 1965; and Whiteley, 1967). As Carr (1971) states, the effective verbal communications identified by these and other studies enable the educator to explicit or implicitly conduct interpersonal communication through specific dimensions within the classroom. Mosher (1968) and Carkhuff (1969) support Carr's contention with studies which emphasize the importance related especially to counseling.

An analysis of counseling verbal responses related to the motor domain on an interpersonal level provides additional specific research. Rogers (1961) has identified the following conditions common to some degree in all counseling theory: genuineness, empathic understanding, and unconditional positive regard. Allen and Whiteley (1958) have found the process of cognitive flexibility to be necessary in effective educational communication between teacher and student or counselor and client. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) have further expanded on Roger's dimensions through research to include concreteness or specificity of expression. Also, Griffin (1966, 1966) in conjunction with Kagan (1967), has developed a scale which purports to measure Truax and Carkhuff's variables.

Using criteria established for measuring verbal interaction, Hopke (1964) and Gazda et al. (1967) found teachers who were preparing
to be counselors to be defective especially in the verbal communication of the affective areas. These teachers still displayed the cognitive orientation of their teacher training. Flanders (1969), in viewing the mental health aspect of teacher-pupil contacts, also found this cognitive emphasis. He discovered that of those teachers studied only a small portion of their time was spent responding to their pupils' feelings. Flanders (1963) illustrated that teachers used "direct talk" in a high percentage of classroom interaction. Since "direct talk" was an important variable in Interaction Analysis, this further emphasized teachers' preoccupation with the cognitive.

Carr (1971) states that in order for teachers to respond in a more supportive or facilitative manner, they must learn to communicate verbal behaviors which deal with the affective as well as the cognitive. Henderson's (1972) review of the literature on the affective domain supports Carr's contentions. He expressly states writings and research which emphasize the necessity for developing verbal skills in the affective domain. Henderson, however, has found from this review that studies in the training of teachers in the affective domain are notoriously weak. As one remedy he recommends guidance and counseling curriculum as having potential for the training of teachers in recognizing and responding to the affective domain. In summary he concludes:

... methods must be found to enable teachers to recognize their feelings, to express their feelings, to help others express their feelings to be more open and to become personally involved. ... Since the present educational system has conditioned to deny feelings, more attention must be given to helping teachers express, enjoy, and manage their feelings.

Copedgge (1970) states that during the last few decades the educational
sphere has been overwhelmingly rational and cognitive. It has either ignored or sacrificed the intuitive or affective. He states that such a trend advocates dispassion, disinterest, and detachment for a generation which is calling for commitment.

Since the above statements and research allude to the importance of educating teachers to communicate verbally in the affective domain, an important consideration of this study is how this can be accomplished most effectively and expediently by teachers who have completed their formal training. As Carr (1971) states, the following three effective methods have been developed:

1. Human relations training (Berenson, Carkhuff, and Myers, 1966; Hefele, 1971; and Berenson, 1970).

2. Interaction Analysis (Flanders, 1963, 1965; and Bondi, 1971).


A fourth method which is actually a combination of interaction analysis and micro-teaching has also been recently developed (Borg et al., 1969; and Amidon, 1969).

A discussion of the research on these instructional approaches indicates that both verbal and nonverbal dimensions can be taught in a short period of time with the assistance of a systematic approach and supervisinal feedback. Most frequently, this is accomplished in pre-service or in-service educational programs.

Boyd (1971) developed a micro-counseling model which provided verbal education in the affective domain and the facilitative conditions listed by Truax and Carkhuff (1967) and categorized by Griffin (1966,
1968). His research on the model was conducted with teachers entering the counseling profession. Carr (1971) expanded on this research model by conducting an experiment to determine the training effectiveness of micro-counseling and instructional supervision on teachers in an urban teaching program. Both Boyd and Carr recognized the necessity to expand the scope of their research to more subjects, a larger random sample, and to educators from varying backgrounds and teaching settings.

In this micro-counseling training model, Boyd incorporated the following three training components:


2. A "Simulation Instructional - Modeling Video Tape" (SIM) based on the work of Ivey's (1968) micro-model for teaching attending behavior.

3. A choice of either Instructional Supervision or Recall Interrogation.

The result of Boyd's work was that this Micro-counseling Training Model especially utilizing instructional supervision did provide a significantly higher verbal response pattern for the experimental group than that realized by the control group in the four rated verbal response dimensions: affective - cognitive, understanding - non-understanding, exploratory - non-exploratory, specific - non-specific.
Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study was to determine the effect of the degree of self-actualization of the teachers in the sample on their verbal response gains for pre-post treatment interviews.

A second purpose was to determine the effect which knowledge of the Counselor Verbal Response Dimensions presented in either micro-counseling or didactic form had on this verbal response gains for pre-post treatment interviews.

The independent and dependent variables were:

1. Independent variables (manipulated):

2. Independent variable (blocking): Self-actualization specifically designated as the self-actualized group and the non-self-actualized group.

3. Dependent variable: Mean gains scores exhibited on the Counselor Verbal Response Scale on pre and post treatment interviews.

Hypotheses

This investigation was concerned with: (1) determining the effectiveness of teaching counselor verbal responses to teachers by either
a micro-counseling or a didactic approach, and (2) comparing the effectiveness of these training techniques to the degrees of self-actualization of the sample. The hypotheses were as follows:

Hypotheses for main effects:

1. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of Counselor Verbal Response Scale for treatment groups defined as micro-counseling and didactic will not differ significantly.

2. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale for treatment groups defined in terms of self-actualization and non-self-actualization will not differ significantly.

3. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale for groups of subjects defined jointly as micro-counseling or didactic or the presence or absence of self-actualization will not differ significantly from the simple addition of the main effects.

Hypothesis for all treatment groups with a control group:

1. The mean Counselor Verbal Response Scale gain scores on each dimension for each treatment group will not differ significantly from the mean Counselor Verbal Response Scale gain score on the same dimension for the control group.

Need for the Study

The literature reflects an increasing attention to the concept of positive mental health with an emphasis on the self-functioning, self-actualized individual. In keeping with this current psychological
trend, educators have expanded their educational objectives to include ultimate human development and relevancy to the individual. Many teacher-educators have also recognized the significance of positive psychological health—a concept of striving for maximal self-functioning. Since teacher education, and more specifically counseling education, has often claimed to contribute to the psychological growth and development of the individual, studies designed to explore relevant relationships become critical for the development and perpetuation of the profession. Directly related to this end, Foulds (1969, A,B,C) has explored the relationship between mental health and facilitative genuineness. This study relates mental health as measured by Shostrom's (1964) Personality Orientation Inventory and one of the four facilitative conditions described and analyzed by Truax and Carkhuff (1967). His findings emphasize the importance of the study of such relationships by stressing the potential use of such consideration in counselor selection and performance. To illustrate this he states:

... the counselor enters the relationship as self-confronting and relating with another self. The ability of the counselor to confront the alienated client who is estranged from his being, from his own inner experience, and to invite or challenge him to a more authentic mode of being may be enhanced by the counselors own degree of personal integration or "healthy personality".

In the field of teacher education, a renewed interest in the affective or humanistic dimensions of teaching behavior has developed. Combs (1962) hypothesizes that each teacher must discover effective ways to utilize his particular talents to maximum advantage—the becoming process of teaching rather than the mechanic structured approach. Truax and Carkhuff (1967) have found that the process of interpersonal communi-
cations can be enhanced by basic facilitative conditions. With these and other insights into the significance of the affective domain, the need for quantification becomes imperative. As illustrated by the work of Flanders (1965), Whiteley (1967), Amidon (1969), and Boyd (1971), there is an abundance of theoretical and philosophical support but only minor scientific evidence to support beliefs of the benefits of verbal training related to teacher mental health. With the impetus provided by the work of Boyd (1971) and Carr (1971) coupled with the need to expand on the work of Foulds (1969, A, B, C) and the interest of the investigator in Shostrom's theories as related to the work of Maslow and speculations relative to psychological health as they apply to education in general and teacher education in particular, this investigator has deemed that it is feasible to attempt to clarify and expand professional knowledge about verbal training as related to psychological health. Thus, this investigator reasons that a parametric study can explore the relationships between psychological constructs and verbal training in practicing teachers. Such an investigation has the potential to lead to further exploration on the nature of such relationships as they pertain to the holistic development of fellow educators.

Definition of Terms

The following terminology and concepts were defined in this study. These definitions are more fully discussed in the review of the literature in Chapter II and the method section of Chapter III.
Freshman Early Experience Program (F.E.E.P.)

The Freshman Early Experience Program was developed at a large university in a midwestern city with a population of approximately 600,000. This program was designed to develop the personal-professional capabilities of both freshman education students, graduate education students, and participating teachers from co-operating public and parochial schools. The students spent half days with a co-operating teacher in an arranged school setting. The co-operating teachers were also formal participants in the program. The requirements for all teachers were having a student as a teacher aid in his classroom and planning activities with that student. Other program activities for these co-operating teachers were planned in a seminar format by local school district co-ordinators who worked closely with the university. This study was conducted through these seminars.

Micro-counseling Model (short term presentation)

This model is a constructed teaching-learning situation in which behaviors to be modeled are refined and presented while practice and feedback are utilized to reinforce desired behaviors. The model used in this study contained three basic components. (See Figure 2.)

Counselor Verbal Response Manual (CVRM)

The Counselor Verbal Response Manual (CVRM) is a symbolic model which is one section of the micro-counseling model. It is a self-instructional manual designed to teach four critical dimensions of counselor verbal responses.
Simulation-Instructional-Modeling Video Tape (SIM Tape)

The Simulation-Instructional-Modeling Video Tape is a perceptual model which is the second part of the micro-counseling model. It contains two taped video sections. The first section consists of four role-playing segments and the second consists of a demonstration of counseling techniques by three expert counselors.

Instructional Supervision

Instructional supervision is a process of conditioning and shaping desired verbal behaviors by a supervisor with expertise in the verbal response dimensions. The supervisor critiques/rates the counselor-trainees tape using the Counselor Verbal Response Scale. He verbally rewards the trainee for good responses and either withholds reward or offers negative reinforcement when the response is poor. In the case of inappropriate responses, the supervisor helps the trainee think of responses which follow the verbal dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale.

Self-Actualization

Self-actualization is defined by Shostrom (1964) as the tendency of an individual to develop and utilize his unique capabilities, or potentialities, free of inhibition and emotional turmoil.

Self-Actualized Participants

Self-actualized participants are those professional teachers who attained a total minimum raw score of ninety-two on the Inner Directed Scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory.
Non-Self-Actualized Participants

Non-self-actualized participants are those teachers having a total raw score of less than ninety-two on the Inner Directed Scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

Delimitations

This study was delimited to volunteer teachers who had been selected by school district co-ordinators to participate in a freshman early experience program. These volunteers were sensitive to the professional growth of both their student aids and themselves. This was indicated by their participation in the training sessions related to this study. Although the volunteers were teaching in varying sociological settings (i.e., rural, suburban, urban) and in varying instructional levels (i.e., grades 1 through 12), the generalization of findings beyond the teachers in this program should be made with caution.

A second delimitation was the scoring of the Personal Orientation Inventory in determining the blocking variable. Concern developed because many different scoring techniques exist related to the inventory scale or scales being used. This concern has been the topic of numerous studies related to the inventory. For the purpose of this study, the scoring technique used was a tabulation of the scores for the I Scale. This scale was found by Damm (1969) to be a highly reliable measure. The degree of the blocking variable, however, could fluctuate if other scoring procedures were used.

The third delimitation relates to the SIM component of Boyd's Micro-Training Model. This component had been video taped on a Sony
recorder which was not compatible with newer video tape recorders. Since the original recorder had been replaced by newer equipment at the university and since this investigator was unable to locate an older model which would be compatible, the presentation of the original video tape in the micro-model was impossible. Therefore, only an audio presentation was used in the model's presentation to the appropriate treatment groups. Recent research related to the effectiveness of playback techniques in supervisory roles supports the equal effectiveness of either technique. The results of this study, however, do reflect this basic change in the Boyd model.

Summary

This study was designed to explore the relationships between the training of teachers in verbal responses and the degree of self-actualization which they displayed. Research would lead one to conclude that verbal development is important to self-actualization. Since many studies are stressing the need for both verbal and non-verbal affective training, the application of a particular micro-model developed from research in counseling represents an alternative to a didactic programmed text method for communicating the affective domain and related facilitative conditions.

The remainder of the study is organized as follows: Chapter II presents a review of selected literature relevant to the dependent and independent variables of this study. Chapter III reports the method of the study while the analysis of the data appears in Chapter IV. Chapter V presents the summary, conclusions, implications, and recommendations.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter will present a review of the writings and research which relate to the two basic components important to the total development of an effective teacher. These components are mental health and verbal response training. More specifically for this study, an analysis will be made of self-actualization and verbal response training with emphasis given to micro-model techniques.

Mental Health Component - Self-Actualization

As Rohaly (1971) stated, the term mental health is often used but with little understanding or quantification. Mental health can be explored, however, through a review of the concept "self". Since theorists have faced confusion in delineating a single view, various meanings have been expounded, all of which emphasize the total functioning of interests, attitudes, feelings, values, goals, and cognitive perceptions to define who he is and where he is going. Rogers (1961) has stated that the "self" conceived as integrated and organized unity, is an essential precondition for self-actualization.

The opinion that teachers must know themselves first before they can be effective in education was supported by Carr (1971) who after reviewing the literature stated:

It is the person of the teacher or helper who ultimately makes the difference, and it is the person of the teacher who determines the
type and nature of his verbal communication to the students. Literature has always supported the idea of "know thyself". The effective life is the self-examined life.

To further emphasize this point, Jersild (1955) stated that the "teacher's understanding and acceptance of himself is the most important requirement in any effort to help students".

The importance of teacher training and its concern with the "self", was emphasized by Combs (1970) who stated,

We have long been concerned with improving the competence of teachers, defined as what they know and how they perform. The teacher as a person, however, has been given comparatively little attention and most teacher education programs, even when they may be concerned with these matters, are woefully inadequate to deal with them.

Although research on self-actualization has followed many different dimensions including personality and behavior correlates, this analysis will review studies which explore the dimension of self-actualization primarily through the development and use of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

Self-actualization - content and implications for teacher education

Foreman (1963) established value dimensions which were theorized to measure the optimally healthy. Eight of these are: environmental involvement, social orientation, admission of personal problems, spontaneity, openness, close interpersonal relations, autonomy, and anticipation of outcomes. In his study, Foreman used judges to rate the mentally healthy and normal students on these dimensions. The results distinguished the mentally healthy as significantly superior to the normal group on all except the social orientation dimension. These results, however, were not able to be generalized to a non-campus environment.
Shostrom (1964) expanded Foreman's work in an effort to delineate in detail those characteristics which distinguish between self-actualized and non-self-actualized individuals. In this effort, he accumulated from psychologists and psychiatrists terms which best delineated the difference between the two groups. Results of this poll produced difference between the two groups, using behavioral traits as descriptors. These descriptors were incorporated into questions for use in his inventory. The basic descriptors for the self-actualized were involved, active, flexible, optimistic, adventurous, and non-threatened while the converse was true of the non-self-actualized who were described as worried, rigid, compulsive, anxious, insecure, self-conscious, non-risk taking, and apprehensive.

Worthen (1967) studied the concept of mental health through an analysis of two value orientations, centeredness and direction. His hypothesis stated that positive psychological health is characterized by self-direction and other-centeredness and that poor psychological health is characterized by the reverse, self-centeredness and other directedness. To test his hypothesis, Worthen had three judges rate second person stories which had as their topics the two value orientations under consideration. The subjects chosen for this study were divided into three groups of varying degrees of psychological health. The results of the study gave credence to Worthen's hypothesis since the rating of each group's stories correlated with their judged degree of mental health.

Combs and Snygg (1959) noted that the best source of information about an individual and his motives may be the individual himself. As
Murry (1972) states, when the individual in question is functioning in the role of teacher, the next best source of information would seem to be the student.

Murry, in an attempt to explore her hypothesis, undertook a study using students' perceptions of teachers. The purpose was to investigate the teacher personality variable within an overall theoretical framework of Maslow's theory of self-actualization. This research, also, was based on the assumption that the teacher, as a person, is a significant variable in the classroom. In her study, Murry hypothesized that students of self-actualizing teachers would perceive their teachers as creating a more growth-promoting atmosphere than non-self-actualizing teachers. Murry used the total score of the Personal Orientation Inventory and Ray's Student Estimate of Teacher Concern which measured the desire to give help. Five teachers were selected from the extreme scores of those given the Personal Orientation Inventory for comparison of student perceptions. In the second phase of the experiment, the students of those teachers were administered the measurement of student perception. The findings of the study supported the hypothesis that students perceive self-actualizing teachers as more concerned than non-self-actualizing teachers.

As Murry notes, it cannot be denied that non-self-actualizing teachers may provide a potential growth/learning climate for some of their students, but their lower range and mean scores indicate that it will be for fewer students. Relevant to this study is Murry's comment that in addition to helping students in educational training develop particular teaching strategies, training programs are charged also with
the responsibility for assisting them in learning to use themselves effectively. Since many studies failed to produce findings concerning the relative importance of teacher personality, she states, that studies based on personality theory may be more useful in investigating the teacher personality variable in the classroom. In relating this to Maslow's theory of the self, she has suggested that the self-actualizing person is the most effective teacher.

A study by Dandes (1966) compared the variable psychological health as measured by the I scale of the Personal Orientation Inventory and teaching effectiveness as measured by three teacher attitude inventories and a dogmatism scale. For the 128 school teachers sampled, positive correlations were predicted and found between psychological health and teacher permissiveness and liberalism. Negative correlations were found for authoritarianism and dogmatism. As Dandes states, this study indicates that the greater the psychological health of teachers, the greater the potential seems for effective teaching. He recommends modifying the college curriculum to aid potential teachers in growing and developing psychologically.

The Personal Orientation Inventory - a measure of self-actualization

Although Maslow (1954) developed the theory of self-actualization which he stated was the basic component of mental health or a healthy personality, the measurement of the construct was left to future studies. Shostrom (1964, 1972) has attempted to quantify mental health in the context of self-actualization with an instrument he developed entitled the Personal Orientation Inventory. The initial validity
test on the Personal Orientation Inventory was conducted by Shostrom on clinically judged self-actualized and non-self-actualized groups. The Inventory significantly discriminated between the two groups on eleven of the twelve scales.

Graff et al. (1970), in a validity check, administered the Personal Orientation Inventory to 71 dormitory assistants and 2963 sampled students who lived with these assistants. These results were compared with dormitory effectiveness as identified by a six scale semantic differential and distributed to an average of between 35 to 50 sample students per resident assistant. An average rating of each of the 6 functions was obtained and canonical correlations were calculated between Personal Orientation Inventory variables and criterion measures of student ratings. The results of these variables of semantic differential between the predictor variables of the Personal Orientation Inventory and criterion correlations indicated that the sub-scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory scales, Inner Directed, Self-Actualizing Value, Spontaneity, and Acceptance of Agression were the primary predictor variables which involved vectors of .65, .41, .73, and .36 respectively. The conclusions of this study indicate that although it needs to be replicated, the results provided support for several of the Personal Orientation Inventory variables in predicting effectiveness of dormitory assistants when using student ratings as a criterion measure.

Braun and Faro (1969) analyzed the fakability or transparency of the Personal Orientation Inventory. The procedure for this experiment consisted of six groups of university students completing the Personal Orientation Inventory on two occasions in regular class meet-
ings. The first administration followed standard instructions. This was followed from several days to several weeks later by one of three faking instructions. Group I consisted of eleven guidance graduate students in a personality appraisal course. On the retake or fake situation they were instructed, "This time we do not necessarily want you to be honest or forthright. Rather, we want you to answer in such a way as to create a very good impression". This procedure was originally intended as merely a classroom demonstration of susceptibility of self-report inventories to faking. Since the results indicated that the subjects were unable to manipulate their scores readily, five additional groups were run for research purposes. These were: Group II - twenty undergraduate students in abnormal psychology, Group III - nineteen undergraduate introductory psychology students who received "good impression" faking instructions, Group IV - seventeen undergraduate students in psychology who had "good - adjustment" faking instructions which asked for answers that an exceptionally well-adjusted person would answer, Group V - thirteen undergraduate students in educational psychology, and Group VI - twenty-nine introductory psychology students who after receiving an explanation of self-actualization were told to answer as a fully self-actualized person.

The results showed that Groups I - IV (good impression or good adjustment instructions) had a less favorable (lower) faking score in forty-five of the forty-eight comparisons. Twenty-three of these forty-eight comparisons were significant at the .05 level or better. As Braun and Faro found the magnitude of score decrement under faking instruction varied among the twelve scales. Inner Directedness, Existentialism,
Feeling Reactivity, and Intimate Contact were significantly decreased for all four groups while varying degrees of decreases occurred among the other groups or scales. These scores were consistent with the results found by Shostrom (1972). Groups V and VI which had received a definition and discussion of self-actualization yielded even more favorable scores for faking. Of the twenty-four compared, eleven were at the .05 level of significance or better.

Conclusions of Braun and Faro's research regarding the Personal Orientation Inventory indicate that subjects can improve their Personal Orientation Inventory scores, if they have knowledge about the test and the concept it attempts to measure. Unless this special information about the inventory exists, the results show an unexpected resistance of the Personal Orientation Inventory to faking.

Knapp (1966) compared 136 college freshman and sophomore scores on the Personal Orientation Inventory and the Eysenck Personality Inventory which measures both neuroticism - stability and extroversion - introversion. The result of this comparison established that 7 of 12 scales on the Personal Orientation Inventory were significant in a positive direction, leading to his generalization that extroverted personality temperaments are generally more self-actualized than introverted. Shostrom and Knapp (1966) reported significant negative correlation between the Depression, Psychasthenia, and Social Introversion Scales of the M.M.P.I. and the scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory.

McClain (1970) correlated staff members self-actualization ratings and Personal Orientation Inventory scores for thirty counselors in an NDEA Guidance Institute. The correlations, which ranged from .23
through .69, were significant in eleven out of fourteen measures. These findings present evidence that the Personal Orientation Inventory can measure self-actualization among normal adults. The correlation of .69 was with the Inner Directed Scale which adds additional credence to its use as a measure of self-actualization.

Numerous research investigators have revealed a significant positive relationship between the ability of counselors to offer the therapeutic conditions of empathic understanding, positive regard, and facilitative genuineness within counseling relationships and the constructive personality and behavior changes in their clients (Truax and Carkhuff, 1967; Knapp, 1965; Carkhuff, Piaget, and Pierce, 1968; and, Jones and Schoch, 1968). Relatively few, however, have explored the relationships between personal attributes and the level of counselor interpersonal functioning on the same dimensions. Foulds (1968, A,B,C) in analyzing positive mental health and facilitative genuineness during counseling, undertook a study to determine if the scales of the Personal Orientation Inventory could effectively discriminate between two groups of counselors with respect to their ability to communicate the condition of facilitative genuineness within counseling relationships. He hypothesized that a positive association exists between the counselor's level of self-actualization and his ability to communicate the therapeutic trait in counseling. More specifically, he hypothesized that the Personal Orientation Inventory can effectively differentiate between beginning counselors with respect to their ability to provide a combination of empathic understanding, respect or positive regard, and facilitative genuineness for their clients.
Foulds' sample consisted of thirty graduate students in a supervised counseling practicum. The method was as follows: (1) each subject after completing the Personal Orientation Inventory was asked to submit one tape-recorded counseling session which he had conducted near the termination of the counseling practicum and which he regarded as one of his better counseling efforts at that stage of his personal and professional development; (2) these tapes were rated and then related to each student's score on the twelve scales on the Personal Orientation Inventory; and (3) computed inter-correlations of all variables disclosed that personality characteristics associated with self-actualization were significantly related to the ability to communicate empathy, understanding, and genuineness. The findings indicate that counselor education programs should focus more directly upon providing personal growth experiences for students of counseling which may improve their ability to communicate the therapeutic condition of facilitative genuineness to their clients. As Foulds indicates, these findings also suggest that the Personal Orientation Inventory may be an effective instrument for discriminating between persons with respect to level of interpersonal functioning or ability to provide the "therapeutic triad" during counseling. Foulds projected that the Personal Orientation Inventory could have significant predictive power for the selection and training of counselor candidates.

An important implication of Foulds' study is illustrated by this statement:

... the effects of specific training experiences on the measured attributes should also be investigated in future research, and the relationship between the positive gain or constructive
personality change of the client and the counselor's level of positive mental health and his ability to communicate facilitative genuineness during counseling should be determined.

This recommendation has been undertaken by this investigator in an attempt to explore these variables with teachers.

Verbal Response Research

The independent variable for this study is verbal response gains. In order to understand the importance of this variable, research will be cited first related to teacher verbal responses followed by a review of counseling verbal responses. Research will then be cited on micro-models used in teaching these verbal responses in both teaching and counseling.

Teacher verbal response research

Meux and Smith (1964) stated that "teaching behavior is primarily verbal". Mosher (1968) suggested that in most schools and for most teachers and students, verbal interaction is likely to be the predominant mode of instruction.

Flanders (1965) made an attempt to analyze teacher-pupil communication through dimensions which can be delineated by trained observers. This method, called Interaction Analysis, studies student-teacher verbal patterns by means of an observation system. It is based on previous analysis of classroom interaction made by Withall (1949). Flanders developed categories which research had indicated may be important in teachers' talk in the classroom. The two basic divisions of these verbal patterns are "direct" and "indirect talk". These teacher verbal dimensions are defined in Figure 1. The result of Flanders' early
study found that teachers spend a very small portion of their time responding to children's feelings. Less than five percent of teacher "talk time" was spent reacting to or using ideas or feelings that students initiated.

Bondi (1971) found that five classroom patterns which affect pupil learning can be distinguished when verbal patterns of classroom interaction are identified by systematic observation. These five patterns are: (1) excessive teacher talk patterns, (2) recitation, (3) teacher reaction to deviant behavior, (4) teacher acceptance, and (5) teacher flexibility or inflexibility.

McDonald and Zaal (1969) in an analysis of the verbal interaction between nine teachers and their students found that verbal behaviors fell into two broad categories - "open" and "closed". The open verbal behaviors of these nine teachers were labeled as accepting, facilitative, creative, and exploratory of their respective student responses. The closed verbal behaviors were illustrated by probing, judging, and reproving talk, and these closed behaviors tended to encourage guessing and the recall of memorized facts. A great similarity exists between the direct - indirect distinctions of Flanders and the "open" - "closed" behaviors in McDonald and Zaet's study. Closed behaviors can be found in Flanders' direct behaviors categories while the open behaviors compare favorably to the indirect behaviors. The similarities of these two categories lend additional credence to the dichotomous classifications of teacher verbal behaviors and their relationship to pupil responses.

Many studies in specific subject areas have been conducted to investigate the effects of identified teacher talk patterns on student
behavior. Basically, these results found that "indirect talk" by teachers can be associated with an increase in achievement, independent learning, or a change in attitudes. Some of these studies are: Flanders (1965), who found higher achievement by students in mathematics and social studies classes; Amidon and Flanders (1961), who found similar achievement patterns in geometry; Schanta (1963), who found similar recall by fourth graders; and LaShier (1965), who found positive changes of attitude of eighth grade science students.

Relevant to this study is a study by Langer and Allen (1970), who developed and analyzed the use of a mini-course as a tool for training teachers in Flanders' Interaction Analysis. The effective observation and analysis of ten teacher categories defined by Flanders (1967) and Amidon and Flanders (1967) was the goal of the mini-course. (See Figure 1.)

| Teacher Talk | Indirect Influence | 1. Accepts and clarifies feeling  
|              |                   | 2. Praises or encourages  
|              |                   | 3. Accepts or uses ideas of the student  
|              |                   | 4. Asks Questions  
|              | Direct Influence  | 5. Lectures  
|              |                   | 6. Gives directions  
|              |                   | 7. Criticizes or justifies authority  
| Student Talk |                   | 8. Student - talk response  
|              |                   | 9. Student - talk initiation  
|              |                   | 10. Silence or confusion  

Figure 1
Teacher and Student Talk Dimensions of Flanders' Interaction Analysis
The mini-course had four steps in its training procedure. These consisted of: (1) an objective section, (2) a handbook which described Flanders' teacher-student verbal classification categories, (3) a teacher behavior section which included practice in observing and scoring these observed behaviors at three second intervals, and (4) an exercise in charting these observations on a 10 x 10 matrix for analysis. The results of this micro-training technique found that a rating reliability of .85 could be achieved. When compared with a group of trainees who had received only verbal training, the trainees from the micro-training were found to be significantly more effective.

Counseling verbal response research

A basic question of this investigator relates to the ability of teachers to be trained to communicate counseling-like verbal responses. Research in the mid 1960's centered on this concern.

Hopke (1964) conducted research to determine the type of responses made by counselors who had recently been teachers. These counselors were entering a summer NDEA Institute for a practicum training. Through the use of the Porter Scale, Hopke found that fifty percent of all the responses on initial interviews were probing while twenty-two percent were interpretation with the understanding, supportive, and unclassified dimensions being much lower percentages. He concluded from these tape examinations that the trainees were exhibiting their previous teaching verbal behaviors by making significant probing responses.

Gazda, Clements, Duncan, and Martin (1967), in a study similar
to that of Hopke's, used the Porter Scale with twenty-five beginning counselor trainees in an NDEA Institute. These counselors verbal responses were rated in role-playing situations. The results of this study substantiated Hopke's study in that sixty percent of the responses were probing, twelve percent were unclassified while the evaluative, understanding, supportive, and interpretative scales were all less than ten percent each. Since the predominate verbal response was probing, Gazda concluded that consideration should be given to the elimination of the teaching requirement for counselor training. Gazda stated that such an occurrence could facilitate the shaping of counselor-like verbal responses.

Griffin (1966) utilized the "facilitative core conditions" as later outlined by Truax and Carkhuff (1967) to establish an audio-visual rating scale for use in Kagan's (1967) Interpersonal Process Recall Project at Michigan State University. The dimensions of the scale were based on the voluminous research data accumulated by Truax and Carkhuff which supported basic counselor education theory that a counselor must be specific, understanding, and exploratory to be effective. To these three basic dimensions, Griffin added an affective - cognitive dimension and a global effective - uneffective dimension to form his rating scale.

Griffin (1968) used his Audio-Visual Counselor Scale to compare the counseling performance of fifty inexperienced M.A. candidates in counselor education with thirteen experienced Ph. D. candidates. His findings indicated that affective, understanding, specific, and exploratory counselor verbal responses seemed to be associated more with ex-
experienced doctoral candidates in counseling than with M.A. students in beginning practicum courses. This, Griffin suggests, illustrates that counselor behaviors are associated with counselor training.

Geoffroy and Heimann (1969) concluded, that since Hopke's study the investigations of counselor verbal behavior in other situations and settings were relatively few. Their study was designed to explore three important variables: (1) methods of observing counselor performance, (2) the types of counselor performance being surveyed, and (3) the amount of counselor training involved. The subjects were teachers, beginning counselor trainees, and practicum counselors. An analysis was made of each group's taped interviews. These taped interviews were made in counseling situations using three verbal classification dimensions: (1) teacher-like, (2) diagnostic-probing, and (3) reflective-analytical.

The basic conclusions and implications drawn from the study indicated that practicum counselors do respond in different verbal patterns from either counselor trainees or teachers. An analysis of the number of words used by each group illustrated that the practicum counselors were significantly more loquacious than either the teacher or beginning counselor trainee groups. Some reasons projected for this wordiness were: more ego involvement in counseling and greater overall knowledge about counseling. Teachers were found to use significantly more words than did beginning counselor trainees. This finding rejected the hypothesis that increased academic experience is related to a significant increase in the number of words used. Most noteworthy of the findings was that practicum counselors used significantly more technical terms than other groups. Teachers, however, related to more teacher-
like verbal response while counselors related more to reflective-analytical responses.

In summary, these studies which have their roots in early counselor verbal behavior serve to illustrate: (1) practicing counselors use or should use a predominance of reflective-analytical, understanding, specific, explorative, supportive, and interpretive verbal responses, (2) neophyte counselors tend to be more probing, non-specific, non-understanding, and non-exploratory, and (3) teachers display more teaching type of responses which are probing and interpretive. The teachers' verbal responses which are non-counselor-like complicate the training process of counselor-like verbal skills.

Micro-Model Research

The use of micro-training models to teach communication skills in teacher and counselor education programs is the subject of much recent research. In general, these models serve as a teacher or counselor training method which involves short scaled-down teaching or counseling situations.

Boyd (1971) cited two basic models which have emerged from his review of the literature. These are the Standford Model, developed by David Allen and Associates, and the Mini-course Model, developed by the Far West Laboratory for Education Research and Development. The procedures in these models are similar since each includes the following: (1) the trainee is provided with literature to read which describes the skill or skills to be learned, (2) the trainee applies these skills in a teaching situation, (3) the interaction is video-taped, (4) the
trainee views the video tape with a trained supervisor who gives instructional feedback or evaluates the tape himself, and (5) a follow-up session is conducted by the trainee. The only major difference occurs at the step four level. The remaining review of the literature will focus on the use of micro-counseling techniques in teacher and counselor education.

Micro-models - teacher education

White (1968) used an audio-model to teach indirect verbal behaviors to student teachers. The procedure required that the experimental group read the lesson to be taught and review audio tapes of both the children's verbal behavior patterns and of the complete lesson. An analysis of the experimental and control groups using Flanders' Interaction Analysis found the trained group to be more indirect in their verbal behaviors than the control.

Hefele (1971) developed a systematic model to train student teachers in the communication of the facilitative conditions as developed by Carkhuff. He hypothesized first that the training would increase the student teachers' ability to relate to themselves and second, that their behaviors in the classroom would increase their pupils' achievement more than that displayed by a control group. The student teachers in the experimental group participated in a twenty hour training workshop in communicating genuineness, empathy, specificity, respect, confrontation, and immediacy. As a result, this study showed the experimental group had communicated with their classes at significantly higher levels of facilitative interpersonal functioning (p > .0037). Also, the experi-
mental group's students were found to score higher on the California Achievement Test in reading and general achievement.

Borenson (1971) conducted a similar study in which forty-eight elementary education majors were assigned to the following four treatment groups: (1) an experimental group receiving twenty-five hours of communication training in empathy, positive regard, and genuineness, (2) a control group receiving twenty-five hours of didactic training in human relations, (3) a Hawthorne group, and (4) a pure control. The data showed that student teachers receiving the experimental training can function at significantly high facilitative levels than the other groups. Also, members of the experimental training group were perceived by their supervisors to be more effective classroom teachers than the others. The last phase of the experiment dealt with the rating of the recordings using Flanders' Interaction Analysis as the criteria. The results showed that the experimental group used significantly greater "indirect talk" patterns.

Carr (1971), using Boyd's model, explored the effect of the micro-counseling model and instructional supervision in the training of teachers in counselor verbal response skills. (See Figure 2.) Carr's procedure was similar to Boyd's with twenty subjects being randomly assigned to four treatment groups. Experimental group one received both micro-counseling and instructional supervision; experimental group two received only instructional supervision; experimental group three received only the micro-counseling; and, experimental group four was the control which received neither. The most significant finding was that the verbal responses of teachers were altered through training. Carr
stated that this finding supports research in the effectiveness of systematic training of specific behaviors in interpersonal communication and in teacher-student interaction. More gains were noted by the teachers on the understanding - non-understanding and exploratory - non-exploratory dimensions of CVRS than on the affective - cognitive and specific - non-specific dimension. Also, the combination of instructional supervision and micro-counseling was more effective than the other three treatment groups.

In summary, these studies indicate that teacher training through the use of models is practical for training in the facilitative conditions. Although varied techniques have been used, this research indicates that teachers with such training are more effective. Also, in limited cases, their students have been found to achieve at higher rates.

Micro-models - counselor education

Ivey (1968) developed a micro-model to teach pre-practicum counselor trainees attending behaviors, eye contact, verbal reflection, and summarization of feeling. This model had the three basic components outlined by Boyd and included the use of an expert supervisor for review of accurate focal behaviors. Ivey reported that these focal behaviors were significantly increased over the control group through the use of the micro-model. In a related study, Haase and Dimatta (1970) used a modified micro-counseling model with three four hour segments to train sixteen female paraprofessionals in the skills of attending behaviors, expression of feeling, and reflection of feeling. They reported that
all trainees evidenced significant learning of all three behavioral skills.

Markey et al. (1970), in an attempt to measure effects of playback techniques as used in counselor supervision and the micro-models described, rated thirty-two student counselors who were randomly divided into four playback treatment groups: (1) audio-video, (2) audio, (3) video, and (4) no playback. All students interviewed two different trained clients in two twenty minute sessions separated by a playback treatment period. Trained judges rated the second interview using the Counselor Evaluation Inventory, Non-Verbal Behavior Scales and Audio-Visual Counseling Scale. Markey et al. used a two-way analysis of variance to compare scores on the criteria instruments. They found no judged differences among the playback treatment groups. This experiment suggests that any of the four approaches could be affective in micro-training techniques.

Boyd (1971) developed a micro-counseling model which could utilize two forms of supervision. The purpose was to train neophyte counselors in improved verbal response skills on four dimensions: affective-cognitive, specific - non-specific, understanding - non-understanding, and exploratory - non-exploratory. The procedure consisted of twenty subjects being randomly assigned to four treatment groups and a control. The four treatments were instructional supervision, interpersonal recall interrogation, a long term presentation, and a short term presentation. The Counselor Verbal Response Scale was used to measure gains in pre, post, and delayed post tapes of verbal responses. Only the affective - cognitive dimension was found to be effective. No difference in
the effect of supervision was found over the control. Boyd did conclude that his model was effective in teaching a verbal response set to neophyte counselors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNSELOR VERBAL RESPONSE MANUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Component 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Time: 45-60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIM AUDIO TAPE PRESENTATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Component 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing Time: 60-70 Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training Component 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision Session: 60 Minutes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2
Boyd's Micro-Counseling Training Model Consisting of Three Training Components

In summary, these studies indicate that a micro-training model has been effective in training teachers and counselors in various desired skills related to the helping profession. Although Johnson (1968) reported that a national survey indicated that micro-models were used in some form in forty-four percent of all teacher programs, only limited research has been conducted on their effect in teacher education. Although interaction analysis represents the most extensively used model
for teacher training in verbal behaviors, only a few studies have attempted to quantify the effects of micro-counseling training in Interaction Analysis. This indicates that more research should be conducted.

While the content of the micro-models in teacher education and counseling education appear to be similar, Carr (1971) notes "the teaching models attempt to teach primary dimensions through the use of secondary ones". She further adds, "by concentrating on the primary dimensions by not adding subject matter, the counseling models focus specifically on the underlying communication dimensions". These have important implications for this investigator's study.

Summary

This chapter presents a review of the literature related to self-actualization and verbal response patterns of teachers and counselors. In considering verbal responses, additional emphasis was given to micro-model training techniques.

Self-actualization has received much consideration in both theoretical and research writings. Early discussions and writings which related to self-actualization contained few research studies until this construct's most documented measurement, the Personal Orientation Inventory, was developed by Shostrom. Research using this instrument expanded the scope of the construct's parameters.

Early Personal Orientation Inventory studies centered on individuals who deviated from the norm and thus were receiving psychotherapy or institutionalized counseling. Recent studies have found that the Personal Orientation Inventory can identify the degree of self-actuali-
zation of those rated as normal. These findings are significant when using the instrument with individuals or groups who are not purported to be behavioral deviates such as the teachers of this study. Also, this finding is basic to the rationale of this study since the degree of self-actualization of teachers in the sample is compared with the training of the sample.

The second section presented the rationale for training in defined verbal responses core dimensions and a review of training techniques. The application of a micro-counseling model developed from counseling research provides an approach for training of those verbal responses which are theorized and purported to be important in teacher interaction. Although alternative training models, such as Flanders' Interaction Analysis, were discussed, the micro-counseling model was shown to have fewer rating scales and shorter training times, which could offer an advantage of expediency. Since this study will compare the effectiveness of the Counselor Verbal Response Manual with a total micro-model, implications regarding the significance of part of the model versus the whole will be possible.

The next chapter sets forth the method of this investigation of applying a micro-counseling model and a didactic presentation for training teachers in verbal response skills who have been defined in terms of self-actualization.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

This chapter describes the procedures employed to conduct the experimental study. The chapter is divided into six sections: the Setting, Population and Sample, Instrumentation, Research Design, Data Collection, and Analysis of the Data.

Setting

This study was conducted in a midwestern state in a county which has a population of approximately 600,000. The county contains a city of approximately 500,000 which is the capital of the state. Also located in the county is a state university with an enrollment of approximately 45,000. In addition to the urban area, the county also contains rural and suburban areas with a population of over 100,000 and a varying socio-economic composition. The study was conducted during the spring quarter of 1973 in conjunction with a freshman early experience program (see definition) in a university college of the state university and was co-ordinated by a college of education.

The facilities used for the study were provided by the co-operating school districts and the state university. These facilities included classrooms, desks, and tables for the treatment procedures. These facilities served as a training center for each participating school district. Each training session required two separate class-
rooms so that identified groups could be divided for treatment purposes. The personnel (Freshman Early Experience Program co-ordinators) assigned by the university to the Freshman Early Experience Program served as co-ordinators with the participating school for the training sessions.

The audio tape recorder used to record instructions and to interpret tapes for the instructional supervision sessions was the Craig model no. 2611 recorder. The Wollensak (3-M) model no. 4300 recorder was used for instructional supervision playback. Since those in the sample had to provide their own tapes for each of the three taped counseling interviews, the following one-half hour tapes were of adequate tone quality to be acceptable for random rating: 3-M Highlander; Cassette C-30; Scotch C-45, low noise/high density; Bell and Howell H.D./high density tape; Audio Magnetics Track, TM; Audio Magnetics Realistic, and the Allied C-60.

Population and Sample

The population consisted of professional teachers who voluntarily participated in the Freshman Early Experience Program at the university. Fifty-seven of these teacher volunteers comprised the sample. Fifty of the teachers were female; seven were male. The teachers were employed in forty-one elementary schools, seven junior high schools, and nine senior high schools which participated in the program. The schools were located in inner city, fringe areas, suburban, and rural settings. All teachers were experienced teachers with the range of experience being from one to twenty-three years. All had completed the Bachelor's
Degree and were taking graduate courses in some phase of education. Only one of these subjects was enrolled in a guidance and counseling curriculum. None of the participants had taken a graduate course in counseling theory nor had any taken a counseling practicum.

Eligibility of the subjects for participation in this investigation was based on the following conditions:

1. The professional teacher would have a teacher aid who was participating in the Freshman Early Experience Program.

2. The professional teacher would volunteer to participate in the micro-training program which included three sessions: an introductory session, a training session, and a follow-up session.

3. The teacher's freshman would not object to fulfilling his counseling requirement with his teacher.

These limitations were imposed since voluntary participation for personal and professional growth was a basic criteria of the entire program. This voluntary participation included school districts, professional teachers, and co-ordinators of the program.

In early February, 1973, the investigator met with the university co-ordinators working in each participating school districts and explained the format for the experiment. Utilizing the input from the co-ordinators, a procedure was developed using the various districts' communication systems to notify all staff of the possibility of participating in the micro-counseling training sessions. The option was also offered that any volunteering teacher (by participating) could receive up to two credits of independent study at the university.
Instrumentation

Personal Orientation Inventory

The Personal Orientation Inventory developed by Shostrom purports to assess a level of self-actualization and is based on the assumption that each subject's system of values is reflected by each person's ability to transcend dichotomies. This ability to transcend dichotomies represents the individual's psychological health. The Personal Orientation Inventory consists of one hundred and fifty two-choice comparative value and behavior judgments which were derived from research and theoretical formulation of writers in Humanistic, Existential, Gestalt Therapy, or Rational Therapy (Perls, 1951; Maslow, 1954, 1962; Horney, 1950; Rogers, 1961; and Ellis, 1962). The Personal Orientation Inventory yields measures for fourteen scales. The first two, time competence-incompetence and inner-other directedness, represent ratio scores. Shostrom (1964) suggests that these ratio scores not be used in correlations and other statistical analyses. Thus twelve scores remain. Each test item is scored twice, once for the two major scales—time competence (twenty-three items) and inner-directedness (one hundred and twenty-seven items), and then for the ten sub-scales. The following are descriptions and scoring categories for each sub-scale:

1. Major scales
   a. Time competence (Tc) — This scale measures the degree to which one is "present" oriented.
   b. Inner directedness (I) — This scale measures the degree to which one is oriented toward others or self.
2. Sub-scales

a. Self-actualizing value (SAV) – This scale measures affirmation of a primary value of self-actualizing people.

b. Existentiality (Ex) – This scale measures one's ability to be flexible in adherence to principles.

c. Feeling reactivity (Fr) – This scale measures sensitivity of responsiveness to one's own needs and feelings.

d. Spontaneity (S) – This scale measures freedom to react spontaneously or to be one's self.

e. Self regard (Sr) – This scale measures affirmation of self because of worth or strength.

f. Self acceptance (Sa) – This scale measures affirmation or acceptance of self in spite of weaknesses or deficiencies.

g. Nature of man (Nc) – This scale measures the degree of one's constructive view of the nature of man, masculinity, femininity.

h. Synergy (Sy) – This scale measures one's ability to be synergistic, to transcend dichotomies.

i. Acceptance of aggression (A) – This scale measures one's ability to accept natural aggressiveness as opposed to defensiveness, denial, and repression of aggression.

j. Capacity for intimate contact (C) – This scale measures one's ability to develop intimate relationships with other human beings, unencumbered by expectations and obligations.
As Shostrom states, a self-actualized person, when compared with an individual lacking in self-actualization, is conceptualized as one who utilizes his talents and capabilities more fully, uses his time effectively by living in the present, is able to resolve dichotomies, functions relatively autonomously, and tends to have a more benevolent outlook on life.

Validity

The Personal Orientation Inventory has been the subject of many studies related to validity. The trend of this research increasingly gives evidence of its validity. Shostrom's initial validation studies were established by administering the inventory to six hundred and fifty freshman at Los Angeles State College, fifty therapy patients, seventy-five sensitivity group members at U.C.L.A., and fifteen Orange County, California school psychologists. The results of these studies indicated that the test discriminates between the self-actualized, normal, and non-self-actualized groups on all scales with the exception of the nature of man.

Tosi and Hoffman (1971) in a factor analysis of the Personal Orientation Inventory found results which were partially supportive of the general construct "healthy personality" as purported to be measured. They specifically found three factors which were highly interpretable: extroversion, openmindedness, and existential non-conformity. A major recommendation of this study was a reduction of the number of scales. Graff et al. (1970), in an attempt to check the construct validity of the Personal Orientation Inventory found that the inner direction, self-
actualizing value, spontaneity, and acceptance of aggression were the primary scales which could predict effectiveness in the diverse roles of the dormitory assistants. From this study, one can conclude that the Personal Orientation Inventory may have practical value as a tool in the selection of personnel for helping professions.

The concurrent validity of the Personal Orientation Inventory has been studied using many varying populations. McClain (1970) offered evidence that the Personal Orientation Inventory can measure self-actualization among normal adults. Fox et al. (1968), in a similar study using psychiatric patients, found that his sample had significantly lower Personal Orientation Inventory scores than those found in a self-actualized, a normal, and a non-self-actualized group. Fisher (1963) found that psychotic felons scored significantly lower on nine of the twelve sub-scales than a self-actualized group of adults. Also, LeMay and Damm (1968) in a school setting found that the successful and more fully functioning students scored significantly higher on six of twelve Personal Orientation Inventory Scales than the less successful and less fully functioning underachievers. When comparing the Personal Orientation Inventory with other instruments purporting to measure similar traits, Shostrom and Knapp (1966) found that correlations of scores on the Personal Orientation Inventory and the M.M.P.I. were generally consistent and significant. They concluded that although the two instruments do not measure exactly the same aspect of mental health, certain meaningful scale relationships do exist. Grossack et al. (1966), who studied the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, found sixteen correlates of self-actualization.
Reliability

As Rohaly (1971) notes, reliability studies are not numerous. She states that a possible reason for this is that self-actualization is viewed as a developmental process which makes the establishment of reliability difficult since change in the direction of psychological health would be considered normal and desirable.

Shostrom (1964) established reliability through test-retest methods. Test-retest reliability coefficients have been obtained for Personal Orientation Inventory Scales based on a sample of forty-eight undergraduate college students. The inventory was administered twice, a week apart, to the sample with the explanation that it was part of the experiment to take the inventory twice. Reliability coefficients were reported of .71 and .77 respectively for the major scales of time competence and inner-direction and coefficients for the sub-scales ranging from .52 to .82. In general, the correlations obtained in this study are at a level commensurate with other personality inventories.

Ilardi and May (1968) in examining the stability of Personal Orientation Inventory scores among a sample of forty-six student nurses over a one year period, reported reliability coefficients ranging from .32 to .74 for ten of the twelve scales. The authors conclude, these are well within ranges of comparable test-retest studies with the M.M.P.I.

Klavetter and Mogar (1967), in another test-retest study, used one week intervals and received reliability coefficients ranging from .52 to .82 using all scales. The scales, time competence (Tc), inner-directedness (I), and self-actualizing value (SAV) accounted for the major variance.
Transparency

Transparency of the Personal Orientation Inventory has also received much basic consideration. Braun (1966), Braun and Asta (1969), and Fisher and Silverstein (1969) have found that those encountering psychotherapy and those who are felons can manipulate their Personal Orientation Inventory scores under certain conditions. Grater (1969), however, illustrates that subjects involved in college training can rarely alter their performance unless they have information about what the Personal Orientation Inventory measures, and unless they want to use the information to alter their scores. Grater concludes the Personal Orientation Inventory scores are an accurate representation of self-actualization, provided the student has not received this prior exposure.

Scoring

Damm (1968) in an attempt to determine the best overall measure of self-actualization analyzed the considerable range in the number of items per scale. The basic problem was that the range was between 9 and 127. The I scale includes 127 while the Tc scale includes the remaining 23 of the total 150 items. Damm also found a considerable amount of overlapping of interscale items. Each of the scales, excluding the Tc scale, overlaps with the I scale with the exception of from 0 to 3 items per scale. Therefore, Damm concluded that since the I scale overlaps most heavily with all other scales, it would appear that this scale should most likely represent an overall measure of the Personal Orientation Inventory. Since the structure of the inventory does not dictate which is the most effective in providing an overall measure of self-actualization,
a question of Damm's study was whether the inner directed (I) scale is
the most accurate and efficient measurement of self-actualization.
Knapp (1965) shed first light on this concern by maintaining that "for
present purposes, the I scale (inner directed) scores were used as the
best single estimate of self-actualization." Shostrom (1966) also
claimed that "when a quick estimate is desired of the examinee's level
of self-actualization, the time competence (Tc) and inner directed (I)
scales only may be scored."

In considering both of these claims, Damm felt the scale should
be validated against some external criteria. As he states, until such
validation procedure is undertaken, a test administrator must choose one
of the available alternatives for obtaining an overall measure of self-
actualization. Damm administered the inventory to 208 high school stu-
dents and then compared the scores through four possible scoring tech-
niques. These four techniques were: (1) standard score: average overall scale (S:AOS), (2) standard score: inner directed-time competent
scale (S:I-Tc), (3) raw score: inner directed-time competent scale
(R:I-Tc), and (4) raw score: inner directed scale (R:I). Interscale
correlation coefficients ranging from .87 to .98 were reported which are
considered high in terms of predictability from one scale to another.
These results showed little practical difference between any given over-
all scale and the remaining eleven Personal Orientation Inventory Scales.
Damm concluded that "an overall measure of the Personal Orientation In-
ventory can probably be best obtained by using the raw score of the I
scale, or by combining the raw scores of the I and Tc scales. No signi-
ficant increase in predictability is obtained by converting raw score
data to standard scores for combining scales."

Summary

The literature and studies reviewed related to the Personal Orientation Inventory point to the overall conclusion that it can be useful in assessing psychological health. As Shotstrom (1966) indicates, the inventory discriminates between self-actualized, normal, and non-self-actualized subjects displaying different life styles. The reliability of the instrument is not high; however, as cited by Ilardi and May, it does follow reliability characteristics of two widely used personality tests. Although the Personal Orientation Inventory can serve the purpose of measuring psychological health, it does have the following limitations: (1) no standard scoring procedures, (2) an overlap of sub-scales, and (3) the potential to be faked in extreme situations.

Counselor Verbal Response Scale

The effectiveness of the micro-counseling session for this study was determined by the comparison of verbal gains made on the Counselor Verbal Response Scale. Since this study is intended to compare the teaching of verbal responses to teachers, the focal responses are taken from the Counselor Verbal Response Manual. The Counselor Verbal Response Scale is used to assess the performance of the trained teachers during pre-training, post-training, and delayed post-training.

The Counselor Verbal Response Scale was first developed by Griffin (1966), utilizing ideas gathered from Rank and DeRoo (1965) and later utilized by Kagan et al. (1967) in research studies related to human interaction. As Carr's (1971) research indicates, the objectives
for the development of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale were as follows: (1) to measure behaviors that were specific enough to foster objectivity and minimize the potential for rater bias; (2) to measure dimensions that were also significant counselor behaviors; and (3) to measure dimensions which were amenable in counselor education or which differentiated between more and less trained and/or more and less competent counselors.

A review of the literature indicates, this Counselor Verbal Response Scale was used by Crzegorek (1970), Spivack (1970), and Dendy (1970). Boyd (1971), in his development of a micro-counseling model, stated that the Counselor Verbal Response Scale was one of the most relevant instruments with which to assess the verbal response sets of counselor trainees. He reported that the scale was capable of being used to determine if verbal response sets of teachers studying as neophyte counselors were indicative of cognitive flexibility or cognitive rigidity. Cognitive flexibility is explained and defined by Allen and Whiteley (1968) as:

... the capacity to think and act simultaneously and appropriately in a given situation. It refers to dimensions of openmindedness, adaptability, and a resistance to premature closure in perception and cognition. Rigidity assumes the opposite, an intolerance of ambiguity or an excessive need for structure.

The format of the scale is based on client/counselor verbal units. Such units are client statements followed by counselor responses. Kagan et al. (1967) provided the following description of the scale:

The Counselor Verbal Response Scale (CVRS) consists of five forced-choice dichotomous dimensions measuring the extent to which counselors are characterized by affective, understanding, specific, exploratory, and effective responses. The dimensions are defined as follows: An affective response is one which makes reference to
or encourages some affective or feeling aspect of the client's communication while a cognitive response refers primarily to the cognitive component of a client's statement; understanding refers to the counselor's ability to convey to the client his awareness of and sensitivity to the client's feelings and concerns by attempting to deal with the core of his concerns rather than making vague responses or referring to peripheral concerns; exploratory responses encourage the client to explore his feelings and provide him with an opportunity to do so while non-exploratory responses typically restrict the client's freedom to explore. The final dimension, effective - non-effective, is a global rating of the overall effectiveness of a counselor's response in promoting client movement.

Note that for this investigator's study, the effectiveness - non-effectiveness sub-scale was not used. The dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Manual in the Appendix.

To illustrate the Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimensions use in rating verbal responses, Boyd distinguishes between verbal response sets which are rated as flexible versus those rated as rigid. (See Figure 3.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive Flexibility</th>
<th>Cognitive Rigidity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses are both affective and cognitive.</td>
<td>Responses are predominantly cognitive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses are predominantly understanding of the client's underlying concerns, or show that the counselor is seeking to understand.</td>
<td>Responses are often non-understanding of the client's underlying concerns, and do not seek to understand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses zero in on the core concerns of the client.</td>
<td>Responses deal with peripheral data and miss the core of the client's concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responses allow and assist the client to explore his underlying concerns.</td>
<td>Responses inhibit the exploratory process, or entirely misunderstand the client's problem.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3
Verbal Response Sets
Boyd (1971) states that in theory, cognitive flexibility-rigidity is founded upon Rokeach's dogmatism (Rokeach, 1954, 1960). The basic difference between the two concepts is that dogmatism is an intrapersonal concept and flexibility is an interpersonal concept.

Validity

Griffin's (1966) original study compared doctoral candidates' responses with those of masters degree candidates. The results found the scale to differentiate at the .01 level with the doctoral candidates having been rated more affective, understanding, specific, exploratory, and effective. Of the ten counselors with masters or doctoral degrees, Griffin found the significant level of training to fall between those of the masters and doctoral level candidates. Kagan et al. (1967) in a follow-up, found that there was a significant difference on the final interviews made by doctoral and masters level candidates.

Reliability

Boyd (1971) cites that his inter-judge reliability for three judges as found through an analysis of variance was the following on each sub-scale: affective - cognitive .936; understanding - non-understanding .925; specific - non-specific .940; and, exploratory - non-exploratory .925. While Carr (1971) found the following for each sub-scale: affective - cognitive .67; understanding - non-understanding .73; specific - non-specific .31; and, exploratory - non-exploratory .85.
Research Design

The research design for the study was a two by two factorial design with a control group using the presence and absence of self-actualization as a blocking variable with micro-counseling and the Counselor Verbal Response Manual used singularly in a didactic approach as treatment levels. A graphic presentation of the design appears in Figure 4. This design has the advantage of (1) examining the interaction of the variables and (2) utilizing the same subjects to analyze both variables. In this particular design a fifth cell, the control, was characterized by subjects in the sample who were not exposed to the treatments or blocking variables.

The subjects, after the blocking levels of self-actualization were determined, were randomly assigned to the five cells using the table of random numbers in *Statistical Reasoning in Psychology and Education* by Edward W. Minium (1970).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E1</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualized</td>
<td>Self-Actualized</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-counseling</td>
<td>Didactic Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 13</td>
<td>n = 12</td>
<td>n = 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E3</th>
<th>E4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normal or Non-</td>
<td>Normal or Non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualized</td>
<td>Self-Actualized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Micro-counseling</td>
<td>Didactic Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 11</td>
<td>n = 11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4
Research Design and Subject Assignment
Those who took the Personal Orientation Inventory and scored 92 or more were randomly assigned to cells $E_1$ and $E_2$, while those scoring under 92 were assigned to cells $E_3$ and $E_4$. Those unable to participate in the training session were assigned to the control. Each subject attended an orientation to the training sessions at a designated building in his respective school district. At this orientation, each subject, besides taking the Personal Orientation Inventory, was instructed to record on a standard cassette recorder an initial pre-treatment interview with his/her teacher aid using a standard verbal set. This interview was to be followed by two post-treatment interviews, the mean gain scores of these two interviews served as the two post-test measures. The preferred hypotheses for this study were as follows:

Hypotheses for main effects:

1. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of Counselor Verbal Response Scale for treatment groups defined as micro-counseling and didactic will not differ significantly.

2. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale for treatment groups defined in terms of self-actualization and non-self-actualization will not differ significantly.

3. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale for groups of subjects defined jointly as micro-counseling or didactic or the presence or absence of self-actualization will not differ significantly from the mean gain scores expected from the simple addition of the main effects.
Hypothesis for all treatment groups with a control group:

1. The mean Counselor Verbal Response Scale gain scores on each dimension for each treatment group will not differ significantly from the mean Counselor Verbal Response Scale gain score on the same dimension for the control group.

The schedule for the experiment appears in Figure 5 and is described below under the headings of micro-counseling, didactic approach, Personal Orientation Inventory, clients, interviews, and experimental procedures.

**Micro-Counseling Model**

The micro-counseling model used in this investigation was developed by Boyd (1971) for use in research and practicum training at a large midwestern university. The model consists of the Counselor Verbal Response Manual, the Simulated-Instructional-Modeling video tape, and incorporates instructional supervision as an important instructional component. These three components are described in the following three sections.

**Counselor Verbal Response Manual**

The Counselor Verbal Response Manual is a self-instruction manual written by Boyd based on the work of Kagan et al. (1967) and Griffin (1966). This booklet was provided to all subjects of this study in manual form for the purpose of providing the rationale for the basic verbal responses: affective - cognitive, understanding - non-understanding, specific - non-specific, and exploratory - non-exploratory and for providing practice rating exercises. This manual was given to all
subjects after the completion of their pre-treatment interview and was totally reviewed, including rating exercises, by means of a standardized tape presentation which was the initial training for all treatment groups. This manual and the standardized tape presentation provided the basis for the didactic treatment given to the E2 and E4 treatment groups. Approximately sixty minutes were required for the reading and reviewing of the manual through the standardized technique and follow-up discussion.

Simulated-Instructional-Modeling Videotape

The SIM Tape is an audio-video tape which consists of two sections. The first section consists of four role-played excerpts with graduate students making verbal responses. This section illustrates both positive and negative aspects of the dimensions presented in the Counselor Verbal Response Manual.

The second section consists of three fifteen minute counseling excerpts by three expert counselors representing rational-emotive, analytic-existential, and phenomenological-eclectic counseling approaches. The experts counseled the same coached client who presented the identical problem in each interview.

Instructional Supervision

The Instructional Supervision used with the micro-counseling was conducted in small group sessions (not exceeding five subjects) in which the subjects were instructed by a professor of teacher education previously trained in the dimensions discussed in the Counselor Verbal Response Manual. Through the replay of pre-treatment tapes, the super-
visor attempted to encourage good verbal responses, withhold negative comments or criticism of poor responses, and assist the E₁ and E₃ subjects in finding alternative responses congruent with the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale.

Two behavioral techniques, conditioning and shaping, provided the training foundation for this model, while acceptance and attention to each subject as a person was equally important. A description of the Instructional Supervision approach and its evaluation occurs in Appendix

**Supervisor.** The supervisor for this experiment was a professor in teacher education who was utilizing his sabbatical leave from a small liberal arts college to view and participate in practical education programs in the state. This professor had received his doctoral degree in guidance and counseling education from the large university described in this investigation. Also, prior to his teaching at the small liberal arts college, he had been a supervisor with the state department of guidance and testing.

The supervisor studied the self-instruction Counselor Verbal Response Manual. Although he was very familiar with the dimensions, the supervisor reviewed all dimensions and the rating exercises with the investigator. The supervisor served in his supervisory capacity for the four supervision sessions and thereby kept this variable of study constant.

**Control of supervision treatment effect.** Each supervisory session was taped and rated by the two masters degree counselors who rated
the interview tapes. This rating was undertaken to assure that the instructional treatment did occur. These two raters completed this rating after all the interview tapes in this study had been rated. They were selected because of their knowledge of the dimensions and because they had previously experienced supervision and could relate to the dimensions prescribed for rating.

Each tape was rated on the dimensions of instructional supervision. The rating scale used in this investigation was developed by Carr (1971). The scale and its dimensions appear in the Appendix. The results from both raters were scored using a one to five scoring system for each item of the Likert-type scale. The results produced a mean rated score above 4.0 for each item, indicating the supervisor performed adequately each aspect of the prescribed treatment. All supervisory sessions were rated 5.0 on the item describing the supervision as instructional as opposed to counseling or affectively-oriented supervision.

The Didactic Approach

The didactic approach used in this study consisted of a standardized tape presentation of the Counselor Verbal Response Manual to treatment groups E₂ and E₄, followed by a discussion session.

Personal Orientation Inventory

The Personal Orientation Inventory was developed by Shostrom (1964) to measure the construct, self-actualization. This instrument consists of 150 two-choice comparative value judgments. These items reflect those value judgments of clinically healthy and clinically troubled patients, important research, and theoretical foundations.
In this investigation, the Personal Orientation Inventory was used to establish the variable, self-actualization. This was accomplished by administering the inventory to all volunteers at the orientation session. The inventories were then scored and those with scores falling in the self-actualized range on the I scale or above 92 were randomly assigned to the self-actualized treatment groups E₁ and E₂, while those below 92 were randomly assigned to the non-self-actualized groups E₃ and E₄. This variable was not used for assignment to the control group. The control subjects were either randomly assigned from both groups or were assigned by the investigator because of an inability by subjects to participate in the training sessions due to prior commitments.

Clients

The clients used in the investigation were teacher aids assigned to the participating subjects by the university co-ordinators for the Freshman Early Experience Program. All clients agreed to fulfill the counseling requirement of the program through counseling interviews with their participating teachers (subjects). Also, all clients had given permission to have each individual session tape-recorded.

Each client was asked to discuss problems related to the Freshman Early Experience Program or any additional concerns which he might have of a personal-social or educational-vocational nature. The clients did not know the nature of the study. Also, the clients were assured availability of expert counseling if they wished at any time. Each client met with his/her teacher (subject) for the three required taped
interviews.

Interviews

Responsibility for the initiation of each of the three interviews was given to the subjects in $E_1$, $E_2$, $E_3$, $E_4$, and the control group. This responsibility included the operation of the audio-tape equipment used in taping each interview and the finding of a quiet room for conducting each interview. The basic requirement was to provide an audible tape using one of the prescribed tapes. Each interview was required to last a minimum of twenty-five minutes and a maximum of forty-five minutes. The set to be given to the clients as an opening for each interview session was, "How do you feel about the Freshman Early Experience Program now that you have been involved for ___ weeks?" To the subjects after the treatment session was conducted the following set was given, "Be as helpful as you can to your teacher aid and try to remember the effective verbal dimensions studied." The audio-recording of the pre-treatment interview was used in the supervision session of the treatment for $E_1$ and $E_3$.

Experimental Procedures

Session 1 - This session was conducted in conjunction with the individual school districts' orientation program for the Freshman Early Experience Program. This session consisted of: (1) a presentation of the rationale for the training of Freshman Early Experience Program teachers in counseling skills and (2) the administration of the Personal Orientation Inventory to measure the variable of mental health. Prior to the administration of the Personal Orientation Inventory, each volun-
teer was presented the time schedule of the training program and asked to record an interview with his/her teacher aid in the one week period between the orientation and the training session.

Session 2 - For this session, groups E₁, E₂, E₃, and E₄ met in a classroom with the investigator and supervisor. All four groups received a re-explanation of the rationale for the training program in counselor verbal response skills. The Counselor Verbal Response Manual was then introduced and by means of a standardized tape subjects were asked to read the manual and complete the rating scale included in the manual. In each group, attempts were made to clarify the dimensions.

The group was divided based on the random assignments previously made. The didactic group remained with the investigator, and the micro-counseling group went to a separate classroom with the supervisor. In the didactic group, the investigator discussed the dimensions in primarily a learner-centered setting. In the micro-counseling group, the supervisor introduced the subjects to the Simulated-Instructional-Modeling Tape and conducted instructional supervision with each subject's tape made in the pre-treatment interview with the teacher aid. The procedural use of the Simulated-Instructional-Modeling Tape in this study closely paralleled that prescribed by Boyd (1971) and used by Carr (1971).

1. The supervisor introduced the experimental subjects to the tape by explaining that the Simulated-Instructional-Modeling Tape was an extension of the Counselor Verbal Response Manual and that it illustrates the Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimensions.

2. Each role-play excerpt was played through once.
3. As each excerpt was played the second time, the supervisor stopped the tape at occasional responses and asked the subjects to (a) rate the counselor's response, (b) to identify the core of the client's statement, and (c) formulate a response to the simulated client.

4. The supervisor assisted the subjects in rating, finding the core, and formulating responses.

The second part of the Simulated-Instructional-Modeling Tape presented the three experts. The time for this part was approximately twenty minutes.

1. The supervisor introduced the three experts, briefly identified their counseling orientation, and stated that the experts would illustrate effective counseling.

2. The subjects listened to a few minutes of each excerpt. The supervisor stopped the tape at occasional responses which clearly illustrated the effective counselor verbal response dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale and assisted the subjects in rating the responses and identifying the core of the client's problem.

At the conclusion of the Simulated-Instructional-Model, each subject in the micro-counseling group received approximately thirty minutes of individual supervision on the tape prepared in the pretreatment interview. The didactic group at the same time was engaged in a discussion about the pros and cons of the Freshman Early Experience Program and then were dismissed. Both groups, prior to leaving, were given instructions to complete a post-treatment interview within five
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SESSION</th>
<th>E₁</th>
<th>E₂</th>
<th>E₃</th>
<th>E₄</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 1</strong> 1 Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation and Administration of the POI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random to SA</td>
<td>Random to SA</td>
<td>Random to N-SA</td>
<td>Random to N-SA</td>
<td>Random From Both</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 2</strong> 1 3/4 Hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>One Pre-Treatment Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVRM and Discussion</td>
<td>CVRM and Discussion</td>
<td>CVRM and Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIM Tape and Discussion</td>
<td>SIM Tape and Discussion</td>
<td>SIM Tape and Discussion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional Supervision</td>
<td>Instructional Supervision</td>
<td>Instructional Supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 3</strong> 3 1/2 Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Post₁ Treatment Interview</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 4</strong> 45 Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 7</strong> 45 Minutes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Week 9</strong> 2 Hours</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training Follow-up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 5**

Graphic Representation of Experimental Procedures
school days after the training seminar and a follow-up tape three weeks after the first post-treatment tape. Specific completion dates were set. These two tapes would complete the taping requirement for the experiment.

Session 3 - The follow-up session was spent in reviewing the training procedure and the tapes to note gains or lack of gains on the Counselor Verbal Response Scale. Each subject was asked to state opinions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of the program. Also, those members of the didactic instructional group received instructional supervision, thus meeting the requirements set by the university.

Data Collection

Each interview was taped on the recording equipment previously described. Each tape was coded by the investigator so that each subject and tape number would be known only to the investigator.

Judges

Two masters degree school counselors, who had received their degrees in guidance and counseling at the same university at which the investigation was conducted, served as judges, along with a housewife who had no previous exposure to the counseling variables. The judges received six hours of supervised training which was conducted in two, three hour sessions within one week. The first training session focused on the reading, rating, and discussion provided in the Counselor Verbal Response Manual plus the rating of practice tapes. Each judge, also, received assistance from a training manual related to the most frequent judging problems. (See Appendix.) During the second session, the judges listened to the Simulated-Instructional-Modeling Tapes and rated
both sections. The judges then rated fifteen tapes randomly selected by the investigator from the tapes made by the sample in each of the three taped interview sessions.

The inter-judge reliability was determined by analysis of variance for intra-class correlations (Guilford, 1965). Average inter-correlations of the three sets of ratings for each of the dimensions were as follows: affective - cognitive, rcc = .938; understanding - non-understanding, rcc = .936; specific - non-specific, rcc = .937; and, exploratory - non-exploratory, rcc = .922. The data and formula appear in the Appendix. These reliability coefficients are comparable to those obtained for the original scale studies and meet the experimental criteria of .80 inter-correlation of ratings.

Rating procedures

Rating of all tapes was as follows: (1) twenty verbal responses from each tape were rated; (2) rating began after "preliminary responses" on the tape or after a problem had been presented; and, (3) ratings were recorded on the Counselor Verbal Response Scale format. (See Appendix.) As was the case in both the Boyd (1971) and Carr (1971) experiments, each counselor's response was rated separately on each dimension. A score of one was assigned for each response falling in the non-counselor-like verbal response of cognitive, non-understanding, non-specific, and non-exploratory; a score of two was assigned for each response falling in the counselor-like verbal response of affective, understanding, specific, and exploratory.

One hundred and fifty-six tapes (all tapes excluding those ran-
domly selected for inter-judge correlations) including pre, post₁, and post₂ tapes were randomly assigned to the three judges. The judges rated these tapes separately and independently on identical audio equipment. None of the judges knew any of the subjects or the clients.

Analysis of the Data

A two by two analysis of variance for fixed-effects models (Kennedy, 1974) was employed to test the hypotheses of this study. The procedure permitted simultaneous investigation of the two experimental variables, training presentation, and self-actualization. The entries for each cell consisted of the differences between mean scores on an initial pre-treatment interview and two post-treatment interview ratings. The formula for computing the analysis of variance for each dimension appears in Appendix G. The number of observations for each cell varied between ten and thirteen because of uneven distribution of the self-actualization variable, subject mortality, or unusable data. The total number of subjects was fifty-seven.

F tests were used to test for the main effects, interaction of the training presentations, and degrees of self-actualization. Following the application of the F tests, the significance of the differences between treatment group mean and the control group mean on each dimension and at each interval was computed by the use of Scheffe's test (Kennedy, 1974). This conservative test was selected to reduce the risk of committing an alpha error. The .05 level was adopted as the critical level for significance.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The findings of the investigator are presented in this chapter in the affective - cognitive, understanding - non-understanding, specific - non-specific, and exploratory - non-exploratory sections. Each section pertains to a dimension of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale (CVRS). The results of the statistical analysis are presented in table form with appropriate graphic representations.

The experimental hypotheses were tested by means of a two by two factorial analysis of variance for fixed-effects models (Kennedy, 1974). Individual comparison between each experimental group and the control group was made using Scheffe's test. Main effects consisted of two types of instruction in the counseling verbal response dimensions and mental health as measured by the degree of self-actualization. The two levels of instruction were Boyd's micro-counseling model and a didactic lecture-program text model using only the Counseling Verbal Response Manual. The two levels of mental health were a self-actualized group and a non-self-actualized group which were distinguished by measures on Shostrom's (1964) Personal Orientation Inventory. The mean gain scores were obtained from ratings of counseling performance along each of the four Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimensions.

The cell entries were the teacher verbal response mean gain scores on each dimension of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale. F
ratios were computed for each main effect and for interaction for each dimension at the pretest-posttest₁ and pretest-posttest₂ intervals. Further data interpretation was made significant at the .05 level by use of Scheffe's test for comparison of treatment group means with the control group means. The hypotheses investigated were as follows:

Hypotheses for main effects:

1. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of Counselor Verbal Response Scale for treatment groups defined as micro-counseling and didactic will not differ significantly.

2. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale for treatment groups defined in terms of self-actualization and non-self-actualization will not differ significantly.

3. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale for groups of subjects defined jointly as micro-counseling or didactic or the presence or absence of self-actualization will not differ significantly from the mean gain scores expected from the simple addition of the main effects.

Hypothesis for all treatment groups with a control group:

1. The mean Counselor Verbal Response Scale gain scores on each dimension for each treatment group will not differ significantly from the mean Counselor Verbal Response Scale gain score on the same dimension for the control group.
Affective - cognitive dimension

The findings for this dimension are presented in Tables 1 through 6 and Figure 6. These findings correspond to two gain score periods (i.e., post₁ or post₂). The mean raw scores and mean gain scores pertaining to the affective - cognitive dimension for the pretest-posttest₁ are presented in Table 1 and for pretest-posttest₂ are found in Table 2. Figure 6 plots the mean raw scores of the four treatment groups and control group across the three testing points (i.e., pretest₁ and posttest₂). This figure, thereby, illustrates the longitudinal performance of the five groups on the affective - cognitive dimension. The findings for the pretest-posttest₁ and pretest-posttest₂ will be presented separately.

**TABLE 1**

TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUP MEAN RAW SCORES AND MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE AFFECTIVE - COGNITIVE DIMENSION FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST₁

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest₁</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>22.385</td>
<td>27.308</td>
<td>4.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>20.917</td>
<td>23.677</td>
<td>2.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>21.182</td>
<td>24.364</td>
<td>3.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>21.182</td>
<td>23.182</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>20.400</td>
<td>20.900</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUP MEAN RAW SCORES AND MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE AFFECTIVE - COGNITIVE DIMENSION FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST₂

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest₂</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>22.385</td>
<td>27.923</td>
<td>5.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>20.917</td>
<td>22.667</td>
<td>1.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>21.182</td>
<td>25.273</td>
<td>4.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>21.182</td>
<td>23.182</td>
<td>2.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>20.400</td>
<td>20.700</td>
<td>0.300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings: Pretest-Posttest₁

The pre-post₁ findings for the affective - cognitive dimensions are presented in Tables 3 and 4. Table 3 contains the data from a two by two analysis of variance for fixed effects models which was performed on the pre-post₁ mean gain scores on the affective - cognitive dimension for the treatment groups.

Table 4 contains individual pre-post₁ comparisons of the mean gains on the affective - cognitive dimension for each treatment group and the control group which were performed by Scheffe's test. The results are as follows:

1. Micro-counseling was a significant main effect (F=7.348; p < .01) in the analysis of variance on the pre-post₁ mean gain scores on the affective - cognitive dimension. (See Table 3 and Figure 6.)
Micro-Counseling - Self-Actualization
Didactic - Self-Actualization
Micro-Counseling - Non-Self-Actualization
Didactic - Non-Self-Actualization
No Treatment Control
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2. Self-actualization approached significance ($F=3.77; p > .059$) on the pre-post$_1$ mean gain scores on the affective - cognitive dimension. However, this variable did not reach the .05 level which was adopted as the critical level of significance. (See Table 3 and Figure 6.)

3. There was no significant interaction effect from the analysis of variance on the pre-post$_1$ mean gains for the affective - cognitive dimension (See Table 4.)

4. Scheffe's test for comparison of treatment group means with the control group mean showed significant effects for all treatment groups ($p < .05$). This significance indicates that the treatment was significantly higher for pre-post$_1$ mean gains on the affective - cognitive dimension.

**TABLE 3**

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHER VERBAL RESPONSE MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE AFFECTIVE - COGNITIVE DIMENSION OF THE CVRS FOR PRETEST - POSTTEST$_1$**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37.382</td>
<td>3.777</td>
<td>&lt;.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72.727</td>
<td>7.348</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17.679</td>
<td>1.786</td>
<td>&lt;.188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not reported in statistical data.*
**TABLE 4**

**Scheffe's Test for Comparison of Each Treatment Group with the Control Group for Pretest-Posttest<sub>1</sub> Mean Gain Scores on the Affective-Cognitive Dimension of the CVRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Treatment $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Control $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>27.308</td>
<td>20.900</td>
<td>19.836*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>23.667</td>
<td>20.900</td>
<td>4.358*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>24.364</td>
<td>20.900</td>
<td>10.166*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>23.182</td>
<td>20.900</td>
<td>5.259*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p \leq 0.05$ (comparisonwise).

**Findings: Pretest-Posttest<sub>2</sub>**

Table 5 contains the two by two analysis of variance for fixed-effects models which was performed on the pretest-posttest<sub>2</sub> mean gains for the affective-cognitive dimension. Table 6 presents comparison by Scheffe's test of the treatment group means to the control mean in terms of pre-post<sub>2</sub> mean gains on the affective-cognitive dimension. The results are as follows:

1. Self-actualization and interaction did not yield significant F ratios in the analysis of variance performed on pre-post<sub>2</sub> mean gain scores on the affective-cognitive dimension. (See Table 5.)

2. A comparison of pre-post<sub>2</sub> mean gain scores on the affective-cognitive dimension yielded a statistically significant main effect difference ($F=11.795; p \leq 0.001$) for the training presentation.
3. The four treatment groups gained significantly (p < .05) more on the affective – cognitive dimension during the pre-post2 period than the control group. (Table 6 and Figure 6.)

TABLE 5

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHER VERBAL RESPONSE FOR PRETEST–POSTTEST2 MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE AFFECTIVE – COGNITIVE DIMENSION OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.09</td>
<td>1.136</td>
<td>&lt; .293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>167.163</td>
<td>11.795</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.29</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>&lt; .158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not reported in statistical data.

TABLE 6

SCHEFFE'S TEST FOR COMPARISON OF EACH TREATMENT GROUP WITH THE CONTROL GROUP FOR PRETEST–POSTTEST2 MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE AFFECTIVE – COGNITIVE DIMENSION OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Treatment $\overline{X}$</th>
<th>Control $\overline{X}$</th>
<th>$\overline{X}$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M–C/S–A</td>
<td>279.2307</td>
<td>207.000</td>
<td>24.474*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S–A</td>
<td>226.667</td>
<td>207.000</td>
<td>4.978*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M–C/Non S–A</td>
<td>252.727</td>
<td>207.000</td>
<td>8.733*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S–A</td>
<td>231.818</td>
<td>207.000</td>
<td>10.617*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$ (comparisonwise).
These results in pre-post1 and pre-post2 appear to indicate that the micro-counseling treatment contributed more to the pre-post gain intervals than didactic or the degree of self-actualization. (See Table 25.) All treatment groups gained more numerically than the control group on the affective - cognitive dimension. (See Table 26.) These numerical gains were found to be significant (p < .05) thereby indicating treatment effectiveness over no treatment.

**Understanding - non-understanding dimension**

The findings for this Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimension are presented in Tables 7 through 12 and Figure 7. The mean raw scores and mean gain scores pertaining to the understanding - non-understanding are presented in Tables 7 and 8.

**TABLE 7**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest1</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>23.154</td>
<td>29.231</td>
<td>6.077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>21.417</td>
<td>26.417</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.000</td>
<td>26.273</td>
<td>4.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.818</td>
<td>26.909</td>
<td>4.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21.100</td>
<td>22.100</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 8

TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUP RAW SCORES AND MEAN GAIN
SCORES PERTAINING TO THE UNDERSTANDING - NON-UNDERSTANDING DIMENSION FOR THE PRETEST-POSTTEST2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest1</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>23.154</td>
<td>30.692</td>
<td>7.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.000</td>
<td>26.273</td>
<td>4.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.818</td>
<td>24.909</td>
<td>2.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21.100</td>
<td>21.200</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings: pre-posttest1

The pre-post1 findings for the understanding - non-understanding dimension are presented in Tables 9 and 10. Table 9 contains the two by two analysis of variance for fixed-effects models that was applied to the pre-post1 mean gain data. Individual comparisons of the means of each treatment group to the control group mean in terms of pre-post1 mean gain scores which were performed by Scheffe's test are found in Table 10. The findings from Tables 9 and 10 are as follows:

1. The analysis of variance for pre-post1 data on the understanding - non-understanding dimension yielded no main effect for presentation or self-actualization. (See Table 9.)

2. There was no significant interaction from the analysis of variance on the pre-post1 mean gains on the understanding - non-understanding dimension. (See Table 9.)

3. All treatment groups achieved significantly higher mean gains during the pre-post1 than the control group on the
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Didactic - Non-Self-Actualization
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understanding - non-understanding dimension. (See Table 10.)

**TABLE 9**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHER VERBAL RESPONSE FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST<sub>1</sub> MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE UNDERSTANDING - NON-UNDERSTANDING DIMENSION OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.446</td>
<td>1.208</td>
<td>&lt;.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.838</td>
<td>1.046</td>
<td>&lt;.312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.804</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>&lt;.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not reported in statistical data

**TABLE 10**

SCHERFE'S TEST FOR COMPARISON OF EACH TREATMENT GROUP WITH THE CONTROL GROUP FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST<sub>1</sub> MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE UNDERSTANDING - NON-UNDERSTANDING DIMENSION OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Treatment $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Control $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>292.3076</td>
<td>221.000</td>
<td>14.894*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>264.167</td>
<td>221.000</td>
<td>4.254*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>262.727</td>
<td>221.000</td>
<td>6.254*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>269.091</td>
<td>221.000</td>
<td>7.781*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 (comparisonwise).
Findings: pretest-posttest₂

Tables 11 and 12 and Figure 7 present the pre-post₂ findings. Table 11 contains the two by two analysis of variance for fixed-effects models that was applied to the pre-post₂ mean gain data. Individual comparison of each treatment group to the control in terms of mean gain scores was performed with Scheffe's test; these results are presented in Table 12. The findings from Tables 11 and 12 are as follows:

1. The type of presentation was a significant main effect (F=7.154; p < .01) as evidenced by pre-post₂ data for the understanding - non-understanding dimension. (See Table 11.)

2. The analysis of variance for pre-post₂ data on the understanding - non-understanding dimension yielded no main effect for the degree of self-actualization and no significant interaction. (See Table 11.)

3. All treatment groups achieved significantly higher pre-post₂ mean gain scores on the dimension. (See Table 12.) The levels of significance attained by each treatment group were p < .05 for comparisons.
### TABLE 11

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHER VERBAL RESPONSE FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST<sub>2</sub> MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE UNDERSTANDING - NON-UNDERSTANDING DIMENSION OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>67,917</td>
<td>3.158</td>
<td>(&lt;0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>153,855</td>
<td>7.154</td>
<td>(&lt;0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52,687</td>
<td>2.450</td>
<td>(&lt;0.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not reported in statistical data.

### TABLE 12

SCHEFSE'S TEST FOR COMPARISON OF EACH TREATMENT GROUP WITH THE CONTROL GROUP FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST<sub>2</sub> MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE UNDERSTANDING - NON-UNDERSTANDING DIMENSION OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Treatment $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Control $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>306.922</td>
<td>212.000</td>
<td>33.382*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>250.833</td>
<td>212.000</td>
<td>5.702*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>262.727</td>
<td>212.000</td>
<td>8.961*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>249.091</td>
<td>212.000</td>
<td>14.802*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p \(<0.05$ (comparisonwise).
These results appear to indicate that the micro-counseling treatment contributes more to the post₂ gain interval than the didactic or the degree of self-actualization. (See Table 25.) All treatment groups gained more than the control group on the understanding—non-understanding dimension thus indicating that treatment is effective over no treatment dimension. All treatment groups gained more numerically than the control. (See Table 26.)

Specific—non-specific dimension

Tables 13 and 14 present the mean raw scores and gain scores pertaining to the specific—non-specific dimension. Figure 8 presents the mean raw scores of the four treatment groups and control group across the three experimental testing points (i.e., pretest, posttest₁, and posttest₂), thereby illustrating the longitudinal performance of the groups on this dimension.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest₁</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M= C/S-A</td>
<td>23.077</td>
<td>39.615</td>
<td>6.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>21.333</td>
<td>25.167</td>
<td>3.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M= C/Non S-A</td>
<td>21.455</td>
<td>25.909</td>
<td>4.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.818</td>
<td>27.636</td>
<td>4.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21.808</td>
<td>21.300</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 8

Longitudinal Performance of the Four Treatment Groups and the Control Group on the Specific - Non-Specific Dimension
TABLE 14
TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUP RAW SCORES AND MEAN GAIN SCORES PERTAINING TO THE SPECIFIC - NON-SPECIFIC DIMENSION FOR THE PRETEST-POSTTEST\(_2\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest(_2)</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>23.077</td>
<td>30.077</td>
<td>7.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>21.333</td>
<td>24.500</td>
<td>3.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>21.455</td>
<td>26.273</td>
<td>4.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.818</td>
<td>25.727</td>
<td>2.907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21.808</td>
<td>21.200</td>
<td>-0.608</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Findings: pretest-posttest\(_1\)

The findings for the pre-post\(_1\) period are presented in Tables 15 and 16. A two by two analysis of variance was performed on the pre-post\(_1\) mean gain scores for the treatment groups. These results are contained in Table 15. Scheffe's test comparisons of each treatment group mean to the control group mean in terms of pre-post\(_1\) mean gain scores are presented in Table 16. The findings from these two tables are as follows:

1. No significant mean gains for either the presentation or self-actualization from the analysis of variance on the pre-post\(_1\) mean gains on the specific - non-specific dimension were found. (See Table 15.)

2. There was a significant interaction (F=7.420; p < .009) from the analysis of variance on the pre-post\(_1\) mean gains on the specific - non-specific dimension. (See Table 15.)
3. All four of the treatment groups showed significantly higher mean gains for both pre-post<sub>1</sub> and pre-post<sub>2</sub> periods than did the control group. (See Table 16 and Figure 8.)

**TABLE 15**

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHER VERBAL RESPONSE FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST<sub>1</sub> MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE SPECIFIC - NON-SPECIFIC DIMENSION OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.854</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>&lt;.536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.401</td>
<td>1.890</td>
<td>&lt;.176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>111.505</td>
<td>7.420</td>
<td>&lt;.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not reported in statistical data.

**TABLE 16**

SCHEFEE'S TEST FOR COMPARISON OF EACH TREATMENT GROUP WITH THE CONTROL GROUP FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST<sub>1</sub> MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE SPECIFIC - NON-SPECIFIC DIMENSION OF CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Treatment X</th>
<th>Control X</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>296.1538</td>
<td>213.000</td>
<td>22.723*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>251.667</td>
<td>213.000</td>
<td>5.405*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>259.091</td>
<td>213.000</td>
<td>9.565*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>276.364</td>
<td>213.000</td>
<td>20.529*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 (comparisonwise).
Findings: pretest-posttest<sub>2</sub>

The two by two analysis for fixed-effects models of variance was performed on the pre-post<sub>2</sub> mean gain data for the specific - non-specific dimension and is presented in Table 17. Scheffe's test, comparing each treatment group mean to the control group mean in terms of pre-post<sub>2</sub> mean gains on the specific - non-specific dimension, are contained in Table 18. The findings from Tables 17 and 18 are as follows:

1. A significant main effect was found for the training presentation (F=5.464; p < .024). No significant main effect for self-actualization was found.

2. There was a significant interaction effect for the pre-post<sub>2</sub> mean gain data score on the specific - non-specific dimension (F=5.120; p < .029).

3. Individual comparisons between each treatment group and the control group in terms of pre-post<sub>2</sub> mean gains on the specific - non-specific dimension revealed that all four treatment groups were significantly higher than the control. All four treatment groups were numerically higher than the control group in mean gain scores.
### Table 17

**Analysis of Variance of Teacher Verbal Response for Pretest-Posttest Mean Gain Scores on the Specific - Non-Specific Dimension of the CVRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34.546</td>
<td>1.884</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.211</td>
<td>5.464</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>93.910</td>
<td>5.120</td>
<td>.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not reported in statistical data.

### Table 18

**Scheffe's Test for Comparison of Each Treatment Group with the Control Group for Pretest-Posttest Mean Gain Scores on the Specific - Non-Specific Dimension of the CVRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Treatment $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Control $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>300.769</td>
<td>212.000</td>
<td>35.625*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>245.000</td>
<td>212.000</td>
<td>7.131*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>256.364</td>
<td>212.000</td>
<td>6.614*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>257.273</td>
<td>212.000</td>
<td>16.216*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 (comparisonwise).
The results appear to indicate that the micro-counseling treatment contributed more to the pre-post2 gain interval than the didactic and degree of self-actualization. They also appear to indicate that interaction of the treatment contributes to mean gain more than can be expected by the simple addition of the appropriate main effects. (See Table 25.) All treatment groups gained more than the control group on the specific - non-specific dimension. (See Table 26.)

Exploratory - non-exploratory dimension

The findings for the exploratory - non-exploratory dimension are presented in Tables 19 through 24 and Figure 9. Findings correspond to pre-post1 and pre-post2 mean gain score periods. The four hypotheses stated for this study are tested for the exploratory - non-exploratory dimension for both mean gain score periods.

Findings: exploratory - non-exploratory dimension

The mean raw scores and mean gain scores pertaining to the exploratory - non-exploratory dimension are presented respectively in Tables 19 and 20. The mean raw scores are presented for the four treatment groups and the control group in Figure 6. This figure plots the four treatment groups and control group's longitudinal performance for the three testing points on the exploratory - non-exploratory dimension. The findings regarding the pre-post1 and pre-post2 period will be presented separately.
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Longitudinal Performance of the Four Treatment Groups and the Control Group on the Exploratory - Non-Exploratory Dimension
TABLE 19
TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUP RAW SCORES AND MEAN GAIN SCORES PERTAINING TO THE EXPLORATORY - NON-EXPLORATORY DIMENSION FOR THE PRETEST-POSTTEST1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest2</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>23.077</td>
<td>30.769</td>
<td>6.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>21.500</td>
<td>25.083</td>
<td>3.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.091</td>
<td>26.091</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.636</td>
<td>25.091</td>
<td>2.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21.100</td>
<td>21.000</td>
<td>-.100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 20
TREATMENT AND CONTROL GROUP RAW SCORES AND MEAN GAIN SCORES PERTAINING TO THE EXPLORATORY - NON-EXPLORATORY DIMENSION FOR THE PRETEST-POSTTEST2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest2</th>
<th>Gain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>23.077</td>
<td>30.769</td>
<td>6.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>21.500</td>
<td>25.083</td>
<td>3.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.091</td>
<td>26.091</td>
<td>4.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>22.636</td>
<td>25.091</td>
<td>2.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>21.000</td>
<td>21.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings: pretest-posttest<sub>1</sub>

The pre-post<sub>1</sub> findings for the exploratory - non-exploratory dimensions are presented in Tables 21 and 22. Table 21 contains the two by two analysis of variance of fixed-effects models which was performed on the pre-post<sub>1</sub> data for this dimension. Individual comparisons between each treatment mean and the control mean in terms of pre-post<sub>1</sub> mean gains were made by Scheffe's test as presented in Table 22. These results were:

1. Neither self-actualization nor the training presentation was a significant main effect in the pre-post<sub>1</sub> mean gain scores and there was no significant interaction for the pre-post data on the exploratory - non-exploratory dimension. (See Table 21.)

2. All four treatment groups achieved significantly higher pre-post<sub>1</sub> mean gain scores than the control group on this dimension. (See Table 22.)

3. Figure 9 illustrates that all four treatment groups increased on the criterion during the pre-post<sub>1</sub> period while the control remained constant.
### TABLE 21

**ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHER VERBAL RESPONSE FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE EXPLORATORY - NON-EXPLORATORY DIMENSION OF THE CVRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27.296</td>
<td>1.619</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.469</td>
<td>1.748</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25.974</td>
<td>1.541</td>
<td>.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not reported in statistical data.

### TABLE 22

**SCHEFFE'S TEST FOR COMPARISON OF EACH TREATMENT GROUP WITH THE CONTROL GROUP FOR PRETEST-POSTTEST MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE EXPLORATORY - NON-EXPLORATORY DIMENSION OF THE CVRS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Treatment $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>Control $\bar{X}$</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>292.3076</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>28.084*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>262.5000</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>8.635*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>262.727</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>21.585*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>262.727</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>20.023*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p $\leq .05$ (comparisonwise).
Findings: pretest−posttest$_2$

Tables 23 and 24 present the findings from pre−post$_2$ mean gain score data on the exploratory−non-exploratory dimension. The two by two analysis of variance of fixed-effects models on the data is presented in Table 23 and Scheffe's test comparisons between each treatment group mean and the control group mean for the gain scores are contained in Table 24. The findings from these tables are as follows:

1. The training presentation was a significant main effect ($F=6.481; p < .015$) in the pre−post$_2$ mean gain scores. There were no significant main effects for self-actualization. Interaction effects also lacked significance. (See Table 23.)

2. All four treatment groups were significantly greater than the control for the pre−post$_2$ mean gains on the exploratory−non-exploratory dimension (See Table 24.)

3. Figure 9 illustrates the relative pre−post$_2$ mean gain score performance of all treatment groups and the control group. All treatment groups are shown to be numerically higher than the control on the criterion.
### TABLE 23

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF TEACHER VERBAL RESPONSE FOR PRETEST–POSTTEST² MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE EXPLORATORY – NON-EXPLORATORY DIMENSION OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variance</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>70.190</td>
<td>3.180</td>
<td>&lt;.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>143.046</td>
<td>6.481</td>
<td>&lt;.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64.190</td>
<td>2.908</td>
<td>&lt;.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cells</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Not reported in statistical data.

### TABLE 24

SCHETTE'S TEST FOR COMPARISON OF EACH TREATMENT GROUP WITH THE CONTROL GROUP FOR PRETEST–POSTTEST² MEAN GAIN SCORES ON THE EXPLORATORY – NON-EXPLORATORY DIMENSION OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Treatment ( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>Control ( \bar{X} )</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M–C/S–A</td>
<td>307.6921</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>35.365*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S–A</td>
<td>250.833</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>6.384*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M–C/Non S–A</td>
<td>260.909</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>9.382*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S–A</td>
<td>250.909</td>
<td>210.000</td>
<td>15.295*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( *p < .05 \) (comparisonwise).
These results appear to indicate that the micro-counseling treatment contributes more to the pre-post₂ gain interval than the didactic treatment or the degree of self-actualization. (See Table 25.) All treatment groups gained more numerically than the control group on the affective - cognitive dimension. (See Table 26.)

Control group

Findings:

Figures 6, 7, 8, and 9 illustrate the performance patterns of the control group which are not fully exposed in the experimental hypothesis. For all treatment groups and on all four dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale, the gains at the pre-post₁ and pre-post₂ intervals were numerically higher than the control. On the understanding - non-understanding dimension, the pre-post₁ interval, the control showed a numerical increase of one point; however, this was not as great numerically as the four treatment groups on the same dimension and interval. On all four dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale, the control remained constant or decreased during the posttest₁ and posttest₂ period.

A review of Figures 6, 7, 8, and 9 illustrates that the pretest mean gains for all treatments on the affective - cognitive, understanding - non-understanding, and exploratory - non-exploratory were higher than the mean gains of the control group for the same dimensions. The question concerning this investigator was whether this numerical increase was statistically significant. To test this concern, a Scheffe test was run comparing the pretest mean gains for each variable and each dimension.
with the control group mean gains. (See Table 27.)

A significant difference was found on the pre-post mean gains for the self-actualized - micro-counseling treatment group on the affective - cognitive dimension. This indicates that members in the training group displayed the characteristic of making affective verbal responses prior to the beginning of treatment. This is significant since the other self-actualized group did not exhibit a similar characteristic. This finding will be discussed in the implications section of Chapter V.
### Table 25

**Summary of Observed Probabilities Above p < .051**

For each hypothesis across dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Post_1</th>
<th>Post_2</th>
<th>Post_1</th>
<th>Post_2</th>
<th>Post_1</th>
<th>Post_2</th>
<th>Post_1</th>
<th>Post_2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualized (A)</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>&lt;.011</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>&lt;.024</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>&lt;.015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A x B</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>&lt;.009</td>
<td>&lt;.029</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 26

**Summary of the Cell Mean Gains**

Pre-post_1 and pre-post_2 for each treatment across dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Post_1</th>
<th>Post_2</th>
<th>Post_1</th>
<th>Post_2</th>
<th>Post_1</th>
<th>Post_2</th>
<th>Post_1</th>
<th>Post_2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-C/S-A</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>6.15</td>
<td>6.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/S-A</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-C/Non S-A</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D/Non S-A</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimensions</td>
<td>( \frac{M-C}{S-A} \times )</td>
<td>Control ( \times )</td>
<td>( \frac{D/S-A}{X} \times )</td>
<td>Control ( \times )</td>
<td>( \frac{M-C/Non\ S}{X} \times )</td>
<td>Control ( \times )</td>
<td>( \frac{D/Non\ S}{X} \times )</td>
<td>Control ( \times )</td>
<td>F Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( *p < .05 \) (comparisonwise).
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine the effectiveness of two methods of training teachers with varying degrees of self-actualization on core dimensions of counseling-like communication, and to draw implications for a teacher education model for improving teacher growth and teacher verbal interaction patterns. Two levels of mental health (self-actualization and non-self-actualization) and two levels of training presentation (micro-counseling and didactic) were employed and the effect of these two variables on changes in verbal core dimension was measured.

The verbal response set which served as the basis for the training presentation and as the gain score measure was the Counselor Verbal Response Scale. Fifty-seven teachers, participating in a freshman early experience program, served as volunteer subjects. The teachers were divided into two groups based on the degree of measured self-actualization. Volunteers were then randomly assigned to two treatment groups defined by micro-counseling or didactic training. Each subject conducted one pre-treatment interview and two post-treatment interviews. Following the pre-treatment interview, the treatment defined as micro-counseling was administered to experimental groups E_1 and E_3 while the treatment defined as didactic was administered to E_2 and E_4.

A two by two analysis of variance for fixed-effects methods fol-
lowed by Scheffe's test was employed to test the hypotheses of the study. This permitted the simultaneous examination of the effects of self-actualization and the training presentation on the verbal gains measure. The cell entries were gain scores on each dimension of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale. F ratios for each main effect and for interaction were computed. Additional analysis was conducted for significance by the use of Scheffe's test for comparison of each treatment group mean with the control group mean using the gain score measure.

A summary of the findings is discussed in relationship to the hypotheses. These are:

Hypotheses for main effects:

1. Mean gain scores on the four Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimensions for treatment groups defined in terms of micro-counseling and didactic will not differ significantly.

There were five main effects for the presentation in the results of this study. The micro-counseling presentation was found to be more effective than the didactic presentation for both pre-post1 (p < .01) and pre-post2 (p < .001) on the affective response mean gains. (See Tables 3 and 5.) Also, the micro-counseling presentation was found to be more effective than the didactic presentation for pre-post2 understanding response mean gains (p < .01), the pre-post2 specific response mean gains (p < .024), and the pre-post2 exploratory response mean gains (p < .015). (See Tables 11, 17, and 23.) In general, the findings support that the micro-counseling presentation was more effective than the didactic presentation at the pre-post2 level. The hypothesis concerning levels of presentation was accepted at the pre-post1 level but
rejected at the pre-post2 level.

2. Mean gain scores on each of the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale for treatment groups defined in terms of self-actualization and non-self-actualization will not differ significantly.

The two levels of self-actualization were not significantly different for either pre-post1 or pre-post2 gain periods or any of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimensions. The hypothesis for levels of self-actualization was accepted for all dimensions at both the pre-post1 and pre-post2 levels.

3. Mean gain score on each of the dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale for groups of subjects defined jointly as micro-counseling or didactic or the presence or absence of self-actualization will not differ significantly from the mean gains scores expected from the sample addition of the main effects.

There were two significant main interaction effects. These were found on the pre-post1 (p < .009) and the pre-post2 (p < .02) mean gain scores for the specific dimension. (See Tables 15 and 17.) No other treatment dimension or intervals showed significance. This hypothesis, therefore, was accepted. This lack of interaction thus allowed the interpretation of the main effects according to the experimental design. (Winer, 1962).

Hypothesis for all treatment groups with a control group:

1. The mean Counselor Verbal Response Scale gain scores on each dimension for each treatment group will not differ signifi-
cantly from the mean Counselor Verbal Response Scale gain score on the same dimension for the control group.

**Affective - cognitive dimension**

All four treatment groups were numerically higher in this criterion for both the pre-post₁ and pre-post₂ intervals for this dimension. (See Figure 6.)

All four treatment groups were significantly greater than the control group in pre-post₁ and pre-post₂ mean gains on the affective - cognitive dimension. (See Table 4 and 6 and Figure 6.) The treatment group designated as self-actualized and receiving micro-counseling was greatest among the treatments in pre-post₁ and pre-post₂ mean gain on this dimension. (See Figure 6.) All four treatment groups achieved the .05 adopted level of significance during both the pre-post₁ and pre-post₂ gain periods. (See Table 4 and 6.)

**Understanding - non-understanding dimension**

All four treatment groups were numerically higher in this criterion for both the pre-post₁ and pre-post₂ intervals for this dimension. (See Figure 7.)

All four treatment groups achieved significantly higher pre-post₁ mean gain scores than the control group on the understanding - non-understanding dimension. The treatment group, micro-counseling and self-actualization, was particularly higher than the control group. All treatment groups achieved the adopted .05 level of significance.

All four treatment groups achieved significantly higher pre-post₂ mean gain scores than the control on this dimension. The micro-
counseling - self-actualized and didactic - non-self-actualized treatment group were particularly higher than the control ($F=33.382; F=14.802$). All treatment groups, however, achieved the adopted .05 level of significance.

Specific - non-specific dimension

All four treatment groups were numerically higher in this criterion for both the pre-post$_1$ and pre-post$_2$ intervals for this dimension. (See Figure 8.)

All four treatment groups achieved significantly higher pre-post$_1$ mean gain scores than the control on this dimension. The micro-counseling - self-actualized and didactic - non-self-actualized treatment group were at a higher level of significance than the others ($F=22.723; F=20.529$). All treatment groups achieved the adopted .05 level of significance.

For the pre-post$_2$ mean gain period, all four treatment groups also achieved significantly higher mean gain scores than the control. Micro-counseling - self-actualization and didactic - non-self-actualization also attained a higher level of significance ($F=35.625; F=16.216$) than the other groups. All treatment groups achieved the adopted .05 level of significance and all groups were numerically higher in this criterion than the control.

Exploratory - non-exploratory dimension

On this dimension, all four treatment groups were numerically higher in this criterion for both the pre-post$_1$ and pre-post$_2$ intervals.

All four treatment groups for the pre-post$_1$ and pre-post$_2$ mean
gain period achieved significantly higher mean gain scores than the control. Micro-counseling - self-actualization, micro-counseling - non-self-actualization, and didactic - non-self-actualization achieved particularly higher levels of significance (F=28.084; F=21.585; F=21.585), although all four treatment groups achieved the adopted .05 level of significance.

In summary, the individual comparisons on the four Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimensions between each treatment group and the control group produced the following points related to all findings for this hypothesis:

1. All four treatment groups on both the pre-post1 and pre-post2 intervals were numerically higher in the criterion measure than the control group.

2. The hypothesis was rejected for the pre-post1 mean gain score interval on all four Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimension.

3. The hypothesis was rejected for the pre-post2 mean gain score interval on all four Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimensions.

Discussions

In reviewing the results of this study, several considerations can be drawn, and several possible explanations and interpretations can be made. One of the most significant findings is that on all dimensions, for both pre-post1 and pre-post2, there was a numerical increase in verbal responses of the teachers. This supports the effectiveness of
training as opposed to lack of training.

Initial consideration is given to the significant gains made by teachers in the sample on the affective - cognitive dimension for the pre-post_1 test period and on all Counselor Verbal Response Scale dimensions for the pre-post_2 period. These findings suggest several possible interpretations. First, the affective - cognitive dimension is one which Griffin (1966) added to a previously established scale designed to measure the "therapeutic triad". The instruction in both the subject and rater training sessions gave emphasis to the identification of feeling type responses. This emphasis may have provided a more easily definable guideline for distinction of the affective dimension than those guidelines for the other dimensions. A second alternative is that previously acquired affective oriented verbal skills by certain subjects in the micro-counseling - self-actualized group affected the significance of pre-post_1 results.

One should note, however, that the affective - cognitive dimension was also found by Boyd (1971) to be significantly more effective than a control group when using the micro-counseling model with instructional supervision. These findings do not substantiate those of Carr's (1971), who found significantly greater gains in teacher verbal training on the understanding - non-understanding and exploratory - non-exploratory dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale. However, Carr contended that affective responses may require an awareness of interpersonal functioning not present in her sample. Possibly, this awareness was present in the sample of this investigation.

A third possibility for the significance found in the affective -
cognitive dimension for the pre-post 1 period may be the length of training time. This dimension may be more easily learned in a short time period by teachers than the other dimensions. Perhaps a longer training time using the same treatment would produce changes in the other dimension equal to those found on the affective - cognitive dimension.

An important trend in the data is the significant gain on the Counselor Verbal Response Scale made by each treatment group on each dimension at the pre-post 2 interval. All gains including those on the affective - cognitive dimension were significantly greater than at the pre-post 1 level. (See Table 26.) A possible explanation for these significant gains might be that the post 1 interview was the first attempt by the subjects to implement the skills taught in the training sessions. In these initial attempts, the subjects using the newly acquired skills in the post 1 interview may have encountered difficulty which resulted from the radical change required by the subjects to adjust their verbal patterns to a counseling-like mode of verbal skills. Such difficulties in change of verbal patterns by teachers have already been noted by Hopke (1964) and Gazda, et al. (1967).

It should be noted that as a result of this study the microcounseling model appears to be more effective on all dimensions than the didactic model. This is supported by research of Truax and Lister (1970) and Berenson (1970) which indicated the superiority of an experimental - didactic approach over either a didactic or an experimental approach.

The second basic consideration for the data is the interaction at the pre-post 1 and pre-post 2 interval on the specific - non-specific dimension. This interaction appears to have been the result of an in-
crease in the mean gains of didactic - non-self-actualized treatment. A possible reason for this increase is that those subjects in this treatment group may readily recognize "core" problems; however, because of their less positive personal orientation or because of the lack of instructional supervision, they may be able to respond cognitively with no depth of understanding or no desire for exploring the concern in detail.

The comparison of significant gains by treatment groups over the control does present some interesting implications as to the variable self-actualization. Although all treatment levels showed significant gains for both the pre-post₁ interval and the pre-post₂ intervals on the understanding, specific, and exploratory dimensions which purport to measure the "therapeutic triad", the micro-counseling - self-actualized treatment and didactic - non-self-actualized treatment groups showed higher gains on these three dimensions at both the pre-post₁ and pre-post₂ intervals. A possible explanation for this significance is that the group defined as self-actualized may be more capable of inter-personalizing a new training technique on the dimension because their positive personality orientation permits them greater ability to adjust to new techniques. Also, some of the subjects may have entered training with skills superior to those of the control. Those non-self-actualized subjects, however, who received a didactic approach, may find that particular type of training technique more favorable for their personal orientation since the didactic may not present radical contrast to or change from their previous experience.

The results related to the Counselor Verbal Response Scale up-
held a basic contention made by Carr (1971) that the relationship between the understanding - non-understanding and the exploratory - non-exploratory dimensions appear to highly correlate. As Carr indicated, and this investigator concurs, interdependency of the two is noted since by scale definition a verbal response can only be judged exploratory if it is also judged understanding. This also offers a possible explanation for similarities in significance and lack of significance found for each hypothesis for these dimensions. The correlations which Carr found on the affective - cognitive and the specific - non-specific dimension were not so obvious in this study. Perhaps this was because the verbal interaction of this study was not totally problem oriented. However, due to the orientation of the training manual, the trend may still exist for raters to rate many affective responses as specific if the "core" is associated with personal-social problems and if the "core" has an affective orientation.

Self-actualization was not found to create a significant effect on any of the four dimensions or for either interval. These results differ from those of Foulds (1969, A,B,C). He found that self-actualized teachers in advanced counselor training programs are significantly associated with their ability to provide the overall conditions of the "therapeutic triad". Since this study found no significant results for teachers exposed to either treatment, a possible explanation is that the training period may not have been long enough to permit teachers with positive personality characteristics to function differently from those with less positive ones. A second possibility is that levels of previous training in counseling techniques may have effected the Foulds'
findings. Since the sample in this study was virtually free of previous treatment training, such influence does not have to be considered. In short, teachers with different levels of self-actualization and with little or no background knowledge of the training topic may perform similarly in early training phases. If this could be proved, the value of self-actualization in the training process may become more significant as training increases.

Implications

The data from this study provide implications for the variable self-actualization, and the use of a micro-counseling model as a teacher education model. These implications will relate first to the effects on the educational environment, specifically related to pre-service and in-service program development, micro-model utilization and the implementation of supervisory techniques. Secondly, implications will be drawn from the data and related to personnel development and utilization. Specific consideration will be given to teacher selection, teacher assignment to instructional levels, and affective training.

Pre-service and in-service program development

A basic implication which can be derived from this study is that a short-term training program can produce affective, understanding, specific, and exploratory gains in the verbal response behaviors of teachers whose initial responses were primarily cognitive, non-understanding, non-specific, and non-exploratory. The micro-model utilized in this study produced significant effects which should be recognized by school officials who desire to change the verbal response patterns of their
staff. Since many public institutions are limited by time and contractual agreements as to the length of pre and in-service programs, the implementation of short-term training programs can be advantageous as part of either new teacher orientation or staff development programs. This should be especially true for a program which requires only five hours of staff involvement and which could produce significant training effects.

College officials, who are co-ordinating teacher training programs such as freshman early experience programs or student teacher programs may find that teachers or graduate students who are supervising teacher trainees or student teachers can be trained to communicate on a more effective interpersonal level. This improvement in verbal communication skills has the potential for greatly reducing problems which can develop in such programs because of misunderstandings or personal needs.

Micro-model utilization

The results of this study suggest that teachers can be effectively taught verbal response skills which are derived directly from counseling theory with success similar to that of neophyte counselors. (Boyd, 1971). Such suggestions, however, do not support results for teachers as found by Carr (1971). One possible reason for this difference is that this study incorporated a larger sample from a more diverse population than Carr's. Also, the procedures used, follow those originally stated by Boyd (1971) with the elimination of Carr's practice interviews. A direct one to one comparison with either of Boyd's or Carr's samples cannot be made.
One must realize that the use of this model was effective with teachers who were in special training programs and who were receiving credit or special consideration for their participation. To generalize the results for developing counselor-like verbal responses to teachers who do not have similar orientations would be presumptuous.

In a follow-up session, subjects in this study suggested that improvement of the model could occur by adding a second instructional supervision session. This session could provide additional positive reinforcement for good responses and could eliminate some of the confusion which might exist after the initial training session. Also longer and more detailed initial training might be necessary to increase the understanding, specific, and exploratory dimensions, since they were not significantly effective for the pre-post interval.

**Supervision Techniques**

The importance of small group or one to one supervision sessions was emphasized by the significant effects produced through the use of the micro-model which included instructional supervision as a major component. This supervisory technique provided one dimension which could not be duplicated using the didactic approach. The utilization of instructional supervision provides a potential for two-way communication and is highlighted by a basic behavioral concept which requires positive reinforcement of appropriate behaviors. The addition of this dimension seems to be necessary if short-term presentations, such as a micro-model, are to be effective.

An important implication for those planning either pre or in-
service programs, early experience programs, or student teacher programs would be the utilization of personnel with recognized expertise in the training variable to provide the supervisory function. Although this occurs to some extent in most programs, the identification of potential supervisors is usually inefficient. Also, often training presentations, such as the micro-counseling model, are not implemented due to some convenient rationalization. Those with training and experience in verbal supervisory techniques could easily teach such techniques to personnel with varying educational experience. These newly trained supervisors could in-turn provide the important training experience in verbal response skills to many people with varying educational responsibility.

**Teacher screening**

Self-actualization, as measured by the Personal Orientation Inventory, has been exposed to much research related to its ability to measure therapeutic change and to identify varying personality characteristics. Although this study found no significance in the numerical increases made on the Counselor Verbal Response Scale by subjects identified as self-actualized, these subjects, when exposed to the micro-training model, did make the greatest numerical gains. This could indicate that the Personal Orientation Inventory appears to have the capability of identifying individuals who can function best in new experimental-training techniques. This could also imply that the Personal Orientation Inventory has the capability of screening teachers for training programs which require optimum instructional gain in a short period of time. The inventory results could also be used as a screening device
for identifying those teachers who are best adjusted to conventional didactic approaches. Such implications are predicated on additional research using self-actualization categories of teachers over a longer period of time.

**Assignment to instructional levels**

The significance of the gains by micro-counseling - self-actualization and didactic - non-self-actualization groups over the control group presents a noticeable dicotomy which may have implications for making teaching assignments. Since the self-actualized group made significantly larger gains on the micro-counseling than the non-self-actualized, it would seem that this group could best adjust to new educational experiences or new educational approaches. Possibly, teachers with this personal orientation have more success in innovative programs which require unique approaches and commitment. Conversely, since the didactic - non-self-actualized group also showed greater significance after exposure to the didactic approach, the possibility exists that this group might function best in an educational atmosphere which emphasizes more conventional lecture or question-answer approaches. These possibilities could provide those who make personnel assignments with the opportunity to obtain maximum teaching performance from those with specific personality orientations. Much discretion, however, would have to be used by a person undertaking such an endeavor. A self-actualization measurement should be used as only one of hopefully many criteria in making such assignments.
Affective training

Murry (1966) and Henderson (1972) have cited research and writings that indicate more affectively oriented education is needed. This study provides a technique by which the elements of the affective domain can be identified and partially taught through verbal response training. The findings of this study also indicate that the degree of self-actualization displayed by teachers does not significantly effect the affective learning process. Therefore, training programs using the findings from this study could be developed to assist in the affective training process for teachers regardless of their personal orientation.

Recommendations for Further Research

1. This study should be replicated utilizing a random sample of teachers, which is not a part of an organized teacher training program. This should make the findings more generalized to all teachers.

2. This study should be replicated with the addition of required taped intervals beyond the pre-post\textsubscript{2} interval. These additional intervals would permit further examination of the longitudinal effects of the training techniques.

3. This study should be replicated using larger sample sizes. This would permit more statistical power in the analyses of the data.

4. Studies should be conducted with a similar design using public school personnel who are in supervisory positions such as curriculum directors, personnel supervisors,
principals, and assistant principals as subjects. The comparison of verbal responses and degrees of self-actualization could provide important findings for these helping occupations.

5. Similar studies should be conducted utilizing college and university personnel such as professors, teachers, student teacher supervisors, and dormitory officials, who are typically in helping positions in higher education. The results of these studies could have important training implications.

6. More complicated designs could be incorporated using additional personality measures or training techniques. Such designs would permit greater latitude in analyzing variables considered important to verbal training.

7. A study using alternative verbal measures which are feasible and academically justifiable should be undertaken. This would provide alternative criteria for testing the differences in verbal response patterns of the treatment groups.

8. A study could be conducted with a revised counseling verbal response scale designed to eliminate the apparent problem of rating the exploratory dimension as understanding. This could mean the elimination or combination of one of the dimensions.

9. The development of a more effective supervisory rating system would enhance that variable of the micro-counseling training.
10. A similar study conducted at a different time of the year with the potential of utilizing more than one college quarter as a time span could be profitable. This would permit a greater longitudinal profile of the verbal response gains.
APPENDICES
This manual is similar to a programmed text. The reader must understand each page before continuing on to another. Read slowly and carefully. If a particular paragraph or page is confusing—re-read it. If re-reading does not lead to complete understanding, then request help from the instructor. The reader may have as much time as desired to read the manual and complete the exercises.

The Counselor Verbal Response Manual was developed by John Boyd, Assistant Professor of Education, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, Virginia.
THE COUNSELOR VERBAL RESPONSE

SECTION I.

Nearly all of the verbal activity in a counseling session consists of counselor-client units. A client verbalization is emitted or elicited and the counselor verbally responds to it. The client statement, followed by a counselor verbalization, is the counselor-client unit. The response which the counselor makes is termed a counselor verbal response.

For example, the following excerpt from a counseling session illustrates the counselor-client unit; a client verbalization is followed by a counselor verbal response.

CL: ". . . . the thing is, every time I do express an opinion, no one listens . . . it's as though I hadn't said anything."

CO: ". . . . like you're overlooked . . . ?"

CL: "Yes . . . so why talk . . . I'd rather just go my own way."

CO: "Um . . Going your own way . . you mean . . avoiding them . . . perhaps, because you feel hurt . . . maybe rejected?"

Counselor verbal responses, then, are words, phrases or sentences used by the counselor which interrupt the flow and momentum of client communication or which are in direct response to a client's statement. Although such responses normally occur at the conclusion of a client's communication, there are times when a counselor will deliberately interrupt a client's statement. It either case, such counselor
statements are considered verbal responses.

Responses which are part of a counselor's unconscious mannerisms, and do not interrupt the flow and momentum of client communication, e.g., "Umm," "Okay," "Hm," "Yes," and "I see" are not considered to be true verbal responses (although they are verbal and do have an effect on the counseling session). For the purpose of this training program, we will not treat these mannerisms as counselor verbal responses.

There are times when counselors make two distinct responses to a single client communication, these responses normally being separated by a pause:

Example: 

CL: "It's good to get rounded especially if I decide to teach which you really can't decide until you get into college, I guess."

CO: "Kind of hard to figure things out, isn't it?" "Do you think student teaching is helping you get the feel of teaching?"

In this case there are clearly two responses differing in nature which must be treated separately. There are other instances in which there is a clear shift in the content of the counselor's response without a distinct pause. In such cases, as in the preceding example, counselor statements are treated as two separate responses.

By now the reader should have grasped the conceptualization of the counselor verbal response. It is a very fundamental and basic idea. It is a useful concept for the neophyte counselor who is encountering the anxiety and uncertainty of those first few counseling sessions—the first time in his life when he is expected to "behave as a counselor."

The phrase "behave as a counselor" includes two realms—verbal
and non-verbal behavior. Most neophyte counselors know what kind of non-verbal behavior is appropriate in counseling. The counselor should indicate by his posture and eye contact that he is paying attention to the client, he should be mannerly and show respect and acceptance, and hopefully he will not exhibit an annoying habit. These are some of the non-verbal behaviors that most counselors try to exhibit. But what about verbal behaviors; do successful counselors have a particular way of verbally responding? The answer to this question is affirmative, and will be explained in the next section of this manual.
COUNSELOR VERBAL RESPONSE DIMENSIONS

SECTION II.

As stated in Section I, there are certain kinds of counselor verbal responses that are indicative of successful counseling. Rather than referring to "kinds" or "types" of responses, let's use the term dimensions.

There are four dimensions of counselor verbal responding which are generally supported by a wide variety of counseling approaches such as psychoanalytic, client-centered and eclectic. Research has shown that these dimensions effectively discriminate between inexperienced and experienced counselors. In other words, experienced and successful counselors tend to verbally respond in a different manner on the four verbal response dimensions than inexperienced and unsuccessful counselors. The neophyte counselor can be greatly assisted in his counseling skill if he learns appropriate verbal response behaviors. The development of desirable verbal response habits may help the neophyte progress more rapidly toward a high level of expertise and success. This manual can help you learn to verbally respond as an experienced, successful counselor.

Counselor Verbal Response Dimensions

(1) Affect - Cognitive
(2) Specific - Non-Specific
(3) Understanding - Non-Understanding
(4) Exploratory - Non-Exploratory
The experienced and successful counselor tends to use more affective verbal responses than the inexperienced, unsuccessful counselor. His verbal responses are also consistently specific, understanding, and exploratory. Inexperienced and unsuccessful counselors often use cognitive verbal responses almost to the exclusion of affective responses. They also frequently use non-specific, non-understanding, and non-exploratory verbal responses.

The neophyte counselor can improve his counseling by learning to make more affective, specific, understanding, and exploratory responses to the client. Such responses are not difficult to learn or perform, but in order to do so, one must break the verbal habits of social conversation. A social conversation tends to be almost entirely cognitive with non-specific, non-understanding, and non-exploratory responses by both parties. Let's examine the four verbal response dimensions so that through greater understanding of these responses you can improve your counseling skill.

Affective - Cognitive Dimension

This dimension indicates whether a counselor's response is in reference to some affective or feeling aspect of a client's verbal communication (an affective response) or whether his response omits any such reference to affect or feeling in the client's verbal communication (a cognitive response). These categories are more clearly defined as follows:

A. Affective Responses

Affect refers to emotions, feelings, fears, moods, desires,
urges, impulses, fantasy, dreams and any ideas, attitudes, beliefs, convictions, etc., which are based upon such referents are these. A counselor affective response is one which makes reference to any of this type of affective material on a feeling level regardless of how congruent it is with that being expressed by the client. An affective response is not determined by the extent to which the counselor's manner or communication is affective, but rather, it is determined solely by the fact that the counselor responds through comment (reflection, clarification, interpretation, etc.) to underlying affective elements, or to what he implies are underlying affective elements, in the client's verbal and non-verbal expressions as they are revealed in his inter- actional discussion with the counselor. Examples:

1. "You feel quite inadequate in these situations."
2. "You act that way because you are angry."
3. "You feel better when she mothers you."
4. "How do you feel when your parents argue."
5. "Maybe that's not what you want at all."

B. Cognitive Responses

A counselor cognitive response is one which is on a non-affective plane in that it is devoid of any basic concern, reference, or recognition of client feelings, emotions, moods, attitudes, or any other affective aspects which may be implied in the client's communication. Such a response passes over any affective implications inherent in the client's remarks. The counselor responds at a cognitive, non-feeling level or asks a question or makes a statement concerning cognitive or content material. Such cognitive responses are more formal, informative, matter of fact, of a general discussion order, and socially acceptable oriented, and are altogether on a different plane from re-
sponses which make emotional contact with the client through discussion of feelings, attitudes, etc. Cognitive responses include answering factual questions, "busy" talk, discussing trivialities, repeating client remarks verbatim, exclusive talk about third parties without affective reference back to the client, or any general educational, intellectual, vocational, conversation etc. type discussions. Examples:

1. "Yes, that seems to be a logical step to take."
2. "Your father was an attorney, huh. Well, that seems to give you a good background."
3. "How are you feeling today?" (If intended in a general sense)
4. "I think your performance in your science course would support a decision to enter medicine."
5. "So you want to enter graduate study. I think that's nice."

It has been stated earlier that experienced counselors tend to use more affective verbal responses than inexperienced counselors. This is particularly true in personal-social counseling when the client's concerns are of an affective nature. But, the reader should not generalize that all cognitive responses are undesirable and any affective response is desirable. There are times when a cognitive response is clearly most appropriate, there are times when an affective response should be used, and there are situations when either an affective or cognitive verbal response would be acceptable. When and how to use cognitive and affective verbal responses will become clear as the other three verbal response dimensions are discussed.

For the present, it is sufficient that the reader understand the affective-cognitive dimension, and be able to differentiate between affective and cognitive verbal responses.
Specific - Non-Specific Dimension

This dimension indicates whether the counselor is dealing directly with the client's basic problem by confining his response to a concrete (specific) one quite relevant to the presented problem (a core response), or whether the counselor passes over dealing directly with the client's basic problem and gives a more general, or non-specific response not too relevant to the presented problem (a peripheral response). These categories (specific-non-specific) are more clearly defined as follows:

A. Specific Responses

These are core type responses which indicate that the counselor is handling directly and honestly the basic problem presented explicitly or implicitly by the client. The counselor's remarks are keyed to the central aspects of the problem which the client is feeling and communicating. The counselor thus responds to the underlying concern, feeling, or meaning--the primary message--of the client's remarks such that his responses zero in and are congruent with the level of affect or concern being expressed by the client.

Specific responses are those which influence the client to attend with specificity to his problem areas or emotional conflicts and concerns. They are relevant to these problem areas or emotional conflicts and concerns, move the interview discussion in this direction or bring the client's discussion back to these topics. Specific responses are usually directed at underlying affect, but may consist of cognitive responses if awareness of affect is not essential to the working
through of the counseling problem. Examples:

1. CL: "I've gotten all A's this year and I still feel lousy."

   CO: "You're sensing that obtaining such high grades is not such a satisfactory solution to your feelings of inadequacy as you thought."

2. CL: "It's a common thing for men to have mistresses in Europe. Why do they have to make such a fuss about it over here?"

   CO: "What's that got to do with your sexual problem?"

3. CL: "Hell, what do I care about being on time, my boss never says a good word about my work and he didn't do a thing about getting me that raise."

   CO: "When your boss doesn't continually praise and take care of you, you become angry and take it out on him by being late."

4. CL: "When I try to make love to my wife anymore, I just can't perform."

   CO: "You still look on your wife as your mother."

5. CL: "It's my twenty-second birthday tomorrow, I hate growing old."

   CO: "It's more fun being a little girl, then you don't have to face these adult responsibilities."

B. Non-Specific Responses

These are peripheral type responses which indicate that the counselor is not dealing directly and honestly with the basic problem presented explicitly or implicitly by the client. Rather, the counselor responses stay away from the client and his problem or at best handle the problem at a superficial, surface level. These responses indicate that the counselor has missed or ignored cues which reveal the client's main problem areas. In such responses the counselor concentrates on
aspects of the client's verbalizations that are of less importance than
the main message which the client has attempted to communicate. The
counselor's responses refer mostly to cognitive generalizations or su-
perficial cognitive specifics rather than their underlying concerns, and
thus such responses are not congruent with the level of affect being
expressed by the client.

Non-specific responses are those in which the counselor becomes
abstract, intellectual, or extraneous rather than confining his remarks
to the specifics of the client's problem areas or emotional conflicts.
Such responses tend to be irrelevant to, or deal inappropriately with,
these problem areas or emotional conflicts and thus move the interview
discussion in a direction which avoids them. Such responses encourage
expansion of superficial cognitive content; leads to debate with the
client over cognitive or affective concerns; are typified by excessive
response verbalization and verbal monopolizing on the part of the coun-
selor; and are illustrated by all sorts of lecturing, sermonizing, and
philosophizing to the client by the counselor. Examples:

1. CL: "I've gotten all A's this year and I still feel
   lousy."
   CO: "I wouldn't feel so bad if I were you. There are
   a lot of kids who would give their eye-teeth for
   those grades. Feel thankful and count your blessings."

2. CL: "It's a common thing for men to have mistresses in
   Europe. Why do they have to make such a fuss about
   it over here?"
   CO: "Well you know it's really not the Christian thing
to do. Anyway, it's wise not to develop relationships
which are frowned upon by our society. Have you con-
sidered locating in Europe?"
3. CL: "Hell, what do I care about being on time, my boss never says a good word about my work and he didn't do a thing about getting me that raise."

CO: "Don't you think though, that consistently being on time will be to your advantage in the long run? It looks much better on your record and shows a sense of maturity and responsibility. Your boss is probably a very busy man. I'm sure he will make some comment on your work in the future. And, don't be so disappointed about the raise. A lot of people have to get by on a lot less than you're making."

4. CL: "When I try to make love to my wife anymore, I can't perform."

CO: "I imagine that's very frustrating to your wife."

5. CL: "It's my twenty-second birthday tomorrow. I hate growing old."

CO: "My lands, child, that's not old. You're real young yet. You have your whole life ahead of you."

At this point the reader should understand two of the four verbal response dimensions: affective-cognitive and specific-non-specific. The reader should be able to rate a counselor verbal response as being either affective or cognitive, and specific or non-specific. For example, counselor verbal response number 5 was an example of a non-specific response. This verbal response is also rated as a cognitive response.

Understanding - Non-Understanding Dimension

This dimension relates to how well the counselor's response communicates to the client the fact that he understands, or is seeking to understand, the client's basic problem. These categories are more
clearly defined as follows:

A. Understanding Responses

These are responses which imply that the counselor understand the basic underlying affective or cognitive concerns of what the client is talking about, or is trying to get enough information from the client (through appropriate reference to what the client is feeling and expressing) so that he understands. Examples:

1. "These feelings make it difficult for you to get along with others."
2. "In other words, you feel inadequate and self-conscious in these situations."
3. "You really want to be a big man."
4. "Could you tell me more specifically what you mean by this odd feeling about your brother?"
5. "Could you tell me more about that?"

B. Non-Understanding Responses

These are responses which imply that the counselor lacks and understanding of the basic underlying affective or cognitive concerns of what the client is talking about, or are responses which indicate the counselor is making no attempt to obtain appropriate information from the client from which he may derive an understanding of the client's underlying concerns. Non-understanding responses are those which make inappropriate reference to what the client is feeling or expressing, are inappropriately timed to significant cues, or are responses which are made after several significant client clues have either been ignored or entirely missed. Examples:

1. CL: "When he said that I just turned red and clenched my fists."

CO: "Some people don't say nice things."
2. CL: "When I showed my mother my grades and she said they were acceptable, but I should be doing better, I felt like quitting college and telling her to go to hell."

CO: "What would you do if you quit?"

3. CL: "Sometimes I have queer feelings about my parents."

CO: "So what, all adolescents go through that stage."

4. CL: "When Ivan put his arm about me, I started crying."

CO: "You mentioned that Ivan likes the classics."

5. CL: "I'm so self-conscious in a crowd. (CO: Silence) I just can't speak to groups because of my nose. (CO: Silence) My brothers always made fun of my nose. (CO: Silence) My aunt said once I looked like an eagle. Boy, I hated her guts. (CO: Silence) I just don't like my family."

CO: "When you go to college you can get away from your family."

The reader should now understand three of the four verbal response dimensions. He should be able to rate a counselor verbal response on these three dimensions. For example, response number 5 was used to illustrate non-understanding; the reader should also realize that this same response is also cognitive and non-specific.

Exploratory - Non-Exploratory Dimension

This dimension concerns the extent to which the counselor's response permits, encourages, or elicits further exploration on the part of the client of any aspect of his problem areas or affective concerns. These categories are most clearly defined as follows:
A. **Exploratory Responses**

Counselor exploratory responses are responses which first, indicate that the counselor has recognized some portion of the client's basic problem and, second, has made some verbal reference of this back to the client in such a way that the client is free from any defined or "limited" structure in his response, and is thus free to respond to any degree and depth to the counselor's reference that he may choose. In addition to the verbal response, the counselor's whole manner creates an atmosphere for further exploration. An exploratory response, then, is one which concerns some aspect of the client's basic problem and at the same time permits and encourages the client flexibility and freedom in his response. Such responses are often open ended and allow the client to explore his own feelings and to expand up them. Examples:

1. "It seems that your anger is really directed toward your father."
2. "Perhaps your need for such high esteem has something to do with your choice of medicine as a career."
3. "Maybe we should discuss a little more these strong attitudes about sex."

B. **Non-Exploratory Responses**

Counselor non-exploratory responses are responses which indicate no recognition of the client's basic problem, and thus no attempt to search them out further, or responses which structure or limit the client's response. A "yes" or "no" answer or a "pat" answer is often implied by such responses. Non-exploratory responses are those which give the client little opportunity to explore or expand, or to express himself freely. Examples:

1. "What is your average in English so far this year?"
2. "That's a nice place to study, isn't it?"
3. "What was your uncle's name?"

At this point the reader should understand the four counselor verbal response dimensions. You should be able to rate counselor verbal responses on the four dimensions. A rating scale, appropriately named the Counselor Verbal Response Scale (CVRS), will help you rate counselor verbal responses.

Since you have already been introduced to the four counselor verbal response dimensions, using the rating scale should pose no problem. Read the CVRS slowly and carefully, be sure that you understand how to rate responses. After reading the CVRS, you will have an opportunity to test your rating skill.
COUNSELOR VERBAL RESPONSE SCALE

SECTION III.

The Counselor Verbal Response Scale is an attempt to describe a counselor's response to client communication in terms of four dichotomized dimensions:

(A) Affect - Cognitive
(B) Understanding - Non-Understanding
(C) Specific - Non-Specific
(D) Exploratory - Non-Exploratory

These dimensions have been selected because they seem to represent aspects of counselor behavior which seem to make theoretical sense and contribute to client progress.

The unit for analysis is the verbal interaction between counselor and client represented by a client statement and counselor response. A counselor response is rated on each of the four dimensions of the rating scale, with every client-counselor interaction being judged independently of preceding units. In judging an individual response, the primary focus is on describing how the counselor responded to the verbal elements of the client's communication.
DESCRIPTION OF RATING DIMENSIONS

I. Affect - Cognitive Dimension

The affective-cognitive dimension indicates whether a counselor's response refers to any affective component of a client's communication or concerns itself primarily with the cognitive component of that communication.

A. Affective Responses. Affective responses generally make reference to emotions, feelings, fears, etc. The judge's rating is solely by the content and/or intent of the counselor's response, regardless of whether it be reflection, clarification or interpretation. These responses attempt to maintain the focus on the affective component of a client's communication. Thus they may:

(a) Refer directly to an explicit or implicit reference to affect on the part of the client. Example: "It sounds like you were really angry at him."

(b) Encourage an expression of affect on the part of the client. Example: "How does it make you feel when your parents argue?"

(c) Approve of an expression of affect on the part of the client. Example: "It doesn't hurt to let your feelings out once in a while, does it?"

(d) Presents a model for the use of affect by the client. Example: "If somebody treated me like that, I'd really be mad."

Special care must be taken in rating responses which use the word "feel." For example, in the statement "Do you feel that your student teaching experience is helping you get the idea of teaching?", the phrase "Do
you feel that" really means "do you think that." Similarly, the expression "How are you feeling?" is often used in a matter-of-fact, conversational manner. Thus, although the verb "to feel" is used in both these examples, these statements do not represent responses which would be judged "affective."

B. Cognitive Responses. Cognitive responses deal primarily with the cognitive element of a client's communication. Frequently, such responses seek information of a factual nature. They generally maintain the interaction on the cognitive level. Such responses may:

(a) Refer directly to the cognitive component of the client's statement.
Example: "So then you're thinking about switching your major to chemistry?"

(b) Seeks further information of a factual nature from the client.
Example: "What were your grades last term?"

(c) Encourage the client to continue to respond at the cognitive level.
Example: "How did you get interested in art?"
II. Understanding - Non-Understanding Dimension

The understanding - non-understanding dimension indicates whether a counselor's response communicates to the client that the counselor understands or is seeking to understand the client's basic communication, thereby encouraging the client to continue to gain insight into the nature of his concerns.

A. Understanding Responses. Understanding responses communicate to the client that the counselor understands the client's communication—the counselor makes appropriate reference to what the client is expressing or trying to express or the counselor is clearly seeking enough information of either a cognitive or affective nature to gain such understanding. Such responses:

(a) Directly communicate an understanding of the client's communication.
   Example: "In other words, you really want to be treated like a man."

(b) Seek further information from the client in such a way as to facilitate both the counselor's and the client's understanding of the basic problems.
   Example: "What does being a man mean to you?"

(c) Reinforce or give approval of client communications which exhibit understanding.
   Example: CL: "I guess then when people criticize me, I'm afraid they'll leave me."
   CO: "I see you're beginning to make some connection between your behavior and your feelings."

B. Non-Understanding Responses. Non-understanding responses are those in which the counselor fails to understand the client's basic communication or makes no attempt to obtain appropriate information from the client. In essence, non-understanding implies misunderstanding.
Such responses:

(a) Communicate misunderstanding of the client's basic concern.

Example: CL: "When he said that, I just turned red and clenched my fists."

CO: "Some people don't say nice things."

(b) Seek information which may be irrelevant to the client's communication.

Example: CL: "I seem to have a hard time getting along with my brothers."

CO: "Do all your brothers live at home with you?"

(c) Squelch client understanding or move the focus to another irrelevant area.

Example: CL: "I guess I'm really afraid that other people will laugh at me."

CO: "We're the butt of other people's jokes sometimes."

CL: "Sometimes I really hate my aunt."

CO: "Will things be better when you go to college?"
III. Specific - Non-Specific Dimension

The specific - non-specific dimension indicates whether the counselor's response delineates the client's problems and is central to the client's communication or whether the response does not specify the client's concern. In essence, it describes whether the counselor deals with the client's communication in general, vague, or peripheral manner, or "zeros in" on the core of the client's communication. NB: A response judged to be non-understanding must also be non-specific since it would, by definition, misunderstand the client's communication and not help the client to delineate his concerns. Responses judged understanding might be either specific (core) or non-specific (peripheral) i.e., they would be peripheral if the counselor conveys only a vague idea that a problem exists or "flirts" with the idea rather than helping the client delineate some of the dimensions of his concerns.

A. Specific Responses. Specific responses focus on the core concerns being presented either explicitly or implicitly by the client. Such responses:

(a) Delineate more closely the client's basic concerns.  
Example: "This vague feeling you have when you get in tense situations—is it anger or fear?"

(b) Encourage the client to discriminate among stimuli affecting him.  
Example: "Do you feel ______ in all your classes or only in some classrooms?"

(c) Reward the client for being specific.  
Example: CL: "I guess I feel this way most often with someone who reminds me of my father."

CO: "So as you put what others say in perspective, the whole world doesn't seem so bad, it's only when someone you value, like Father, doesn't pay any attention that you feel hurt."
B. Non-Specific Responses. Non-specific responses indicate that the counselor is not focusing on the basic concerns of the client or is not yet able to help the client differentiate among various stimuli. Such responses either miss the problem area completely (such responses are also non-understanding) or occur when the counselor is seeking to understand the client's communication and has been presented with only vague bits of information about the client's concern. Thus, such responses:

(a) Fail to delineate the client's concerns and cannot bring them into sharper focus.  
   Example: "It seems your problem isn't very clear--can you tell me more about it?"

(b) Completely miss the basic concerns being presented by the client even though the counselor may ask for specific details.  
   Example: CL: "I've gotten all A's this year and I still feel lousy."  
   CO: "What were your grades before then?"

(c) Discourage the client from bringing his concerns into sharper focus.  
   Example: "You and your sister argue all the time. What do other people think of your sister?"
IV. Exploratory - Non-Exploratory

The exploratory - non-exploratory dimension indicates whether a
counselor's response permits or encourages the client to explore his
cognitive or affective concerns, or whether the response limits a cli-
ent's exploration of these concerns.

A. Exploratory Responses. Exploratory responses encourage and
permit the client latitude and involvement in his response. They may
focus on relevant aspects of the client's affective or cognitive concerns
but clearly attempt to encourage further exploration by the client.
Such responses are often open-ended and/or are delivered in a manner
permitting the client freedom and flexibility in response. These re-
sponses:

(a) Encourage the client to explore his own concerns.
   Example: Cognitive--"You're not sure what you want
to major in, is that it?"
   Affective--"Maybe some of these times
   you're getting mad at yourself, what do
   you think?"

(b) Assist the client to explore by providing him with
    possible alternatives designed to increase his range
    of responses.
   Example: Cognitive--"What are some of the other
    alternatives that you have to history as
    a major?"
   Affective--"In these situations, do you
    feel angry, mad, helpless, or what?"

(c) Reward the client for exploratory behavior.
   Example: Cognitive--"It seems that you've considered
    a number of alternatives for a major, that's
    good."
   Affective--"So you're beginning to wonder
   if you always want to be treated like a man."
B. **Non-Exploratory Responses.** Non-exploratory responses either indicate no understanding of the client's basic communication, or so structure and limit the client's responses that they inhibit the exploratory process. These responses give the client little opportunity to explore, expand, or express himself freely. Such responses:

- **Discourage further exploration on the part of the client.**
  - **Example:** Cognitive—"You want to change your major to history."

- **Affective—"You really resent your parents treating you like a child."**
RATING EXERCISE

SECTION IV.

Here are some client-counselor units. Rate the counselor responses on the CVRS dimensions; use the rating sheet. After rating the responses, check your ratings with the correct ones which are given on the next few pages.

1. CL: "It sure is difficult to ask a girl for a date, at least for me it's difficult."
   
   CO: "You're experiencing difficulty . . . but . . . it doesn't seem that difficult for others?"

2. CL: "Yes . . . I . . . well, I'm never sure if a girl wants to go out (CO: Silence) I don't want to ask someone unless I know they really want to go out."
   
   CO: "So, because you're uncertain as to whether she really wants to, you don't even bother to ask."

3. CL: "Yes . . . ."
   
   CO: "It sounds as if, perhaps, you're afraid of getting turned down . . . like, this would hurt."

4. CL: "It sure is difficult to ask a girl for a date, at least for me it's difficult."
   
   CO: "This is a big problem for many fellows your age—tell me more about it."

5. CL: "Well, it's not a big problem, really, I guess—it's just that I get nervous when I try to ask a girl for a date."
   
   CO: "Well, that's natural, don't get uptight."

6. CL: "Yea, I guess . . . but, other guys don't seem to have the trouble that I do."
CO: "Don't worry, everyone has these butterfly feelings sometimes."
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counselor-Client Unit Number</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Cognitive Understanding</th>
<th>Non-Understanding Specific</th>
<th>Non-Specific Exploratory</th>
<th>Non-Exploratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation of Rating for the 6 Examples**

1. The first response is affective. The affect is found in the experimental difficulty. Remember, the word feel or feeling is not necessary in order for the statement to be affective. Affect refers to emotions, feelings, fears, moods, desires, urges, impulses, fantasy, dreams and any ideas, attitudes, beliefs, convictions, etc. which are based upon such referents as these. This response is understanding - it is reflective clarification of the client's statement. The counselor is checking out his perception of what the client said, and also reflecting the difficulty which the client indicated that he was experiencing. This response is specific; it refers to the core issue - the difficulty which the client is experiencing and his perception that
others don't have this difficulty. This response is exploratory and is stated in the form of a question; the client is thus encouraged to go on with either a correction of the counselor's perception, or further explanation and exploration.

2. This second response is affective in referring to the uncertainty of the client. The response is understanding; it interprets what the client has said but in a questioning manner, thus seeking more information if the interpretation is rejected by the client. The response is specific in dealing with the explicit core issue of uncertainty, and also deals with the implicit core issue of the uncertainty blocking the asking for a date. Thus, the difficulty which was expressed earlier is seen by the counselor as stemming from uncertainty. This second response is also exploratory; it gives the client freedom to go on with the topic and subtly encourages exploration.

3. This third counselor response is probably in response to all that the client has said thus far in the session. It is interpretative. The response is affective—referring to fear and more implicitly, the fear of being turned down (rejected) and hurt (feelings of rejection, unwanted, unloved, etc.). The response is understanding of this underlying issue which the client has expressed (but not in a verbally explicit manner). The response is specific to this underlying core—the fear of being turned down and hurt. The response is exploratory; it takes the client a step closer to self-understanding. It explores the underlying core which the client has not been able to verbalize or perhaps realize.
4. The counselor response in example 4 is cognitive. It refers to "problem", a factual concept. The response is understanding because it seeks to understand—it asks the client to "tell more about it." The response is non-specific. Instead of referring to the core issue of the client's personal difficulty, it generalizes the specific issue into the fact that many fellows have such a problem. The response is exploratory because it encourages the client to continue his explanation of the problem.

5. This is a cognitive response. It avoids the affect which the client has expressed as "nervous". It is non-understanding; the counselor doesn't indicate that he understands the nervous feelings, nor does he try to gain understanding about it. The response is non-specific; it does not refer to the core—the nervous difficulty. It is non-exploratory by cutting off further exploration with a well intended but poor response of encouraging advice.

6. This is an affective, non-understanding, non-specific, non-exploratory response. To the layman it sounds good—as if the counselor is being optimistic and encouraging. But, the counselor is not indicating to the client that he understands the disturbing perception about having unusual difficulty with dating. The counselor does not focus on the core of dating difficulty, and he cuts off the client from further exploration.

**SUMMARY**

You have been introduced to four verbal response dimensions. You have learned that neophytes like yourself (and some experienced
counselors) often use too many cognitive responses, and that these responses are often non-understanding, non-specific, and non-exploratory.

Thus, you may be saying to yourself: "The next time I counsel I'll try to use more affective, understanding, specific, exploratory responses. But, how do I do this, there's so much to remember, and isn't counseling supposed to be a natural thing? I'll sound phoney if I try to pick and choose and formulate my responses!"

In order to help you incorporate your learnings about the dimensions into your counseling, here are a few suggestions.

1. Responding with good counseling responses is more a function of attitude and listening than memorization of this manual's content.

2. Listen for the core of the client's statements. Don't think ahead or form theories about his problem, just concentrate on listening to the core.

3. Respond to the core of the client's statements. Don't be concerned with superficial facts and information.

4. Listen for affect in the client's statements. Respond to the client's affect.

5. Convey to the client that you understand the core of his concerns. Help the client understand the core. Don't be afraid to admit that you are confused, or that you don't understand. In such cases--seek understanding.

6. Make exploratory responses--avoid "pat" answers, superficial encouragement, etc. which tend to cut off further exploration of the client's concerns. Use questioning inflection and open-ended statements or questions.

Use these suggestions, and your learning from the manual when you counsel. Make good verbal responses.
APPENDIX B

COUNSELOR VERBAL RESPONSE SCALE

| Rater: ___________________ | Tape: ___________________ |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Affective</th>
<th>Cognitive</th>
<th>Understanding</th>
<th>Non-Understanding</th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Non-Specific</th>
<th>Exploratory</th>
<th>Non-Exploratory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

DEFINITION OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION
FOR RATING PURPOSES

Both Boyd (1971) and Carr (1971) defined Instructional Supervision in terms of the role of the supervisor. The following is Carr's (1971) description of this role:

The foundation of instructional supervision . . . is conditioning and shaping. The supervisor assists the teacher-counselor to critique and rate his tape using the Counselor Verbal Response Scale. He rewards the teacher-counselor for good responses and withholds reward or praise when the response is poor. In the case of poor responses, the supervisor helps the teacher-counselor think of better responses he might have used. The supervisor is not interested in affective recall. He deals with the feelings of the teacher-counselor as they appear crucial to the learning of the verbal responses or as they appear crucial to maintaining the supervisory relationship. The supervisor is instructional and focuses specifically on the teacher-counselor's responses. He points out the undesirableness of "bad" responses, as exemplified in the Counselor Verbal Response Scale, by reminding the client that "good" responses lead to productive counseling whereas poor responses lead the client astray and do not deal with his concerns.

It may be that the teacher-counselor has a particularly troublesome pattern of responding, i.e., entirely cognitive, consistently non-specific, or consistently non-exploratory. In other cases there may be no particular pattern and poor responses are scattered throughout the tape. In both cases, the teacher-counselor may be unaware of the pattern or periodic poor responses and may not have been able to discriminate (rate) his responses adequately. Therefore, in both cases the supervisor should help the counselor find alternative responses.

This definition was given to the supervisor for this investigation. He reviewed this definition and the Counselor Verbal Response Manual with this investigator prior to his initial supervisory session.

The supervisor's behavior during the supervisory sessions was taped and
APPENDIX C
(Continued)

DEFINITION OF INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION
FOR RATING PURPOSES

rated on Carr's (1971) Instructional Supervision Rating Sheet (see Appendix D) to determine the effectiveness of his supervisory technique.
APPENDIX D

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION RATING SHEET

1. The supervisor reinforces the counselor for good responses.

Consistently Often Sometimes Seldom Never

2. The supervisor withholds criticism or negative reinforcement for "poor" and/or inappropriate responses (i.e., non-understanding, non-exploratory, non-specific).

Consistently Often Sometimes Seldom Never

3. The supervisor assists the counselor to find alternative responses for "poor" responses.

Consistently Often Sometimes Seldom Never

4. The supervisor points out consistently ineffective patterns of responses when they exist. (Such as questioning, always cognitive, etc.)

Consistently Often Sometimes Seldom Never

5. The supervisor focuses on dimensions of the Counselor Verbal Response Scale as the learning goal.

Consistently Often Sometimes Seldom Never

6. The supervisor attends to the counselor as a person sufficiently to maintain an effective learning relationship.

Very Satisfactorily More Than Satisfactorily Satisfactorily Unsatisfactorily Not at All
APPENDIX D
(Continued)

INSTRUCTIONAL SUPERVISION RATING SHEET

7. The impression of the supervisory session is more one of instruction as opposed to a therapeutic or affectively-oriented supervisory process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totally</th>
<th>Generally</th>
<th>Partially</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

RESULTS OF RATINGS OF SUPERVISION TAPES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale Items:</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Sessions</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
<th>R1</th>
<th>R2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O.S.U.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whitehall</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthington</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleventh Avenue</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean Rated Score  | 4.25 | 4.88 | 5.0 | 4.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 5.0 |
APPENDIX E
MANUAL FOR TRAINING JUDGES IN USE
OF COUNSELOR VERBAL RESPONSE SCALE

This manual is intended to standardize procedures for use of the IPR Counselor Verbal Response Scale in the judging of either video or audio tapes and to provide some guidelines in the training of judges in the use of the scale.

I. What is a scorab le response?

Scorable responses include words, phrases, or sentences used by the counselor which interrupt the flow and momentum of client communication or which are in direct response to a client's statement. Although such responses normally occur at the conclusion of a client's communication, there are times when a counselor will deliberately interrupt a client's statement. In either case, such counselor statements are treated as scorable responses.

Responses which are part of a counselor's unconscious mannerisms, and do not interrupt the flow and momentum of client communication, e.g., "Umm," "Okay," "Hmm," "Yes," and "I see" are not scored. Responses such as "continue" and "go on" are scorable responses. In essence, they urge and encourage the client to continue with his flow of communication and reinforce the client's pattern of communication.

There are times when counselors make two distinct responses to a single client communication, these responses normally being separated by a pause:
Example: CL: "It's good to get rounded especially if I decided to teach which you really can't decide until you get into college, I guess."

CO: "Kind of hard to figure things out, isn't it?" "Do you think student teaching is helping you get the feel of teaching?"

In this case, there are clearly two responses differing in nature which must be scored separately to accurately evaluate the counselor. There are other instances in which there is a clear shift in the content of the counselor's response without a distinct pause. In such cases, as in the proceeding example, counselor statements are treated as two separate responses and are scored individually. N.B.: Each scorable counselor response must be rated on each of the five dimensions of the scale.

II. How many responses are scored?

For purposes of accurate evaluation, twenty consecutive counselor responses are scored from each counseling session rated. These responses should be drawn from the middle portions of a counseling session, avoiding both the beginning and the termination segments of the interview. Judges should, however, be given an opportunity to listen to a few responses prior to the start of judging so that they may become acclimated to the voices and pace of both client and counselor, and may gain some familiarity with the general tone of the interview.

III. When is rating done?

Each response is rated at the conclusion of the counselor's statement (word or phrase). The tape (audio or video) should be stopped after each scorable counselor response and scoring should be completed by all judges prior to the playing of the next unit. As
judges become more comfortable with the use of the scale, they should require no more than thirty seconds for the scoring of each response.

As in all judging procedures, it is desirable that communication among judges be minimized during the rating session. Thus, judges should be so placed that, while they all have adequate view of the video monitor or can clearly hear the audio tape, there is a minimum of contact among judges.

IV. How are judges trained?

It is important that adequate time be given to the training of judges. The success of any evaluation of this sort depends upon the agreement reached by the judges in defining the dimensions of the scale. Training must involve actual rating of practice tapes. The number of tapes used will, of course, depend on the needs of the judges. However, the tapes should represent a variety of counseling interviews, i.e., experienced, inexperienced, or beginning, etc.

During training, discussion should follow the rating of each counselor response (obviously in the later stages of training, this is not as crucial and a group of responses may be rated before discussion occurs) until agreement about interpretation of the dimensions of the scale is reached. Prior to the actual rating, judges should again go over the definitions of the five dimensions to insure complete understanding.

V. How much time does rating require?

It has been found that at least one is required for the rating of two audio tapes. It is clear that more time would be involved in the
rating of video tapes due to the time required for changing tape. These
time allowances should be noted prior to establishing a rating session.*

It has also been our experience that approximately three hours
is necessary for adequate training of judges and discussion of the def-
initions of the five dimensions.

General Questions:

The most frequent question which occurs centers about whether
responses can be judged independently of prior content in the interview.
The intent of this scale is to focus primarily on a single client commu-
nication and counselor response. It is obvious, however, that many coun-
selor responses take into account material which has been elicited in
prior portions of the interview. Most interviews also present a general
theme within which individual interactions occur. The judge must clear-
ly be aware of this larger framework in making his rating. However, the
emphasis still remains on the individual response to a client communi-
cation.

In this context, it is important to note that ratings of re-
sponses take into account the appropriateness of the response at a given
moment in time. For instance, while a response may be specific in the
early portions of the interview, the same response coming later in the
interview may not only be nonspecific, but also inappropriate in moving
the client to a further understanding of his own concerns. To this

---

*Care should be taken in scheduling rating sessions so that
judges are not required to rate too many tapes at any one session. If
this is allowed to occur, judges may acquire a "set" which will affect
later ratings.
extent, the unfolding theme and the appropriate timing of responses must be considered by the judge in making his rating.

VI. Clarification of frequently occurring rating problems and questions:

Right Side and Left Side Scoring Tendencies

For a given counselor response, judges should be particularly cautioned against rating the first dimension and then marking all the remaining dimensions to follow suit: e.g., marking the first dimension cognitive, and then the remaining dimensions nonunderstanding, nonspecific, nonexploratory, and noneffective, or marking the first dimension affective, and then the remaining dimensions understanding, specific, exploratory, and effective. Each dimension is to be scored independently according to category definitions.

Possible Counselor Dimension Scoring Patterns

According to the dimension category definitions, the following scoring patterns are possible:

1. A response can be cognitive and still be understanding, specific, and/or exploratory.

2. A response can be affective without being understanding, specific, and exploratory.

3. A response can be affective and understanding without being specific and exploratory.

4. A response can be understanding and specific without being affective and exploratory.

5. A response can be affective, understanding, and exploratory without being specific.

A response, however, can never be exploratory without being understanding.
Recurring Judge Questions Concerning Dimension Category Definitions

Although it is not possible to anticipate the nature of all judge questions concerning category definitions, the important recurring ones are presented here along with the answers of clarification:

Q: "If the counselor demonstrates affect himself in his response, is this scored affect?"

A: "No, not necessarily. The main criterion is whether the counselor is referring back to some affective aspect presented by the client. The important thing is what he is referring back to, not his manner in referring."

Q: "What if the counselor makes reference back to affective aspects or implications in the client's remarks which are not justified by the client's remarks or manner. Is this scored affect?"

A: "Yes. However, if you feel the affective reference is inappropriate you would also score the response nonunderstanding, nonspecific, nonexploratory, and probably noneffective."

Q: "What if the counselor refers to or discusses the feelings and concerns of third parties which are in no way related to the concerns or involvement of the client. Is this scored affect?"

A: "No, such a response is scored cognitive. To be scored affect, discussion of feelings and concerns of third parties must be directly related to the client and tied in with the feelings and concerns of the client."

Q: "Are all questions by the counselor to be considered as seeking understanding?"

A: "No. The question has to be related to clarifying for the counselor some aspect of major concern, explicitly or implicitly implied by the client. Random questions asked by the counselor from the 'top of his head' to alleviate anxiety, to continue a cognitive discussion unrelated or leading away from the client's main concerns, or which in any way seem unrelated or inappropriate to what the client is trying to express, are scored nonunderstanding."

Q: "If the counselor fails to respond to several important affective client leads but finally responds to a lesser type of client lead, is this scored nonunderstanding?"

A: "Yes."
Q: "If the counselor maintains a cognitive discussion with the client when the client's remarks are implying more affective concerns, is this scored nonunderstanding?"

A: "Yes. Whenever a counselor maintains a cognitive discussion as a means of keeping away from a discussion of the client's affective concerns, his responses are scored nonunderstanding."

Q: "When is a cognitive response on the part of the counselor scored understanding?"

A: "Whenever the cognitive content to which the counselor is responding seems to be the important concern of the client and is not a cover-up for underlying affective problems or concerns. This also applies to the specific and exploratory categories. Responses are not scored understanding if it is obvious that affective problems and of more concern to the client than cognitive content, but the counselor continues on a cognitive plane. In such cases the counselor's response is also nonspecific and nonexploratory."

Q: "Can a counselor's response be specific without being understanding?"

A: "Yes." A client can present point blank to the counselor a central concern of his and the counselor may comment on it without demonstrating any understanding of its significance or may comment on it in such a way that there is no further pursuit of it."

Q: "What is the main criterion for specific?"

A: "When the counselor's response stays at the same emotional level as the client and it is able to zero through the client's verbage right to his central concerns without being side-tracked by less important affective or cognitive concerns."

Q: "If a counselor's response is such that it is possible that the client could respond in any way that he chooses, is that response scored exploratory?"

A: "No." For a counselor's response to be scored exploratory it is essential that the counselor's response not only permit the client to respond to any length or any depth that he chooses, but it must also reflect that the counselor has some understanding that there is some aspect of real concern to the client and his response is thus encouraging further elaboration of this concern. This concern of the client may be vague and still not specifically identified by the counselor, but he understands there is some kind of concern there and is seeking further exploration or clarification of it.
APPENDIX F

INTERCLASS CORRELATION: INTERRATER RELIABILITY
OF EACH OF THE FOUR DIMENSIONS OF THE CVRS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A-C Dimension</th>
<th>U-NU Dimension</th>
<th>S-NS Dimension</th>
<th>E-NE Dimension</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raters</td>
<td>Raters</td>
<td>Raters</td>
<td>Raters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>23 24 24</td>
<td>22 23 23</td>
<td>24 24 24</td>
<td>23 23 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>25 24 23</td>
<td>25 27 27</td>
<td>27 28 27</td>
<td>25 27 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>20 20 20</td>
<td>22 21 22</td>
<td>22 21 20</td>
<td>22 21 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>22 22 22</td>
<td>21 22 22</td>
<td>22 22 22</td>
<td>21 22 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>21 21 22</td>
<td>21 21 22</td>
<td>21 21 22</td>
<td>21 21 22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>29 30 29</td>
<td>29 29 29</td>
<td>31 29 29</td>
<td>30 29 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>23 23 24</td>
<td>27 29 29</td>
<td>28 28 28</td>
<td>27 29 28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>23 23 21</td>
<td>23 23 21</td>
<td>24 24 21</td>
<td>23 23 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>25 24 25</td>
<td>26 27 24</td>
<td>26 27 23</td>
<td>26 27 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>29 28 27</td>
<td>31 32 32</td>
<td>31 32 31</td>
<td>31 32 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>24 25 24</td>
<td>25 26 23</td>
<td>25 26 24</td>
<td>25 24 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>20 22 20</td>
<td>21 23 21</td>
<td>21 22 20</td>
<td>21 23 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>21 22 21</td>
<td>23 22 23</td>
<td>23 22 22</td>
<td>23 23 22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
r_{cc} = \frac{V_r - V_e}{V_r + (K-1)V_e}
\]

(V Guilford, 1965, p. 299)

\(V_r = \text{Variance between rows}\)

\(V_e = \text{Variance for residuals}\)

\(K = \text{Number of columns}\)

A-C Dimension: \[ r_{cc} = \frac{21.308 - .456}{21.308 + .912} = .938 \]

U-NU Dimension: \[ r_{cc} = \frac{29.689 - .660}{29.689 + 1.320} = .936 \]

S-NS Dimension: \[ r_{cc} = \frac{29.879 - .684}{29.879 + 1.368} = .937 \]

E-NE Dimension: \[ r_{cc} = \frac{27.784 - .7684}{27.784 + 1.5208} = .922 \]
APPENDIX G

FORMULAE AND COMPUTATIONS FOR ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE
FOR COUNSELOR VERBAL RESPONSE SCALE DIMENSIONS
AND SCHEFFE'S TEST

2 X 2 Analysis of Variance for Fixed-Effects Models*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sums of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Squares</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Actualization (A)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSA</td>
<td>SSA/df</td>
<td>MS_A/MS_S/AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation (B)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSB</td>
<td>SSB/df</td>
<td>MS_B/MS_S/AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A X B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>SSB</td>
<td>SSB/df</td>
<td>MS_A/MS_S/AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Cell (error)</td>
<td>4(n-1)</td>
<td>SSerror</td>
<td>SSerror 4(n-1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computational Formulas*

\[ SSA = \frac{a}{b} \sum_{i} \sum_{k} \frac{X_{ijk}^2}{bn} - C \]

\[ SSB = \frac{b}{a} \sum_{j} \sum_{k} \frac{X_{ijk}^2}{an} - C \]

\[ SS_{AB} = \frac{a}{b} \sum_{i} \sum_{k} \frac{X_{ijk}^2}{n} - C - SS_A - SS_B \]

\[ SS_{error} = SS_{total} - SS_A - SS_B - SS_{AB} \]

Scheffe's test: comparison of each treatment to the control condition

\[ F = \frac{(a-1) \left( \frac{1}{n_i} \sum_{j} + \frac{1}{n_j} \right)}{SS/a} \]
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